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INTRODUCTION

In an email reacting to my lecture on the Jesuits of Jewish origins at the Jesuit Ricci Institute of Macau in November 2007, a Jesuit told me briefly the story of his Jewish lineage. While his other Sephardic ancestors went to Istanbul, Baghdad, Tehran, and—through the Silk Road—up to Shanghai, where they remained Jewish until today, both his grandparents were descendants of Jews who settled in Palermo and Trabia (Sicily), where they converted to Catholicism in order to survive (in the baptismal registers, which are still extant, they are described as “usurers”). Yet, they kept practicing Judaism secretly. From Friday evening through Saturday evening, his grandfather would hide the image of baby Jesus from a large framed picture of St. Anthony that he kept in his home. It was, in fact, a wind-up music box. On Fridays he would wind up the mechanism and push a button, so that Jesus would disappear out of St. Anthony’s arms, hidden in the upper frame of the picture. On Saturdays, he then would push the button again, so that Jesus would come back out from hiding into St. Anthony’s arms. As eldest son in his family, my correspondent was told this story by his father (who passed away in 1979), who also had asked him to eat only kosher food. None of his siblings was required to do so—they in fact hide their origins, since they are a devout practicing Catholic family.

Had the Jesuit who wrote me this email asked to enter the Jesuit Order between 1593 and 1608, his Jewish ancestry would have constituted a legal impediment to his admission, just because his character would have been allegedly compromised by his impure blood, no matter how distant his Jewish ancestors were. Had he asked to become a Jesuit between 1608 and 1946, his background would have been reviewed up to the fifth generation and the story of his heterodox paternal grandfather could, therefore, have been cited as reason to prevent him from entering the Order. However, had he become a professed Jesuit between 1540 and 1593, no law would have prevented him from following his vocation, even though not every confrere would have supported it.

This book tells the story of the evolution of the discriminatory concept of purity of blood, its complex nature, its magnitude in the early Society of Jesus (the Jesuits), and the role Christians of Jewish ancestry
played in the Order. Purity of blood (pureza de sangre) was an obsessive concern that originated in mid-fifteenth-century Spain, based on the biased belief that the unfaithfulness of the “deicide Jews” not only had endured in those who converted to Catholicism but also had been transmitted by blood to their descendants, regardless of their sincerity in professing the Christian faith. Consequently, the Old Christians “of pure blood” considered New Christians impure and morally inadequate to be active members of their communities. As Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi put it eloquently, “the traditional mistrust of the Jew as outsider now gave way to an even more alarming fear of the Converso as insider.” In the process of nation-state building in the early modern period, which was characterized by the national self-definition based on purity of lineage, the converso and Jewish elements—as figuratively epitomized in Shakespeare’s unmiscegenated Belmont—became a particularly dangerous threat. Arguably, the high number of Jews who converted to Christianity as a result of the pogroms in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and as a result of the royal edict of 1492 con-
stituted much greater hindrance to the monarchs’ vision of Catholic national identity than they had during the Visigothic rule in Spain, prior to the Muslim invasion of the Iberian Peninsula in 711.3

The first part of the title of the present book, The Jesuit Order as a Synagogue of Jews, reflects the genealogical identification of the converted Jews and their descendants, no matter how distant, with their allegedly infidel ancestors. It was characteristic not only of some renowned Talmudic authorities4 and of the late medieval and early modern Christian authors whom we shall analyze throughout this book but also of some contemporary historians. Alfred Sicoff described this trend as “the ulcer of the Spanish existence.”5 It is telling that, for instance, the titles of both the anti-converso legislation at the San Antonio de Sigüenza College, Statutum contra hebraeos (1497), and the major contemporary work on Spanish conversos by Julio Caro Baroja, Los judíos en la España moderna y contemporánea (Madrid: Ediciones Arion, 1961),6 reflect the identification of conversos with Jews, even though after the Expulsion of 1492 there were officially no Jews in Spain (as there were no Jews in Portugal after their expulsion in 1497).7

Caro Baroja, in fact, identified three different sources of the anti-Jewish bias: the economic (usury), the psychological (intelligence and arrogance), and the physical (body features and ungratefulness).8

---

3 In this context, Jerome Friedman’s article “Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws and Reformation: A Revisionist View of Racial and Religious Antisemitism,” published in Sixteenth Century Journal 18/1 (Spring, 1987): 3–30, lacks the chronological order, which leads its author to inaccurate if not false conclusions.


6 A few pages there (pp. 231–7) are dedicated to the converso problem in the Society of Jesus.

7 This is a characteristic underscored by both older and recent historiography on the subject. See, for example, Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, Los judeoconversos en España y América (Madrid: ISTMO, 1971), p. 28; and David L. Graizbord, Souls in Dispute: Converso Identities in Iberia and the Jewish Diaspora, 1580–1700 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), p. 3.

A mixture of prejudices based on these features the conversos allegedly inherited by blood pervades the entire anti-converso literature, starting with the first purity-of-blood legislation (1449) passed by the mayor of the city of Toledo in Castile, Pero de Sarmiento, to the Estatutos (1547) promulgated by the archbishop of Toledo, Juan Martínez Guijarro (1477–1557), better known as Silíceo,9 and to Bishop Diego de Simancas’s Defensio Toletani Statuti (Antwerp: Plantin, 1573). Like the gentle (but not-gentile) daughter of Shylock, Jessica, in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice, “in spite of canonical assurance of the regeneration through baptism, the converso was still considered a Jew in the eyes of Spanish Old Christians, and as such he [or she] was constantly responsible for the faults of his [/her] Jewish ancestors.”10

Two major ecclesiastical intellectuals of fifteenth-century Spain adamantly challenged in their works the discriminatory portrayal of the converso: Alonso de Santa María de Cartagena (1384–1456) in the Defensorium unitatis christianae [In Defense of Christian Unity] (1449–50),11 and Alonso Oropesa (d. 1469) in the Lumen ad revelatiorem gentium et gloria plebis Dei Israel, de unitate fidei et de concordi et pacifica aequalitate fidelium (1450–66) [Light for the Revelation of the Gentiles and Glory to the People of God Israel: Concerning the Unity of the Faith and Agreeable and Peaceful Equality of the Faithful].12 Although Gretchen Starr-LeBeau has pointed out in her

---


important book on the religious history of Guadalupe in Extramadura that “fray Alonso de Oropesa’s work represents one of the period’s most important and carefully reasoned theological statements on the status of conversos in Christendom,” Cartagena’s work seems to have exercised even more influence in offering a distinctive Jewish-converso soteriology. This is why we shall spotlight his Defensorium in Chapter One, without failing to note, however, its theological resemblance to the Lumen. In their comprehensive template of arguments, both Defensorium and Lumen would become inspirational to many future efforts to defend the threatened status of conversos, including Jesuit conversos, as we shall see in the last chapter.

Analyzing Cartagena’s and Oropesa’s works adds significance to the understanding of the following chapters of this book for two reasons: first, Juan Alfonso de Polanco (1517–76)—one of the most influential converso Jesuits—descended from the converso Maluenda clan of Burgos, which was allied with the newly converted Santa María family through the marriage of Alonso de Cartagena’s paternal aunt, María Nuñez (d. 1423), to Juan Garcés de Maluenda (el Viejo); second, the Jesuit jurist García Girón de Alarcón (1534–97), whose pro-converso treatise we shall examine below, belonged to the same order as Oropesa—the Jeronymites—before joining the Society of Jesus. The Jeronymites were renowned for their openness to converso candidates and as such represented—in Sicoff’s view—the Spanish pre-Erasmists

---

only on the quotations of the former in José Sigüenza’s Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo (Madrid: Bailly-Balliére, 1907–9), before Díaz y Díaz published his Spanish translation of Oropesa’s work in 1979.


14 See Sicoff, Estatutos, p. 62: “[Cartagena] hizo un estudio tan profundo que durante dos siglos los abogados de los cristianos nuevos no encontraron nada que añadir a las consideraciones teóricas expuestas en el Defensorium”; and Pastore, Eresia spagnola, p. 5: “I due vescovi di Burgos, padre e figlio, rimasero per i conversi di fine secolo i rappresentanti della nobiltà conversa per eccellenza, ritornando come figure esemplari nelle Generaciones y semblanzas di Fernán Pérez de Guzmán e tra i Claros varones de Castilla di Fernando del Pulgar.”
movement.\(^{15}\) It is not unreasonable, therefore, to see connections between the Jeronymite and Jesuit converso traditions, which—to the best of my knowledge—have passed unnoticed by historians, but which deserve to be treated in a separate monograph.

Furthermore, the founder of the Jesuits, Ignatius of Loyola (c. 1491–1556), had many contacts with influential Erasmists (and *alumbrados*) during his studies at Alcalá de Henares,\(^{16}\) as we shall see in Chapter Two. Indeed, his positive approach to conversos (and Jews) pre-dates the foundation of the Society of Jesus in 1540, despite the assertion of many experts to the contrary. His openness towards conversos may have been motivated by the financial support that he had sought from their network in Spain and in the Spanish Netherlands before founding the Society and that he would continue to seek as the superior general of the Jesuits. In spite of this down-to-earth concern, Loyola undoubtedly was, as Henry Kamen powerfully put it, “a deep and sincere spiritual Semite.”\(^{17}\)

The foundation of the Jesuits coincided—for better or worse—with the rise of the Spanish anti-converso hysteria\(^{18}\) that reached its peak in 1547, when the most authoritative expression of the purity-of-blood legislation, *El Estatuto de limpieza [de sangre]*, was issued by the Inquisitor General of Spain and Archbishop of Toledo, Silíceo. Even though Pope Paul IV and Silíceo’s former pupil, King Philip II, ratified the archbishop’s statutes in 1555 and 1556, respectively—in spite of the latter’s earlier opposition to it\(^{19}\)—the authority and impetuous

\(^{15}\) Sicroff, “*El Lumen ad revelationem gentium* de Alonso de Oropesa,” pp. 655–64.


character of Silíceo did not deter Ignatius of Loyola and his converso successor, Diego Laínez (1512–65). Encouraged by their close converso collaborators, they vigorously opposed the Inquisitor’s attempts to preclude conversos from joining the Jesuits. They also had to counter the Jesuit provincial superior for Spain and Loyola’s relative, Antonio Araoz (1515–73), who—abetted by his penitent, the prince of Éboli, Ruy Gómez de Silva (c. 1516–73)—made himself the Jesuit harbinger of the Iberian policy of pureza de sangre.

In a letter addressed to the Jesuit Francisco de Villanueva (1509–57), Loyola straightforwardly wrote that in no way would the Jesuit Constitutions accept the policy of the archbishop, who, according to Loyola, should take care of his own business rather than interfering with the internal issues of the Society. The problem was that the flourishing College at Alcalá de Henares—which was inaugurated by the Jesuit Villanueva in 1546 and became a mine of Jesuit (converso) vocations—was located within Silíceo’s diocesan jurisdiction. In this delicate affair, Loyola was aided by his plenipotentiary emissary, Jerónimo Nadal [Morey] (1507–80), who visited the Inquisitor in February 1554. In communion with Loyola, Nadal insisted that the Jesuit Constitutions did not discriminate between candidates of the Society on the basis of lineage. Nadal, therefore, during his visit to Iberia admitted a handful of converso candidates. In a heated debate over the admission of one of them, Luis (Diego) de Santander (c. 1527–99), Nadal frankly


22 Antonio Araoz: *1515 Vergara (Guipúzcoa, Spain); † 13 February 1573 Madrid; SJ 1538; priest in 1541; professed in 1542 (see *DHCJ* 1:215–6). On Araoz’s anti-converso sentiments, see Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” pp. 8–9.


25 Loyola employed Villanueva also in the affair of the converso Juan de Ávila’s entrance to the Society (see Manuel Ruiz Jurado, S.J., “San Juan de Ávila y la Compañía de Jesús,” *AHSI* 40 (1971): 153–72). See also *DHCJ* 4:3976–7, where the author avoids the true motive of the conflict between the Society and the Inquisitor.

and proudly replied: “We [Jesuits] take pleasure in admitting those of Jewish ancestry.”

The heated polemics over Silíceo’s legislation were still echoed three decades later in Diego de Simancas’s *Defensio Toletani Statuti a Sede Apostolica saepe confirmati, pro his, qui bono et incontaminato genere nati sunt* [The Defense of the Toledan Statute, which was often confirmed by the Apostolic See for those who were born of good and uncontaminated lineage] (1573), despite the fact that the Inquisition in 1572 prohibited further discussion of the purity-of-blood issue. This text—whose publication date coincides with the Jesuit Third General Congregation, in which the anti- and pro-converso lobbies collided—is of special concern here. Not only because—in contrast to the early Jesuit leadership—it defended Silíceo’s statutes but also because Simancas’s tract may have been utilized by some Jesuits to promote similar anti-converso legislation in the Society of Jesus during the decade of fervent discriminatory propaganda that preceded General Congregation 5 (1593). Indeed, a Jesuit from Toledo copied many excerpts from Simancas’s book in 1591. They are preserved in the Jesuit Archives of Rome but until now have remained unnoticed, because a Jesuit archivist inserted the manuscript (*Defensio Statuti Toletani*)—whose genre he did not recognize—into a folder containing documents (*statuta*) related to the foundation of the Jesuit College at Toledo. These excerpts are analyzed in Chapter One for the first time. In the context of earlier anti-converso texts, they suggest the genealogy of modern racism, from Sarmiento to Silíceo to Simancas to anti-converso Jesuit legislation, and they indicate the correlation between early modern institutional Catholicism and the new racism developing in Spain and spreading outwards.

In this perspective, the anti-discrimination policy of the early Jesuit leadership constituted an act of bold and tenacious resistance to the early modern Iberian *Zeitgeist*. As a result, the minority of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry, socially and psychologically bonded one to another or dissociated from one another, shaped the history of the early Society of Jesus. They held the highest administrative offices, defined the Society’s institutional development and spirituality, revised Loyola’s historio-

---

29 ARSI, *Fondo Gesuítico, Toledo 1641*. 

graphy by assigning it an inflated anti-Protestant character, filled the 
 ranks of linguistically adroit missionaries in Asia and the Americas, 
 authoritatively represented the Society at the Council of Trent, signi-
 ficantly contributed to the transformation of the Society into the first 
 teaching order and to the placement of Greco-Roman culture in the 
 center of the Jesuit school curriculum, (influenced by the Dominicans 
 from the School of Salamanca) boldly offered a new epistemological 
 frame to casuistry as a transition from medieval Tutiorism to modern 
 Probabilism,30 developed a new discipline of moral theology, and 
 staffed the papal penitentiary office at St. Peter’s basilica in Rome. Some 
 came from families who generously supported the work of the Society 
 and the foundation of a number of Jesuit colleges; others enthusiasm-
 ally engaged in many other extraordinary literary, diplomatic, and 
 scientific endeavors (especially popular among them were different 
 missions dealing with “heretics” and schismatics). “By their sanctity 
 and learning they rendered the Society illustrious,” as the Jesuit García 
 Girón de Alarcón put it.31

On a much larger scale than the historian Marcel Bataillon has 
 intuitively suggested,32 these contributions by Jesuits of Jewish ances-
 try helped to shape Early Modern Catholicism33 by complementing 
 the work of their distinguished Iberian converso fellows, such as 
 Hernando de Talavera (1428–1507),34 Joan Lluís Vives (1492–1540),35

30 See Robert A. Maryks, Saint Cicero and the Jesuits. The Influence of the Liberal 
 Arts on the Adoption of Moral Probabilism (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), passim.
31 See Alarcón’s memorial in ARSI, Instit. 184/I, ff. 297r–312v. The same argument 
 appears in Diego de Guzmán’s memorial (ARSI, Instit. 186e, f. 255v), as we shall see 
 in Chapter Four.
33 John W. O’Malley coined this term. See his Trent and All That: Renaming 
 Catholicism in the Early Modern Era (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 
 2000), and my translation of it into Italian, Trento e dintorni. Per una nuova definizione 
34 See Sicoff, Estatutos, pp. 13–4. Talavera, who was the Jeronymite bishop of 
 Ávila and the confessor of Queen Isabella, wrote on sacramental confession (Breve 
 forma de confesar), a preferred subject of Jesuit conversos—see Maryks, Saint Cicero 
 and the Jesuits, pp. 32–48. He was also very engaged in the apostolate with Moriscos, 
 as were many converso Jesuits. For his portrayal, see, for example, Roth, Conversos, 
 Inquisition, pp. 152–4; and David Coleman, Creating Christian Granada: Society & 
 Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492–1600 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell 
35 See Miguel Battlori, “Las obras de Luis Vives en los colegios jesuíticos del siglo 
 colloquii Brugensis, 1985 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), pp. 121–45; and Valentin Moreno
St. Juan de Ávila (1500–69), 36 Luis de Granada (1504–88), 37 St. Teresa of Ávila (1515–82), 38 Benito Arias Montano (1527–98), 39 Luis de León (1528–91), 40 St. Juan de la Cruz (1542–91), and many others. 41

However, after the death in 1572 of Francisco de Borja, 42 the grandson of Pope Alexander Borgia (r. 1492–1503) and the third superior

---

36 His relation to the Society of Jesus will be discussed below.
37 See his De frequenti Communione libellus (1591), another preferred Jesuit topic, and a biography of Juan de Ávila, Vida del Padre Maestro Juan de Ávila y las partes que ha de tener un predicador del Evangelio (1588) that he discussed with the converso Jesuit Pedro de Ribadeneyra, about whom much will be discussed below.


41 Rey argued that Bataillon’s claim of the influence of the converso Juan de Ávila and Laínez on Catholic reform lacks proofs (see Rey, “San Ignacio,” p. 176). See the contrary view of Sicroff (Estatutos, p. 13): “No cabe duda de que la historia españa habría sido muy diferente de lo que fue si hubiera seguido las corrientes religiosas e intelectuales introducidas por españoles de la estirpe de Talavera, Luis de León y Arias Montano.” Most Jewish scholars working on converso history—who are often more familiar with the history of the Protestant Reformation than the Catholic Reformation—associate the Iberian conversos more with the former than with the latter. A blatant example of this historiographical tendency is Yovel’s recent book on conversos and their relation to modernity. See Yirmiyahu Yovel, The Other Within: The Marranos. Split Identity and Emerging Modernity (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), especially pp. 246–62.

42 Francisco de Borja: *1510 Gandía; SJ 1546; †1572 Rome; priest in 1551; professed in 1548. It is interesting to note that it was Borja’s grandfather, Pope Alexander VI, who rewarded the Aragonese King Ferdinand for his anti-converso policy with the title of “Catholic Monarch.” Borja’s pro-converso policy will be studied below.
general, a close-knit anti-converso party gained ground within the Society, as indicated by the archival material on the Italo-Portuguese sabotage of the election of Juan Alfonso de Polanco as Borja’s successor during the Third General Congregation (1573), which we shall analyze in Chapter Three. Upon election as vicar general, the converso Polanco was the most prominent figure in the Society of Jesus; he had been a senior administrator in the general curia in Rome since his appointment by Loyola in 1547 as Society’s secretary. Because the previous two vicars general, Láinez and Borja, had been elected superiors general at the subsequent general congregations, Polanco was considered the most probable candidate for this highest post in the Society. After all—to the dismay of the Italian Benedetto Palmio (1523–98) and the Portuguese—the Spanish electors dominated the congregation. They governed all but one Italian province, and the province of Portugal also was in their hands.

Contributors to the *Mercurian Project* have recently discussed this anti-Polanco campaign more critically. Francisco de Borja Medina, S.J., pointed out that even though the Italian Benedetto Palmio denied in his unpublished autobiography the charge that he was part of the Portuguese intrigue during the congregation, his anti-Spanish tendencies were well known. Medina further pointed out that “the veiled attacks against Juan Alonso [sic] de Polanco for his Judeo-Christian ancestors were directed, in reality, against the Spanish nation.” Moreover, John Padberg, S.J., argued that Palmio pressed Antonio Possevino “to do battle for his homeland Italy by voting against a Spaniard.” Finally, Mario Fois, S.J., suggested that a distinction must be made between the anti-Spanish motivation of Palmio (and other Italians)

---


46 See his “The Third General Congregation,” in McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, p. 54 (the information comes from Astrain, *Historia*, 3:7–8, but it can be traced back to Possevino’s memorial, ARSI, *Congr. 20b*, f. 210r).
and the anti-converso opposition of the Portuguese group. As we shall see, however, the archival material that we examine in this book reveals that the real intention of both Palmio and the Portuguese was to impede the election of Polanco or any other converso candidate. “Spanish” was a euphemism for “Jew/converso,” and the “anti-Spanish” campaign during the Third General Congregation was thus merely a camouflage for the Italo-Portuguese anti-converso conspiracy.

In spite of the death of the royal minister, Ruy Gómez de Silva, and his protégé Araoz in 1573, the anti-converso lobby found support in the newly elected superior general Everard Mercurian (1514–80), who from the very first years of his office “cleansed the house”: he removed from Rome (and possibly from Italy or even Europe) almost all Spanish Jesuits, especially those who are accused in Palmio’s memorial of being part of the converso lobby.

Ironically, Mercurian’s segregation policy created new opportunities for some converso or pro-converso Jesuits who had occupied high-ranking positions in the Jesuit administration to reinvent themselves as prolific writers. Three clear examples are Polanco, who spent the last years of his life composing the first multi-volume chronicle of the Society; Nadal, who produced his monumental Evangelicae Historiae Imagines with 153 superb engravings by Bernardino Passeri (d. c. 1590), Maarten de Vos (1532–1603), the brothers Wierix, and others; and especially Pedro de Ribadeneyra (1525–1611), who between 1574 and 1611 composed an impressive number of writings on history, historiography, asceticism, and politics, many of which were multi-edited and translated, assigning him a foremost place among the writers of the Spanish Siglo de Oro, as we shall see in Chapter Three.

Arguably, the discriminatory policy of Mercurian—one that was subsequently endorsed also by Claudio Acquaviva (1543–1615)—and the defeat of the converso lobby during the general congregation triggered the anti-Roman movement by Spanish Jesuits known as the memoria-

---

48 See Palmio’s autobiography, ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 42r–45v; Rey (“El problema de cristianos nuevos,” p. 187) mistakenly argued that Mercurian maintained the pro-converso policy of Loyola and Lainez.
49 MHSI, Chronicon, 6 vols.
Contrary to what the closet-converso Ribadeneyra argued (in an attempt to minimize the participation of his fellow converso Jesuits in this movement), some members were indeed of converso background. In an alleged plot against their superior general in Rome, they sent secret memorials to the Spanish court, the Inquisition, and the Holy See, asking for reform of the Jesuit Institute and, especially, for the autonomy of the Spanish Jesuit provinces. As in the case of the earlier comunero movement in Spain, the vexed question of whether the participation of conversos in the memorialistas movement gives it an exclusively converso character needs a more comprehensive and unprejudiced answer, which exceeds the scope of the present book.

The converso character of the memorialistas movement was indeed accentuated by the anti-converso lobby, which after the election of Acquaviva (1581) included other high-ranking officials in the Jesuit curia, such as Paul Hoffaeus (c. 1530–1608), Manuel Rodrigues (1534–96), and Lorenzo Maggio (1531–1605). Their Italian predecessor, Assistant General Benedetto Palmio, had fueled their anti-converso bias. It is evident in a manuscript that has remained virtually unknown for more than 400 years (its critical edition is published in the appendix to the present book). In it, the author relates how “the multitude and insolence of Spanish neophytes” in the Order had been growing. According to him, the first two superiors general, Ignatius of Loyola and Diego Laínez, had excluded conversos, but conversos subsequently had found refuge in Laínez’s successor, Francisco de Borja. It was true that the converso party had been defeated during the Third General Congregation in 1573, Palmio related, but they were insufficiently controlled by the newly elected superior general, Mercurian, and consequently revolted against Rome under his successor, Acquaviva.
This and other documents by Acquaviva and his three assistants that we critically scrutinize in Chapter Three undeniably reveal that these men orchestrated the discrimination of Christians of Jewish lineage into law at the Fifth General Congregation (1593), as punishment for the alleged participation of conversos in the revolt against their way of governing the Society. Ironically, this congregation was convened because of pressure from two converso Jesuits, José de Acosta (1540–1600) and Cardinal Francisco de Toledo (1532–96).

There is no doubt, however, that the 1593 decree—proclaiming that Jewish (and Muslim) ancestry, no matter how distant, was an insurmountable impediment for admission to the Society—ignored Loyola’s desires as expressed in the Jesuit Constitutions and contradicted the practice of the first three generalates. The lineage-hunting season began. The measure, which was voted for by all but two delegates, was so harsh that it scandalized even the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo and Inquisitor General, Gaspar de Quiroga (1507–94), who affirmed that the Society dishonored itself by promulgating such a law. Indeed, Quiroga, who held the reins of the Spanish Inquisition between 1573 and 1594—during the bout of the most intense Jesuit anti-converso offensive—restricted the employment of purity-of-blood laws, a policy that reflected a shift in the approach of Philip II’s council to the converso problem in the last decades of the sixteenth century.

As a matter of fact, the Jesuit Sixth General Congregation mitigated the 1593 decree in 1608, if only superficially, because of strong opposition from many Jesuits led by Antonio Possevino (1533–1611), Diego de Guzmán (c. 1522–1606), Ribadeneyra, Girón de Alarcón, and Juan de Mariana (1536–1624). These men’s writings against discrimination...
and in defense of the indispensable minority of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry are analyzed in Chapter Four. Amid other arguments, Possevino would point out that discrimination against conversos had ramifications for the relationship with aboriginal peoples with whom the Jesuits worked as missionaries. Apparently, the Church at large became aware of the problem, as the canonical quotation of the Benedictine Bishop Prudencio de Sandoval (1553–1620) from his *Vida y Hechos del Emperador Carlos V* (1604) shows:

> I do not censure the Christian compassion, which embraces all, for, then I would be in mortal error, and I know that in the Divine presence there is no distinction between Gentile and Jew, because One alone is the Lord of all. Yet who can deny that in the descendants of the Jews there persists and endures the evil inclination of their ancient ingratitude and lack of understanding, just as in the Negroes [there persists] the inseparable quality of their blackness [negrura]? For if the latter should unite themselves a thousand times with white women, the children are born with the dark color of the father. Similarly, it is not enough for the Jew to be three parts aristocrat [hidalgo] or Old Christian, for one family line alone [solo una raza] defiles and corrupts him…

Racial tensions played a pivotal role in early Jesuit history (bearing in mind the obvious semantic difference of the early modern term of *raza*, but not its utter dissociation with modern racism or anti-Semitism)—to which the texts of Palmio, Acquaviva, Hoffaeus, Rodrigues, Maggio, and many other manuscript sources that we examine in the present book unequivocally testify. Nonetheless, the battle within the Order against those Jesuits with Jewish ancestry has been insufficiently acknowledged and has even been suppressed in scholarship on the subject.

In their writings on Benedetto Palmio, for example, two Italian Jesuit historians of high repute, Pietro Tacchi Venturi (1861–1956) and Mario Scaduto (1907–95), omitted Palmio’s converso-phobic attitude. Tacchi Venturi, also involved in negotiations between the Vatican and the Mussolini regime regarding the fate of the Jews

---


published parts of Palmio’s autobiography, but not those that reveal his discriminatory lobbying. Scaduto knew both Palmio’s “moving” autobiography and the memorial, yet never discussed the racial tensions contained therein. Indeed, in his lists of the primary sources used, Scaduto either omitted the codex *Institutum 106* or bypassed the part containing the memorial. Furthermore, in one of his works he portrayed Palmio as “the first and the ripest fruit of the Italian harvest.” The Belgian Jesuit historian Jean-François Gilmont (b. 1934) also omitted some of Palmio’s autobiography. A laconic note about the resemblance between the latter part of Palmio’s autobiography and his memorial, made by the renowned Spanish Jesuit historian Cándido de Dalmases (1906–86), editor of a volume in the series *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, makes clear that he knew the content of Palmio’s memorial. However, he never divulged it.

Until the present work there has been no sustained, systematic analysis of the correlation between the rise of the Society of Jesus and that of *limpieza* mania in the sixteenth century and no analysis of how implementation of the purity-of-blood laws had different stages in early Jesuit history. There are, however, a few fragmentary studies on the history of early converso Jesuits. The most important of them regard the relation of Ignatius of Loyola to the problem of the New Christians. The first such study was published in 1956 by the Spanish Jesuit Eusebio Rey; the second one was a long article by the American Jesuit James Reites, published in 1981, a continuation of his dissertation work from 1977 at the Jesuit Gregorian University of Rome, which unfortunately was never published. Still before Reites’s

---

64 Scaduto, *Governo*, p. 316.
66 *Fontes Narr.*, 3:154, n. 9.
works, two important articles on more specific issues pertaining to the history of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry had appeared: the first one on the converso genealogy of the prominent Spanish Jesuit Pedro de Ribadeneyra, published by José Gómez-Menor in 1976, whose results were taken into consideration only by a few scholars; and a year later the Jesuit Josef Wicki published an article on the role that New Christians played in the Jesuit missionary enterprise in the Far East until the generalate of Acquaviva. Another decade elapsed before the American Jesuit John P. Donnelly published an article on the most probable Jewish ancestry of Antonio Possevino. Scholarship on the subject intensified in the 1990s, to which the Spanish Jesuit Francisco de Borja Medina especially contributed. He tenaciously argued (contrary to the Anglo-Saxon scholarship of Reites, Donnelly, and Munitiz) that anti-converso sentiments in the sixteenth century had only socio-religious, not racial, origins. The only article on the subject in the French language was published in 1999 by the French Jesuit Pierre-Antoine Fabre, who explored the reasons why conversos were willing to join the Society of Jesus. In the last decade, only three articles on the converso Jesuit question have appeared: in 2004 the Jesuit Joseph A. Munitiz published an article on the legal support given to the Jesuit anti-converso legislation by the famous Jesuit jurist Francisco Suárez, and Thomas Cohen published his excellent analysis of Possevino’s first pro-converso memorial, which later found its extension in the

---


The present book aims to fill the gaps of scholarship on the subject in two ways: by a different reading of the sources and secondary literature already known; and by an analysis of the archival material that has been known little or not at all. The clarification of blind spots in early Jesuit history that I attempt on the following pages may well shed light on other discriminatory problems—like those so dramatically embodied in the meandering Shakespearean characters not only of Shylock and Jessica but also of Antonio—with which the Jesuit Order grapples to this very day.
“Map of the Iberian Peninsula in 1492”
CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PURITY-OF-BLOOD DISCRIMINATION (1391–1547)

[New Christians] still hold on their lips the milk of their ancestors’ recent perversity.
Archbishop Juan Martínez Guijarro (Siliceo), 1547

The Society of Jesus could not avoid coping with the converso problem, because the Jesuits were founded by a group of Old and New Christians whose majority, as did their leader Ignatius of Loyola, originated in Iberia. In spite of the universal character of the Order envisioned by the founding fathers and of Catholicism per se, the vexed purity-of-blood concept produced a profound polarization in the Society as it tried to implement its mission of conversion.1 Naturally, both Jesuit supporters and opponents of the purity-of-blood discrimination sought validation for their arguments in the works that had been employed in the heated discussion that had rent the Iberian Church between the first anti-converso legislation of 1449 and the Jesuit decree that legalized the converso discrimination in 1593. Moreover, the historical context of the Spanish discriminatory laws—whether discrimination by civic or ecclesiastical authorities—sheds more light on the origins of such legislation in the Society of Jesus itself.

Given this close connection between the majority of the founding fathers of the Society of Jesus and the Iberian context, this chapter aims to provide the reader with a concise historical excursus of the complex and abundant discussion about the concept of purity of blood. It begins in Toledo with the Sentencia-Estatuto of Pero de Sarmiento (1449); rests on major subsequent pro-converso works by two prominent ecclesiastical intellectuals of the mid-fifteenth century, Alonso de Cartagena and Alonso de Oropesa, whose legacy would be reflected in later pro-converso literature; and concludes again in Toledo with

---

the Estatutos of Archbishop Silíceo (1547), which—along with the Sarmiento legislation—were eagerly defended by Bishop Diego de Simancas in his Defensio Toletani Statuti (Antwerp: Plantin, 1573). Arguably, the latter inspired some Jesuits in their campaign to introduce the anti-converso discriminatory laws in the Society of Jesus in the last decade of the sixteenth century.

**Sentencia-Estatuto of Pero de Sarmiento (1449)**

The history of the purity-of-blood anti-converso discrimination begins with the so-called Sentencia-Estatuto adopted in Toledo in June 1449. It resulted from a popular uprising against the royal authority of King Juan II of Trastámara (1405–54) that was led by the city mayor (alcalde mayor), Pero de Sarmiento. To make the complex and long story short for the purposes of this chapter: the rebellion was provoked by an attempt by the converso Constable of Castile, Álvaro de Luna (d. 1453), to raise additional revenue of one million maravedíes from the citizens of Toledo for the defense of Castile against a recent invasion of the Aragonese. Sarmiento associated this measure with the machinations of the treasurer Alonso Cota and other Toledan conversos. They represented an affluent and influential minority among burgurers, unparalleled in other European countries of the Middle Ages, who—under royal protection—rapidly emerged after the first massive conversions propelled by the brutal pogroms against the “deicide Jews” in 1391.

Recalling these allegations that had spawned a half-century of social, economic, and political resentment and combining them with the old anti-Judaism bias, a fanatical mob of Old Christians murdered several...
conversos in 1449 and plundered or burned many dwellings, beginning with Cota’s. What started as an anti-fiscal rebellion turned into anti-
converso riots and an anti-royal war. Subsequently, seeking a veiled 
justification for their laesa maiestas offense, the city council issued the 
purity-of-blood legislation. Claiming a precedent of royal and canon 
law, it barred all Jews converted to Christianity and their descen-
dants from holding public offices or testifying in Christian courts of 
law, because of the conversos’ infamy, inability, and indignity, which 
 allegedely stemmed from their untrustworthy faith and was proven by 
their continued judaizing. According to the Sentencia-Estatuto, the 
history of the city of Toledo testified to the longtime converso plot-
ting that can be traced back to the alliance of their Jewish ancestors 
with the Muslim conquerors, which had caused the death or enslav-
ement of many old and pure (lindos) Christians. More recently, with 
the royal money that they astutely stole, the conversos had oppressed, 
destroyed, and robbed the majority of Old Christians of their property 
in the city of Toledo, where they had been able to sneak into influen-
tial governmental posts.

---

6 “Que por cuanto es notorio por derecho así canónico como civil, que los 
conversos de linaje de los judíos, por ser sospechosos en la fe de nuestro Señor e 
Salvador Jesucristo, en la cual frecuentemente vomitan de ligero, judaizando […] 
Que debemos de declarar e declaramos, pronunciar e pronunciamos, e constituimos, 
e ordenamos, e mandamos, que todos los dichos conversos descendientes del per-
verso linaje de judíos, en cualquier guisa que sea, así por virtud del derecho canónico 
y civil que contra ellos determina sobre las cosas de suso declaradas, como por vir-
tud del dicho privilegio dado a esta cibdad por el dicho señor Rey de muy gloriosa 
memoria don Alfonso Rey de Castilla y de León, progenitor del rey nuestro señor y 
por otros señores reyes sus progenitores e por su alteza, jurado e confirmado, como 
por razón de las herejías e otros delictos, insultos, sediciones e crímenes por ellos 
fasta hoy cometidos e perpetrados, de que de suso se face mención, sean habidos e 
tenidos como el derecho los ha e tiene por infames, inhábiles, incapaces e indignos 
para haber todo oficio e beneficio público y privado en la dicha cibdad de Toledo, y 
en su tierra, término y jurisdicción con el cual pueden tener señorío en los cristianos 
viejos en la santa fe católica de nuestro Señor Jesucristo creyentes, facerles daños e 
injurias, e así mismo ser infames, inhábiles, incapaces para dar testimonio e fe 
como escribanos públicos o como testigos, y especialmente en esta cibdad” (Ruano, 
Toledo en el siglo XV, pp. 193–5).

7 For the historical context of Jewish collaboration with the Muslim conquerors, 
see, for example, Serrano, Los conversos, p. 9; and Roth, Conversos, Inquisition, p. 91. 
According to the experts, this is the first use of the term pure in relation to Christians 
who were not of Jewish lineage, which would constitute a shift from socio-political 
into a racial approach to the vexed converso question.

8 See Ruano, Toledo en el siglo XV, p. 194.
Alonso de Cartagena and Alonso de Oropesa

These tragic events of 1449 in Toledo and the consequent anti-converso legislation of Pero de Sarmiento provide the historical context for the major pro-converso work penned by Alonso de Santa María de Cartagena (1384–1456)—Defensorium unitatis christianae [In Defense of Christian Unity] (1449–50). Its author was indirectly involved in the political turmoil of Toledo, for his brother, Pedro de Cartagena, saved the life of the Constable of Castile, Álvar de Luna, against whom the riots of 1449 began. But what was the broader background of one of the foremost intellectuals of fifteenth-century Spain?

Alonso de Cartagena had been baptized (at the age of five or six) by his father Shlomo ha-Levi/Pablo de Santa María (c. 1351–1435), who—as chief rabbi of Burgos—converted to Christianity just before the anti-Jewish pogroms of 1391 and later was elected bishop of Cartagena (1402) and Burgos (1415), while his wife remained faithful to her ancestors’ faith. As was the case with a number of other conversos, Cartagena studied civil and ecclesiastical law at Salamanca; he later served as apostolic nuncio and canon in his native Burgos. King Juan II—to whom Alfonso’s father and the latter’s brother, Álvar García de Santa María (1370–1460), had lent their services—appointed Cartagena as his official envoy to the Council of Basel (1434–9). There, he expressed his conciliarist views and contributed to the formulation of a decree on the regenerative character of baptism without regard for lineage (which Pope Paul III later cited in his bull Cupientes Iudaeos, as the Jesuit García Girón de Alarcón would note):

For the members of the family of God and the saints become citizens by the grace of baptism, and it is much more worthy to be regenerated in the spirit than to be born in the flesh, we stipulate by this decree that [the converted Jews] of the cities and places, where they are regenerated by holy baptism, must enjoy the same privileges, exemptions, and liberties that other [Christians] receive based on their birth and origin alone.

---

9 See Roth, Conversos, Inquisition, p. 89.
10 Marcel Bataillon was incorrect in stating that Shlomo ha-Levi converted after the 1391 pogroms (see Fabre, Marcel Bataillon, p. 237).
11 On the enormous influence of the converso clan of Santa María, see Francisco Cantera Burgos, Alvar García de Santa María y su familia de conversos. Historia de la Judería de Burgos y de sus conversos más egregios (Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1952).
12 Concilium Basileense, De his qui volunt ad fidem converti (Decretum Sexto Basileense, sess. XIX): “Et quoniam per gratiam baptismi cives sanctorum et domestici
After Pablo de Santa María’s death (1435), Pope Eugenius IV (r. 1431–47) nominated Cartagena his successor in the episcopal see of Burgos. As would be the case with many future converso Jesuits, the civic aspects of ancient Roman literature, especially Cicero and Seneca, fascinated Cartagena. At the request of Juan Alfonso de Zamora, King Juan II’s secretary, he translated Cicero’s *De officiis, De senectute*, and *De inventione* and rendered into Castilian Seneca’s twelve books. He also participated in the literary debate with Italian humanists over the translation of Aristotle’s *Ethics* by Leonardo Bruni (1369–1444). Cartagena employed in his *Defensorium* these classical authorities to corroborate the biblical and patristic citations.

The 1449 events in Toledo are also echoed—albeit less explicitly—in another work that was written around the same time by Fray Alonso de Oropesa (d. 1469). It was entitled *Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloria plebis Dei Israel, de unitate fidei et de concordi et pacifi ca aequalitate fidelium* [Light for the Revelation of the Gentiles and Glory to the people of God Israel: Concerning the Unity of the Faith and Agreeable and Peaceful Equality of the Faithful], which is an allusion to the words of old Simon in the Gospel according to Luke (2:32).

The book was dedicated to Alonso Carrillo de Acuña (1413–82), Archbishop of Toledo since 1447, known for his opposition to the *pureza de sangre* laws that he and his successors would later repudiate, as we shall see in Chapter Four.

Oropesa, who may have been a converso and had taken his name from his native town of Oropesa near Toledo, studied—as had Cartagena—at Salamanca and entered the Jeronymite monastery

Dei efficiuntur, longeque dignius sit regenerari spiritu, quam nasci carne, hac edictali lege statuimus et civitatum et locorum in quibus sacro baptismate regenerantur privilegis, libertatibus et immunitatibus gaudeant quae ratione duntaxat nativitatis et originis alii consequuntur.” In his *Defensorium* (ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 261), Cartagena stated that this decree was voted unanimously.


13 For a presentation of Cartagena’s thought in his *Defensorium*, see, for example, Sicloff, *Estatutos*, pp. 64–99; and Pastore, *Eresia spagnola*, pp. 5–8 and 10.


of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Extremadura. Shortly thereafter, he was elected as prior of Santa Catalina in Talavera (1451/2) and later became superior general of his religious Order (in 1457 and again in 1462). Oropesa had been composing the *Lumen* intermittently between 1450 and 1466 as a response not only to the Sarmiento anti-converso legislation but also to the subsequent anti-converso tensions in Toledo in 1461–2 that he was personally called to solve by Archbishop Carrillo, after a certain Franciscan claimed to possess a hundred foreskins that had come from circumcised Christians.

Even though it is difficult to establish the reciprocal influence between the two treatises—sometimes it looks as though Oropesa copied parts of Cartagena’s work (or was depending on a common source?)—they employed very similar arguments in their effort to counter the Sarmiento legislation and its anti-converso bias. The main themes of Cartagena’s *Defensorium* and Oropesa’s *Lumen*, on which they based their anti-discrimination arguments, are the unity of Christian faith; the election of Israel in view of the generation of Christ; the imperfection of Israel before the birth of Jesus and its perfection in Christ; and the redemption of both Gentiles and Jews to form one people of God in harmony and peace. However, Cartagena and Oropesa give the Jews differing responsibility for the conversos’ lack of persistence in the Christian faith. The former claims that the Jews—more than pagans, heretics, or schismatics—represent a risk for the Christian faithful and that, therefore, one must preach to them their fulfillment in Christ. The latter calls for more drastic measures: the intervention of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities to prevent contacts between Christians and Jews, a position that

---


18 On different views about Oropesa’s ancestry, see Roth, *Conversos, Inquisition*, p. 183; and Pastore, *Eresia spagnola*, pp. 18–9. Foa in her “Limpieza versus Mission” (pp. 303–4) incorrectly states that Oropesa was the general of the Jerusalemite Order. The name of the Jeronymite Order comes from its patron, St. Jerome (Spanish *Jerónimo*, Lat. *Hieronymus*, thus also “Hieronymites”—a different spelling of the Order’s name).


would eventually materialize in the creation by Oropesa of a proto Spanish Inquisition.\footnote{Archbishop Carrillo summoned Oropesa to resolve a new conflict between the conversos and the Old Christians that sparked in Toledo in 1461. The Jeronymite superior general punished those conversos who judaized and those Old Christians who denied the regenerative character of baptism. According to the Order’s historian, José de Sigüenza, this intervention formed the first Inquisition in Castile. On Oropesa’s contribution to the creation of the Spanish Inquisition, see David Nirenberg, “Mass Conversion and Genealogical Mentalities: Jews and Christians in Fifteenth-Century Spain,” \textit{Past and Present} 174 (2002): 31; Roth, \textit{Conversos, Inquisition}, pp. 73–4, 80, 146; and Pastore, \textit{Eresia spagnola}, p. 10. The relationship among the purity-of-blood laws, the conversos, and the foundation of the Spanish Inquisition was much more complex than Foa suggested in her “Limpieza and Mission,” p. 303.}

To the Bishop of Burgos and the General of the Jeronymites, the desire to strive for Christian unity originates in God’s creation of humanity in the unity of one man alone. Cartagena’s account, thus, begins with a literal analysis of the biblical story of the creation of Adam and Eve (Genesis 1:26): “One Adam was created, as the Scripture says: ‘Let us make man to our image and likeness.’ He did not say men, but man, to show that he was thinking about the unity of men from the very beginning and that he abhorred the distinction among them based on carnal birth.”\footnote{“Un solo Adán fue creado como dice la escritura […] No dijo a los hombres, sino al hombre, para manifestar desde el mismo principio que pensaba en la unidad de los hombres y que la diferencia entre ellos, basada en la propagación de la carne, la aborrecía” (Cartagena, \textit{Defensorium}, ed. Verdin-Díaz, p. 107).

“Pues como permanece la Iglesia perfecta e inmutable en su estado, así también permanece universal y unida en concordia unánime de todos sus fieles, apartada de ella toda disparidad de aquellas antiguas imperfecciones, puesto que, de otro modo, ya no podría decirse que tuviera un estado nuevo y perfecto; esta sacratísima unión la solemnizó Cristo muriendo en la cruz para redención universal de todos los fieles, sin división alguna que se introduzca entre ellos, cuando adquirió para sí la única e indivisa Iglesia de todos los católicos; y tan admirable misterio ya había sido figurado antes en la formación de la primera mujer del costado del varón: de forma que, como del único varón Adán, se formaba la única mujer para la procreación universal de todos, así también del gloriosísimo Jesús, único redentor nuestro, se formase la única santa madre Iglesia para salvación universal de todos sus fieles, a quienes por el mismo hecho les encomendó una concordia unánime” (Oropesa, \textit{Luz}, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXI).} In the history of the dispersion of humankind

\textit{Defensorium}\footnote{All quotations from the \textit{Defensorium} are from the Spanish translation of the Latin original in Verdin-Díaz, ed., \textit{Alonso de Cartagena}. The choice of the Spanish translation is dictated by Verdin-Díaz’s premise that he based it on his more correct reading of the manuscript than that of the Jesuit Manuel Alonso in his D. Alonso de Cartagena. Obispo de Burgos, \textit{Defensorium unitatis Christianae. Tratado en favor de los judíos conversos. Edición, prólogo y notas por el P. Manuel Alonso, S.I.} (Madrid: CSIC, 1943), and on the comparison of two different manuscripts.}

\textit{Lumen}\footnote{All quotations from the \textit{Lumen} are from the Spanish translation of the Latin original (Oropesa, \textit{Luz}, ed. Díaz y Díaz).}
resulting from Cain’s crime, God based his choices not on a person’s lineage or origin but on righteousness. That was the case, for instance, with Noah and Job, who were Gentiles: their righteousness came from their obedience to the law of nature alone,\textsuperscript{23} which Cartagena compares elsewhere to the lunar light in contrast with the solar light of Christ, who is eternal splendor and a second Adam without stain.\textsuperscript{24}

God’s preferences, argue Cartagena and Oropesa, do not guarantee justification; Abram’s circumcision was just a mark of an alliance, not a result of his merits. This is why “God generously decided to give his people the law, so that the distinction among peoples be perceived not only in the flesh by cutting off the foreskin, but also in the customs by cutting off vices.”\textsuperscript{25}

For both Cartagena and Oropesa, the election of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the story of the chosen people were

\textsuperscript{23} See Cartagena, \textit{Defensorium} (ed. Verdin-Díaz), pp. 108–9. Concerning Job, Oropesa quotes Augustine’s \textit{De civitate Dei}: “Ni creo que los mismos judíos se atrevan a decir que nadie perteneció al Señor fuera de los israelitas, desde que comenzó a ser descendencia de Israel con la reprobación del hermano mayor. Pueblo que de verdad se dijera con propiedad pueblo de Dios no hubo otro; pero no pueden negar que hubiera algunos hombres que pertenecían no a la patria terrena sino a la sociedad celestial, a los verdaderos ciudadanos israelitas de la patria del cielo, ya que, si lo niegan, con toda facilidad se les demostrará ‘del santo y admirable Job,’ que ni era del país ni prosélito, es decir, ni vivía en el pueblo de Israel, sino que era descendiente de los idumeos; donde nació allí murió; quien de tal forma es alabado por la palabra de Dios que, en lo que atañe a su justicia y piedad, ningún hombre de su tiempo lo iguala, y cuya época, que, aunque no encontremos en las crónicas, podemos deducir de su mismo libro—que con razón los israelitas lo aceptaron entre los autores canónicos—debió ser tres generaciones posterior a Israel” (Oropesa, \textit{Luz}, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XI).

\textsuperscript{24} See Cartagena, \textit{Defensorium} (ed. Verdin-Díaz), pp. 127–35. See a similar use of this metaphor in Oropesa: “Pero esta paz excelente y verdadera concordia de la Iglesia militante ha de durar hasta que no haya luna, que es lo mismo que decir hasta que acabe la actual Iglesia, que, cual otra luna en la oscurísima noche así resplandece ella en las tinieblas de este oscuro mundo, iluminada incesante y maravillosamente por el verdadero sol de justicia, por la que, el que es la luz verdadera, ilumina a todo hombre que viene a este mundo (Jn 1, 9); o también: hasta que no haya luna, es decir, hasta que se termine esta vida actual, cuando ya cesó el moverse de las estrellas y puede decirse que ya tampoco hay luna. Y así concuerda bien con ésta otra frase del profeta en que dice de Cristo: «Grande es su señorío y la paz no tendrá fin…» (Is 9, 6). Y esto es porque en esta vida no tendrá fin esta paz de la Iglesia, y después de esta vida tampoco puede decirse propiamente que se acaba sin más, porque le sucede otra paz mejor que ha de durar para siempre, como se ha dicho” (Oropesa, \textit{Luz}, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXXV).

\textsuperscript{25} “[Dios] se dignó darle generosamente la ley para que la diferencia no fuese percibida sólo en la carne, por el corte del prepucio, sino en las costumbres, por el corte de los vicios” (Cartagena, \textit{Defensorium}, ed. Verdin-Díaz, p. 114).
understood in light of the generation of Christ,26 in whom all lineage distinctions cease. Christ saved both Jews and Gentiles, for they are united as one people by the virtue of regenerative baptism, as St. Paul—fundamental to Cartagena’s argument—had already stressed: “For as many of as have been baptized in Christ have become clothed with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither servant nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:27–9).27

---

26 “Sólo a ese pueblo [judío] la ley le fue ofrecida para que alcanzase ciertas prerrogativas de virtud por encima de los demás en atención a que de ese pueblo había de nacer Cristo […]. Dios dio la ley y otros muchos beneficios a aquel pueblo por la promesa hecha a sus padres, por aquella especialmente que de ellos nacería Cristo […]. La razón de la distinción concedida a aquel pueblo se deriva de la carne de Cristo que habría recibido de aquel pueblo, y no de los méritos del pueblo” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Díaz, pp. 116–7).


“Pues así como todos hemos sido engendrados por Adán y Eva, y todos sin diferencias hemos quedado pecadores, así también todos hemos sido reengendrados por Cristo y la Iglesia sin diferencias y hemos quedado en perfecta justicia, según lo que explica ampliamente el Apóstol a los Romanos y en la primera carta a los Corintios, diciendo: «Porque, habiendo venido por un hombre la muerte, también por un hombre viene la resurrección de los muertos. Pues del mismo modo que en Adán mueren todos, así también todos revivirán en Cristo» (1 Co 15, 21–22; cf. Rm 5, 12–21), «pues no hay diferencia alguna (de judío y griego, es decir, de judío o gentil, como dice la Glosa); todos pecaron y están privados de la gloria de Dios, y son justificados por el don de su gracia, en virtud de la redención realizada en Cristo Jesús» (Rm 3, 22–24), como dice a los Romanos; y concluye el Apóstol diciendo a los Gálatas: «Ya no hay judío ni griego; ni esclavo ni libre; ni hombre ni mujer, ya que todos vosotros sois uno en Cristo Jesús» (Ga 3, 28); lo que comenta la glosa: «Por ninguna de esas cosas nadie se hace más digno en la fe de Cristo, y por tanto que ninguno juzgue cuál si fuese más digno por algo de eso, ya que en verdad por ninguna de esas cosas se hace nadie más digno en Cristo»” (Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXI).
Within the framework of his ecclesiology of the continuity of the covenant, Cartagena underlines the point that Christ’s redemption is for the Israelites the clear perfection of their faith that was represented in the Old Testament as figurative or allegoric. For Gentiles—to the contrary—Christ’s message is something totally new. Thus, the former are invited to learn more profoundly something that had been known already;\(^\text{28}\) the latter, in contrast, are invited to learn something they had not yet heard.\(^\text{29}\) As Cartagena notes, “it was not Jerusalem that walked towards Gentiles, but it was they who went to Jerusalem, so that both peoples established the new and true Jerusalem that in this life is the Church Militant, through which one reaches the celestial Jerusalem, where all, without regard to their provenience, walk in the light without enmity.”\(^\text{30}\)

\(^\text{28}\) “Dios eligió a aquel pueblo de entre los gentiles, como quedará claro en el capítulo siguiente, para que, al llegar el tiempo elegido por él, rehiciera de ellos un pueblo que le fuera grato entre todos los gentiles, perfecto en su estado e inmutable hasta el fin del mundo; cuya perfección y calidad, fe y creencia, culto y veneración significó suficientemente en aquel pueblo pequeño y singular especialmente elegido para que por él pudiera darse a conocer con claridad lo que la religión cristiana cree, venera y predica, con tal que el que va a ser instruido no ponga ante sus ojos el velo de una obstinada ceguera con que contradiga al Espíritu Santo no dejando entrar dentro de si la luz de la fe; lo que parece claro que ha ocurrido a los perdidos judíos, que pugnan hasta hoy día por negar con cerviz altiva a Cristo como verdadero salvador, que es el camino, la verdad y la vida por donde debieran entrar al descanso eterno” (Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XII).

This argument seems to be the ideological backbone of the Jesuit apostolate to the Roman Jews, as we shall see below: Polanco wrote in a letter that “many Jews, moved by the love of our fellow Jesuits or the good example of some of their own who were already baptized, were converted to our faith. Among them were some of the most respected Jews who were highly important for converting others because they could clearly and forcefully persuade the other Jews, showing them from Scripture that Jesus Christ our Lord is the real promised Messiah” (Polanco, Chron. 3:9; MHSI, Fontes Narr. 4:404).

\(^\text{29}\) “Se saca en conclusión, por consiguiente, que una vez libre el entendimiento y purificada el alma, los israelitas que reciben la fe de los libros de la ley escrita, espiritualmente entendidos y por Cristo completamente perfeccionados, reconocen claramente lo que se consideraba como figural o alegórico; los gentiles, en cambio, lo escuchan como algo nuevo y saludable desconocido para sus filósofos, cosa que manifiestamente se ve en la misma llamada a los dos pueblos, si se observa bien la cualidad de la llamada. El uno es invitado a conocer más profundamente lo que de alguna manera había conocido; el otro, en cambio, es invitado a lo que no había oído” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, pp. 113–4). See also the following Chapter 7 of Cartagena’s work.

\(^\text{30}\) “Y no fue Jerusalén la que se dirigió a los gentiles, sino que es el pueblo gentil el que se vuelve a Jerusalén para de uno y otro pueblo establecer la única y verdadera Jerusalén, que en esta vida es la Iglesia militante por medio de la cual se sube a la
After having provided a biblical context in Part One that concurs with Oropesa’s exposition, Cartagena aims to provide what he calls four theorems: (1) Through the Redeemer of the world, Jesus Christ, the Israelites were redeemed in fullness; (2) In the same way and through the same Savior all nations of the world also received grace and redemption; (3) Israelites and Gentiles, as they entered the door of the Catholic Church through baptism, do not remain divided into two peoples or nations; instead, together they form one new people; (4) Now, as before, those who arrive to the Catholic faith recuperate their capacity of any excellence, nobility or any other faculty that they had possessed earlier, provided that in doing so they do not oppose the principles of authority of the Catholic Church.\footnote{31}

To demonstrate the first theorem, the son of the former chief rabbi of Burgos highlights what the New Testament teaches about the redemption of Israel. Christ in the Gospel according to Matthew (15:24), for example, defines his mission by saying “I was not sent except to the Jerusalén celestial y en la que todos, de cualquier parte que vinieren, caminarán en la luz sin enemistad” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 133).

“Todo lo cual hay que entender así, según los sagrados doctores: la fuente abierta había de ser el santo bautismo en el que la impureza, es decir, el pecado original en las entrañas de la menstruada, o sea, contraído de la misma madre, y el pecado, se entiende actual, habían de lavarse y purificarse del todo; y tenía que estar abierta, o sea, pública y común, para todos los habitantes de Jerusalén, que es la Iglesia militante, que con frecuencia se la designa en la Escritura por Jerusalén, y que había de estar abierta espiritualmente a la casa de David; y por la que se habían de extirpar los nombres de los ídolos de esta tierra, porque tanto los judíos como los gentiles tenían que venir a ella y a la vez purificarse uniformemente por ella y, abandonando el judaísmo y la gentilidad, congregarse en unanimidad en un pueblo nuevo que se hizo al comienzo de la Iglesia naciente y se hará después sucesivamente, pero se completará del todo en uno y otro pueblo hacia el fin del mundo, cuando se haga íntegra y perfectamente un solo rebaño y un solo pastor, porque entonces se exterminarán definitivamente tanto el judaísmo como los ídolos de la gentilidad, y todos se reunirán juntos en la fe universal” (Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXXIX). See also Sicoff, Estatutos, p. 65.\footnote{30 “Y no fue Jerusalén la que se dirigió a los gentiles, sino que es el pueblo gentil}

\footnote{31 “Primer teorema. Se demuestra que por medio del redentor del mundo, Jesucristo nuestro Señor, el pueblo israelita fue completamente redimido. Segundo teorema que todas las gentes del mundo, del mismo modo y mediante el mismo Salvador, recibieron también la gracia de la redención. Tercer teorema que tanto los israelitas como los gentiles, al entrar por la puerta del bautismo a la Iglesia católica, no permanecen divididos como dos pueblos o dos gentes, sino que de uno y otro se crea un único pueblo nuevo. Cuarto teorema que tanto entonces como ahora los que arriban a la fe católica recuperan de nuevo la aptitud para obtener cualquier excelencia, nobleza, u otra dote cualquiera que en principio tenían, siempre que para recuperarlas no se opongan a los principios de la autoridad de la Iglesia” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 142). On the discussion of the Jewish/Spanish concept of nobility, see Netanyahu, Toward the Inquisition, pp. 8–16.}
sheep, which have fallen away from the house of Israel,” and Paul describes Jesus’ mission as “minister of circumcision because of the truth of God, so as to confirm the promises to the fathers.” \(^{32}\) Oropesa supports Cartagena’s first theorem by emphasizing that the entire Holy Scripture testifies how these promises were accepted or refused by Israel. \(^{33}\) This story still continues—those who reject the Catholic Church follow the infidelity of the impious and the hardness of the rebel. However, those who refuse the imprudence of their ancestors and submit their hearts to the Catholic faith with purity of spirit are true followers of the chosen Israel. \(^{34}\) That is what Paul had in his mind when he addressed the Gentiles in his Letter to the Romans (11:13–26 and 30–2), whose longest quotation is pivotal in Cartagena’s work and, therefore, worth citing in its entirety:

> For I say to you Gentiles: Certainly, as long as I am an Apostle to the Gentiles, I will honor my ministry in such a way that I might provoke to rivalry those who are my own flesh, and so that I may save some of them. For if their loss is for the reconciliation of the world, what could their return be for, except life out of death? For if the first-fruit has been sanctified, so also has the whole. And if the root is holy, so also are the

\(^{32}\) See Cartagena, *Defensorium*, ed. Verdin-Díaz, p. 146; and Oropesa, *Luz*, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXVII: “Pues eso es lo que Jesús les dijo a sus discípulos que intercedían por la mujer cananea: «No he sido enviado más que a las ovejas perdidas de la casa de Israel» (Mt 15, 24), es decir, no he venido a predicar ni a conceder mis beneficios ni yo ni mis discípulos, como ocupación propia mientras viva, a no ser a los judíos a quienes fue hace mucho tiempo prometido; y a la mujer cananea que ya en persona se había acercado a Cristo pidiendo insistentemente la salud de su hija, le respondió Cristo de la misma manera diciéndole: «No está bien tomar el pan de los hijos y echárselo a los perros» (Mt 15, 26).”

\(^{33}\) Oropesa, *Luz*, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XIII: “Ciertamente hay muchos y diversos testimonios tanto de la ley como de las profecías y también de ambos, que claramente hacen ver que el pueblo elegido por Dios y su ley y sacerdocio habían sido puestos al modo de un espejo divino de todos los gentiles para salvación y bendición de todos los que se iban a salvar, a quienes Dios había dispuesto a su tiempo llamar, traer y reunir por medio de su Unigénito hecho hombre; quienes llegando en gran muchedumbre de las cuatro partes del mundo se habían de salvar, una vez revelada la gracia y la salvación eterna, al conocer al único y verdadero redentor y al aceptar su santísima ley; y todo esto debía aprovechar en ventaja y salvación de todos a partir de los judíos, cuya raíz seleccionada. Pero, ya que esto resalta claramente en los santos evangelios y el Apóstol lo muestra y desarrolla brillantemente en muchos lugares de sus cartas, resultaría superfluo acumular testimonios sobre ello; sin embargo hay uno en que el santo Simeón, nuevo profeta evangélico de Cristo, en una sentencia encerró este admirable misterio diciendo que Cristo, nacido del pueblo judío y presentado en aquel mismo momento a sus manos en el templo, era la luz para conocimiento de los gentiles y gloria de su pueblo Israel (cf. Lc 2, 32).”

branches. And if some of the branches are broken, and if you, being a wild olive branch, are grafted onto them and you become a partaker of the root and of the fatness of the olive tree, do not glorify yourself above the branches. For though you glory, you do not support the root, but the root supports you. Therefore, you would say: The branches were broken off, so that I might be grafted on. Well enough. They were broken off because of unbelief. But you stand on faith. So do not choose to savor what is exalted, but instead be afraid. For if God has not spared the natural branches, perhaps also he might not spare you. So then, notice the goodness and the severity of God. Certainly, toward those who have fallen, there is severity; but toward you there is the goodness of God, if you remain in goodness. Otherwise, you also will be cut off. Moreover, if they do not remain in unbelief, they will be grafted on. For God is able to graft them on again. So if you have been cut off from the wild olive tree, which is natural to you, and, contrary to nature, you are grafted on to the good olive tree, how much more shall those who are the natural branches be grafted on to their own olive tree? For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery (lest you seem wise only to yourselves) that a certain blindness has occurred in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles has arrived. And in this way, all of Israel may be saved [. . .]. And just as you also, in times past, did not believe in God, but now you have obtained mercy because of their unbelief, so also have these now not believed, for your mercy, so that they might obtain mercy also. For God has enclosed everyone in unbelief, so that he may have mercy on everyone.35

From the above citation, Cartagena deduces that the election or rejection of the Israelites is based on their reception or refusal of the faith. Only those who believe, no matter whether they come from Israel and Abraham or from other nations, can be called faithful Israelites and descendants of Abraham.36 Thus, it is necessary to recall the sins

35 See Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Diaz, p. 156. On the centrality of this passage in Cartagena’s father’s Scrutinium Scripturarum, see Rosenstock, New Men, pp. 35–7.

36 “Y de estas palabras del apóstol con sobrada evidencia se deduce que la elección o rechazo de los israelitas está basada en la recepción de la fe o en rechazo de la misma, de manera que de acuerdo con la diversidad de méritos los creyentes se consideran elegidos, y los no creyentes, rechazados, quedando balanceado el juicio del justo juez. En cuanto al lugar de donde procedieren, tanto de Israel y de Abraham como de otras naciones, llámense solamente fieles israelitas y descendientes de Abraham” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Diaz, p. 157).

“Aun cuando aquel pueblo judío era el único que pertenecía al Señor de modo que él y ninguno más se llamase pueblo de Dios por su especial culto, ceremonias y ley, y por esa razón Dios fuese conocido en Judá y fuese grande su nombre en Israel (cf. Sal 76, 2), sin embargo, no lo eligió Dios de tal modo que ya entonces permitiese pereceran todos los gentiles, por no abrirlas con misericordia el camino de
of their fathers, either Gentile or Israelite, if they resist accepting the Catholic faith or if, after having received it, they fall into the errors of Judaism or Gentilism. This is so because to not know the truth or, after having known it, to abandon it, is something very grave and must be persecuted by authorities. Together with “saint doctors,” Cartagena believes that Paul in his Letter to Titus (1:10–4) gave an example of this sharp rebuke by addressing those of the circumcision who “subvert the entire house” by teaching in Crete “the Jewish fables” under the name of Christ, while at the same time failing to reprehend the Cretan Gentiles themselves.

Concluding the exposition of the first theorem, Cartagena repeats that a special attention should be paid to the faith and not to the Israelite flesh, even though—he proudly underscores—the faith appears to be more splendid in the Israelite flesh, as proven in Philippians 3:3–6, where Paul paradoxically says that even though there should be no confidence in the flesh for the circumcised, he might be entitled to have more confidence in the flesh as “a Hebrew among Hebrews.”

It follows, Cartagena points out, that the Israelite who was exiled from the divine grace due to his infidelity, but was adopted through baptism to receive the faith, is reestablished in the divine grace with more richness than before, for the grace that is earned by the divine adoption is much more extraordinary, pure, and beneficial than the

---

37 See the Ultílogo of Cartagena’s Defensorium (ed. Verdin-Díaz), pp. 398–400.
39 See Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XLVIII: “Ampliamente explica todo esto el Apóstol a los Romanos, donde hace ver que Dios no ha rechazado a Israel, sino que su resto siempre se salvará, elegido por gracia, etcétera (cf. Rm 9–11), y que Dios es poderoso para volver a reinjertarlos en la fe, de donde se han cortado y caído, y que tenga cuidado cualquiera que de la gentildad se ha injertado en la fe para que no presuma ni se ensoberbeza contra los que se convierten del judaísmo a la fe de Cristo, no sea que él mismo sea cortado y caiga a causa de la soberbia, etc.” See also Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Díaz, pp. 89–90. For a discussion of the pride of conversos stemming from their descent from God’s chosen people with the bibliography on the subject, see Nirenberg, “Mass conversion,” pp. 30–1.
one under the law, as St. Paul’s life itself testified. The divine adoption opens the gates of heaven, which was impossible before, for the sacraments of the old law did not possess any virtue whereby the sanctifying grace could be conferred. To exemplify this argument, Cartagena cites the proverbial Jewish shyness that, by virtue of baptism, was transformed in many into military valor.

The equality with which the Savior treats both Israelites and Gentiles is the subject matter of Cartagena’s second theorem. Since the issue had been partially treated in the previous theorem, its exposition here is briefer. The special connection between Israelite lineage and acceptance of the Catholic faith mentioned at the end of the previous theorem clearly does not exclude Gentiles from the universal redemption offered through Christ, provided that they make themselves worthy to receive it, which is true also for the Israelites. Moreover,
even though “the first fruits of the Israelite people represented in the shepherds anticipated the fruits of the Gentiles in the reception of the Catholic faith, yet the fullness of the nations represented by the Magi anticipated the Israelite fullness in the faith,” as St. Paul had noted in his Letter to the Romans (11:25–6): “A certain blindness has occurred in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles has arrived and in this way all of Israel may be saved.” Cartagena and Oropesa study this soteriological order by an analysis of the *Acts of the Apostles* 10, where Peter visits the Gentile Cornelius and, after having overcome his own resistance, as a circumcised Jew, to dealing with a Gentile, recognizes God’s will in redeeming the Gentile through baptism.

The baptism of Cornelius united him with Peter to be part of the new and indivisible—as Jesus’ tunic—people of the Church of

****


44 “Así pues, las primicias del pueblo israelita figuradas en los pastores se anticiparon a las primicias de los gentiles en la recepción de la fe católica, mas la plenitud de las gentes representada por los Magos se anticipó a la plenitud israelita en la fe” (Cartagena, *Defensorium*, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 182). Surprisingly, Rosenstock (*New Men*, p. 33) overlooked this choice of the Pauline corpus by Cartagena in an attempt to explicate Israel’s delay in the final redemption.

“Pero hay que seguir considerando para redondear del todo el tema presente que en su santísimo nacimiento no sólo mostró que pronto iba a hacer tal paz entre los dos pueblos, sino que también comenzó a realizarla en seguida, y en cierta forma ya los unió en sí mismo, pues trajo a los pastores, que eran del pueblo judío (como está en el evangelio de Lucas, 2, 8–17), y a los magos, del pueblo de los gentiles (como está en el evangelio de Mateo, 2, 1–12); y a unos y otros llamó de modo extraordinario y los trajo para que lo adorasen y reconociesen como Dios y hombre, y así ya los reunió en sí mismo en una cierta alianza de paz” (Oropesa, *Luz*, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXXV).


“Pero, sea de ello lo que se quiera, resulta evidente que la Iglesia universal estuvo congregada de unos y otros en unanimidad y se hizo admirable ejemplo en esta santa comunión dicha, como se dice expresamente en los Hechos de los Apóstoles (cf. Hch 6,1–7; 14,1.27) y puede deducirse en general del desarrollo de todo el libro; y todos los de ambos pueblos, de los judíos y de los gentiles, recibían de Dios la misma gracia y dones dentro de la única Iglesia universal de los fieles. Por eso, cuando Pedro fue de Joppe a Cesárea invitado por el centurión Cornelio, que era hombre gentil, y permaneció con él, y él con sus parientes y amigos recibieron el Espíritu Santo hasta llegar a proclamar en toda lengua las maravillas de Dios y merecer que les bautizara en el nombre de nuestro Señor Jesucristo, y cuando los creyentes de Jerusalén que eran de la circuncisión comenzaron a reprocharlo a Pedro, él, haciéndoles ver esta igualdad de gracia para unas y otras gentes, les respondió diciendo: «Por tanto, si Dios les ha concedido el mismo don que a nosotros, por haber creído en el Señor Jesucristo, ¿quién era yo para poner obstáculos a Dios? Al oír esto se tranquilizaron y glorificaron a Dios…»” (Oropesa, *Luz*, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXXVIII).

Christ, regardless of their different lineage. This mixture of blood had taken place already in biblical times among the Israelites themselves, explicates Cartagena in the third theorem. For instance, Rahab (Joshua 6:25) and Ruth (Ruth 1:16–7) came from the Gentiles—from Jericho and Moab, respectively. Yet they both married Israelite men: the former became mother of Solomon and the latter of Jesse, father of David, from whom Christ derived his lineage, as the Gospel according to Matthew highlighted. In sum, “the sanctification of Israel would really come in the form not of division but of unification, so that both the descendants of Jacob by flesh and the rest would unite under one king and one pastor, that is Christ, in order to form one people only, one lineage only, and one flock only.” Isaiah predicted this union: “The wolf will dwell with the lamb; and the leopard will lie down with the kid.” According to Cartagena, in this image, the “bellicosity of the armed Gentility unites with tenderness of the Israeliite meekness.”

The unity of the Christian Church that encompasses both Israelites and Gentiles is also based on the sharing of guilt for Christ’s death, a guilt shared by those priests who disregarded the signs given to them by prophets; simple Jews as a result to their ignorance; and the Gentiles who actually crucified Christ. The last group’s guilt, however, was more forgivable in Cartagena’s view, for—contrary to the Jews—the Gentiles did not have knowledge of the law. Nevertheless,
both Gentiles and Jews were forgiven in the event of Christ’s death on the cross that dissolved the “intermediate wall of separation,” opening access to the Father for both of them, as St. Paul argued in his Letter to Ephesians (2:14–8). Therefore, as Alonso Díaz de Montalvo (1405–99) pointed out, there are no longer visitors or new arrivals in Christian religion—we cannot tolerate those who distinguish between New and Old (Christians), for there is no Catholic who has not come to the faith recently: as nobody who stays in his mother’s womb can be circumcised, so none can be baptized.

Unique to Cartagena is his fourth and last theorem, which he explains as a consequence of a correct syllogism made of two major propositions contained in the first and second theorems and of a minor proposition enclosed in the third theorem: if both the Israelite and Gentile peoples are fully saved and, after they arrived to the faith, formed one people of God without any lineage differences, ergo they can aspire to all the merits they had previously possessed and can obtain the new ones within the unity of the new people.
Based on this syllogism, the Roman Constantine the Great, the Frank Clovis, the Gothic Alaric, or the Lithuanian Jagiełło, who were all Gentiles before they accepted the Catholic faith, not only kept their attributes of majesty and nobility of lineage but also were further ennobled by the water of baptism. Moreover, Emperor Justinian—in spite of being Christian—was proud to trace his lineage to the pagan Aeneas.

Royalty and priesthood, the highest of dignities assigned to nobility, existed also in the history of the people of Israel, as the Scriptures testify abundantly. Beyond this nobility by lineage that was often combined with theological nobility in the great figures of Solomon or Samuel, Cartagena points out the presence of what he calls “civic nobility” in the Israelite people. Its most evocative example is Judas Maccabaeus. Cartagena admits, however, that this civic nobility must have waned because of grave Jewish sins of infidelity and blindness in not recognizing Christ, as could be observed during the so-called Jewish war against Titus and Vespasian. He confidently concludes his argument with an analogy:

As by divine mercy they were freed from the material Egypt through the passage across the Red Sea signaled to them by a column of fire, so will they be mercifully freed from the spiritual Egypt of infidelity and all their grief when they turn to the Catholic faith through the Red Sea of baptismal water reddened by the blood of Christ and signaled to them by the column of fire of love of the Holy Spirit.

---

54 Constantine I (c. 272–337) was the first Roman emperor to endorse Christianity as state religion (Edict of Milan, 313), even though he accepted baptism only on his deathbed.

55 Clovis I (c. 466–511) was the founder of the Merovingian dynasty of Frankish kings. He converted to Catholicism under the sway of his wife, Clotildida.

56 Alaric I (c. 370–410) was the king of Goths, who captured Rome.

57 Jogaila, later Władysław II Jagiełło (c. 1362–1434), was Grand Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland. In 1386 he converted to Christianity and married Queen Jadwiga of Poland. See also Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Díaz, p. 331.

58 Justinian I or Justinian the Great (482–565) was Eastern Roman Emperor since 527. His major legacy, reflected in the Visigothic legislation, with which Cartagena as jurist must have been quite familiar, comes from his Corpus Iuris Civilis.


61 Cartagena alludes here to the first Jewish-Roman War, 66–73 C.E., known as The Great Revolt.

62 “Y así como por la divina clemencia fueron librados del Egipto material a través del paso del Mar Rojo señalándoles el camino una columna de fuego, así serán
In other words, natural and civic nobility had been undermined by, as Cartagena puts it, the theological slavery of Hagar—whose womb symbolizes the Synagogue—which prevented the Jews from holding civic offices in Christian society. Yet, through the water of baptism the Jews are liberated from this kind of slavery to become sons of Sarah—whose womb represents the Church Militant—and their impurity is made purer than snow (Psalm 50:9). Thus,

While the unfortunate Jews on account of the blindness of their hearts are filled with the misfortune, both spiritual and physical, of not seeing the light that enlightens every man who comes to this world, if their eyes are opened, once they have come to the Church, they receive the vision of the soul. There is no doubt that, freed from spiritual ills, they will also be freed from the weight of temporary ones. Who, then, will dare to say that the men purified by water of baptism are still marked by the stain of infamy of their ancestors, while their own sins are completely removed by the same water of baptism?64

To support his argument against “the malice of the envious,” about whose origins from Goths or Vandals nobody inquires,65 Cartagena—like the jurist Díaz de Montalvo—quotes a law from the Civil Code66 that contradicts what we would term today “biological determinism”: “a father’s sin or punishment cannot impress any stain on his child [unless it is the stain of original sin transmitted from Adam], for everyone is subject to his own responsibility and no one inherits crime.”67

misericordiosamente liberados del Egipto espiritual de la infidelidad, y de todas sus congojas, por el Mar Rojo del agua bautismal, enrojecidos por la sangre de Cristo al pasar a la fe católica y señalándoles el camino la columna de fuego del amor del Espíritu Santo” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 226). See also ibidem, pp. 241–3 and 277–9.

64 “Como los infortunados judíos por la ceguera de su corazón son colmados de desgracias, tanto espirituales como corporales, al no ver la luz que ilumina a todo hombre que viene a este mundo, si abiertos los ojos, una vez llegados a la Iglesia, reciben la visión del alma, no cabe lugar a duda de que, al ser liberados de los males espirituales, serán también liberados del peso de los males temporales [...] . ¿Quien, pues, se atreverá a decir que al purificado por el agua del bautismo le ha quedado mancha alguna de la infamia de sus antepasados, cuando hasta sus propios pecados son completamente removidos por la misma agua del bautismo?” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 251).
67 “El pecado o el castigo paterno no puede imponer mancha alguna al hijo, ya que cada cual está sujeto a su propia responsabilidad y no se establece como sucesor del delito a nadie” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 252; see also ibidem, pp. 253–5).
Those Israelites who are regenerated by the water of baptism not only enjoy every privilege, exemption, and liberty—as the fathers of the Council of Basel unanimously stated (as we have seen earlier)—but also they have the right to be treated delicately, following St. Paul’s recommendation to give the weak neophytes the milk of love and generous breasts rather than solid food [1 Corinthians 3:2], as a mother gives to her child. Newborns to the faith are like tender plants that have to be watered often with an abundance of water, for the Church is like “an enclosed garden, a sealed fountain” (The Song of Songs 4:12). They must be taken care of with brotherly love, so that they feel they are one, without any differentiation based on their ancient origin. This kind of unity is desired by Christ himself, as was the unity that is between him and his Father (John 17:11), “for in Christ Jesus either circumcision or foreskin is worth nothing, but only faith which works through charity” (Galatians 5:6).

The necessity of Christian unity in Spanish society, continues Cartagena, is built on the promise of equality without regard for lineage, as was well understood by King Alfonso X (the Wise) who inscribed it into the collection of laws known as Partidas [1256–65], which were subsequently confirmed by King Enrique:

We also order that, after any Jews become Christians, all persons in our dominions shall honor them; and that no one shall dare reproach them or their descendants, by way of affront, with having been Jews; and that...

---

68 Fernan Díaz de Toledo, a converso counselor and secretary of King Juan II, presented the same argument in his Instrucción (see Roth, Conversos, Inquisition, p. 95).
69 “Estos han de ser tratados de diferente manera que los demás, sino que bajo la unidad de un mismo cuerpo si advertimos que algunos son débiles, que los aliviemos con la leche de la caridad y con los pechos de la generosidad, como en un mismo jardín a las plantas más tiernas se las riega más a menudo con abundancia de buena agua. Porque la Iglesia es un jardín cercado y una fuente sellada bajo cuya unidad y sello todos cuantos se lavan con el agua de la fuente sellada, que es el bautismo, han de ser cuidados con mano fraterna y caritativa para que se sientan una sola cosa sin diferencia alguna motivada por la antigüedad de origen” (Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, p. 262).

For a different use of the metaphor of milk as drink that feeds Christians coming either from Judaism or Paganism, see Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. XXXII: “Los dos senos son los dos pueblos, de los gentiles y de los judíos, porque, al vivir continuamente en amor fraterno se alimentan mutuamente con la leche de la piedad en la caridad, por lo que se denominan correctamente como dos crias mellizas de gacela, porque, al ser engendrados en la fe por la predicación de la sinagoga, se alimentan de sus escrituras atendiendo a la esperanza de eternidad, y así pacen concordes en los montes.”

they shall possess all their property, sharing the same with their brothers
and inheriting it from their fathers and mothers and other relatives just
as if they were Jews; and that they can hold all offices and dignities which
other Christians can do.\textsuperscript{71}

In Cartagena’s (and Díaz de Montalvo’s) opinion as a jurist trained in
\textit{utroque iure}, all the civil and ecclesiastical laws that he cited so far were
broken by the Toledan anti-converso legislation of 1449, behind which—in
Cartagena’s view—stood Marcos [García de Mora].\textsuperscript{72} Cartagena
accosts him, arguing that García de Mora’s statutes are against the
divine law and heretical.\textsuperscript{73} His “black envy” fueled his distortion of the
Fourth Council of Toledo’s legislation [633], which Cartagena personally
consulted in Basel. According to García de Mora, this canon was sup-
posedly incorporated into Gratian’s \textit{Decretum} (c. 1140)\textsuperscript{74} and provided

\textsuperscript{71} Alfonso X el Sabio, \textit{Partidas}, “La Séptima Partida,” tit. XXIV, ley VI (see Cartagena,
cap. XLIII. The Alfonsine legislation comprised, though, many restrictions on Jewish
life: Jews were prohibited from intermarrying with Christians, visiting Christian baths,
possessing Christians servants, holding any public office that would give them power
over Christians, or seeking Christian converts to Judaism.

\textsuperscript{72} In his \textit{Memorial} (1449), which supported the purity-of-blood legislation of
Sarmiento, García de Mora (known also as Marquillos de Mazarambroz) accused the
conversos of Toledo of being responsible for the conspiracy against Old Christians
during the 1449 revolt. He called for the persecution and murder of New Christians.
For an analysis of this document, see Eloy Benito Ruano, “El memorial contra los
conversos del bachiller Marcos García de Mora (‘Marquillos de Mazarambroz’),
For Cartagena’s analysis of García de Mora’s resentment, see Cartagena, \textit{Defensorium},


\“Pero de todo lo dicho aparece bien claro cuánta ha sido la temeridad y audacia de
estas personas que quieren separar de la Iglesia de Dios a los que se habían conver-
tido del judaísmo y hecho cristianos por el bautismo, y de los que se esfuerzan por
excluirlos de los oficios y dignidades y de los demás honores de la Iglesia de Dios; por
ser esto evidentemente contra la autoridad de la Iglesia universal, contra su sagrada
Escritura y sucesión tácita, contra su uso y costumbre prolongado desde los santos
apóstoles hasta ahora, y contra sus honorables concílios” (Oropesa, \textit{Luz}, ed. Díaz y
Díaz, cap. XLVII).

\textsuperscript{74} \“Y esto solo debiera bastar como respuesta al argumento tomado de dicho
concilio toledano. Sin embargo, para que con el honor debido a dicho concilio y
a la veneración de aquellos santos padres se dé la respuesta, hay que decir que,
aunque aquellos concílios de obispos no tenían validez para definir y establecer,
especially en tan importantes y difíciles asuntos, no obstante eran válidos para
corregir y castigar, y son necesarios para eso, como allí mismo dice Graciano, y así
se hicieron y dispusieron aquellos decretos escritos entonces contra los delincuen-
tes e impuestos y aplicados por aquellos santos padres reunidos en dicho concilio
toledano, o sea, a modo de sentencia y reprensión particular de corrección y castigo
contra aquellos lapsos de entonces, como contra ciertas personas concretas atrapa-
a precedent to debar New Christians from holding office in Toledo. The astute lawyer Cartagena argues, however, that one should look at the different historical context of the reigns of Sisebuto [612–20] and Sisenando [633–6], under whom the legislation was promulgated and which Gratian omitted in his transcription of the decree. Additionally, Toledo IV was the only council among the fifteen Visigothic councils that dealt with the judaizantes. Moreover, Cartagena was unable to find this part of the council’s legislation in Gratian’s collection, for the only fragment related to the debarment of the Jews from public offices and those “ex Iudaeis” refers not—in his view—to the carnal descent but to the spiritual one:

The holy Council has ruled that the Jews, or those who are from the Jews [ex Iudaeis], in no way aspire to public offices, for by such activity they would do injustice to the Christians. Therefore, the judges of provinces, together with the bishops, prevent their fraudulently disguised infiltrations and not allow them to hold public offices. And if anyone permitted it, would have to be excommunicated as sacrilegious and who fraudulently attained office, would have to be put to death publicly.

---

71 Alfonso X el Sabio, Partidas (c. 1140) and provided possibly incorporated into Gratian’s Decretum Fourth Council of Toledo’s legislation [633], which Cartagena personally.

72 In his Memorial, ed. Verdín-Díaz, pp. 330 and 341–2. Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. LI: “Ya que si fuese verdad que dichos cánones abarcaban a todos los de raza judía que habían recibido o iban a recibir la fe de Cristo y a todos les aplicaban las penas allí contenidas, no exceptuaria este canon a sus hijos, al ser igualmente de la misma raza y vivir en la misma fe; pero, sin embargo, los excluye y los salva y dice que el hijo no cargará con la maldad de su padre, es decir, que no será castigado por los pecados de él, como está escrito y puesto en los sagrados cánones del mismo concilio toledano, donde dice: «Los judíos bautizados, si estuviessen condenados con cualquier pena después de haber prevaricado contra Cristo, no convendrá excluir a sus hijos fieles de los bienes de ellos, porque está escrito: El hijo no cargará con la iniquidad de su padre, ni el padre cargará con la iniquidad de su hijo».”

73 See Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdín-Díaz, pp. 304 and 328–30; and Oropesa, Luz, ed. Díaz y Díaz, cap. LI: “Y esto solo debiera bastar como respuesta al argumento tomado de dicho concilio toledano, o sea, a modo de sentencia y reprensión particular de corrección y castigo contra aquellos lapsos de entonces, como contra ciertas personas concretas atrapadas con la iniquidad de su padre, ni el padre cargará con la iniquidad de su hijo».”

For the historical context of Sisebuto’s and Sisenando’s legislation concerning Jews and conversos, see, for example, Serrano, Los conversos, pp. 8–9.

74 “Constituit sanitum concilium ut iudaei aut hi qui ex iudaeis sunt, officia publica nullatenus appetant, qui sub hac actione christianis iniuriam faciunt. Ideoque judices
Cartagena concludes this part of his work, addressing directly Marcos García de Mora, the true leader of the anti-converso party in Toledo, with the following provocative words:

Examine, therefore, so to speak your way, if by chance you are from the Jews, because, applauding their infidelity, you persecute with rancorous hate the faithful who descend from them up to the point that a doorwoman could tell you, *You are one of them* (I do not know whether according to the flesh, but certainly according to the spirit). If you hold a position by which you are blamed, you are one of them, because your language betrays you, because you say huge things against God, as you were a beast going to die.\(^78\)

The legislation of Toledo IV breaks, in Cartagena’s view, with the long-running tradition of the Church, within which many Israelites became prestigious figures:

It never occurred that a person was rejected because of his Jewish blood. And we do not speak here just about the origins of the Church, when the pillars of the faith, the saint apostles, and after them, the disciples of our Redeemer as well as many other descendants of Jewish blood governed the Church of God, holding important offices (and some ennobled it with martyrdom or virtues).\(^79\)
Thus, Evarist was a pope for ten years, and Julian—known for his knowledge and virtue—held the primatial See of Toledo itself. In the conclusion to the exposition of his fourth theorem, Cartagena continues to criticize García de Mora for manipulating the true meaning of the decrees of Toledo IV that pertain to the prohibition against Jews and “those who are from Jews” testifying in Christian courts of law.

The third and last brief part of the work aims to interpret the turmoil caused by García de Mora as a pagan act of destroying Church unity and fomenting a heretical rebellion against the royal power of King Juan II, to whom the Defensorium is dedicated.

Cartagena’s arguments—with the support of his converso colleague from Basel, the Dominican Cardinal Juan de Torquemada (1388–1468), uncle of the future Inquisitor General, and the royal jurist Díaz de Montalvo—found a benevolent hearing with Pope Nicholas V. The pope immediately issued three bulls against the Sarmiento legislation of 1449, the most important of them being the Humani generis inimicus...
Bishop Nicholas, Servant of the Servants of God, that the matter may be perpetually known.

The enemy of humankind, once he saw the word of God fall on good field, engaged in sowing weeds, so that, rammed the seed, it would not produce fruit [Matthew 13:24–30]. Similarly, the Apostle Paul, vase of choice and principal extirpator of this weed, relates that at the beginning a disagreement was born over favoritism among the converted to the faith: some struggled for the precedence of Jews over Gentiles and others looked for other ways to arrive at a schism in the Church of God, when some claimed to be of Cephas and others of Apollo [1 Corinthians 3:22]. Predicting that it would happen in the beginning of the newborn Church, our Redeemer ruled that those who remove such weeds relieve also those who sinned out of human weakness or those who fell. The Apostle himself, writing to the Romans, undid with divine words any dissent over that favoritism; and Peter, Prince of the Apostles, turned away any chance of schism, once bishops were ordained in each diocese.

Following the example of our Redeemer and being His unworthy vicar on earth in removing these disagreements, illustrated by the above examples, We are obliged to use with much care our pontifical authority and challenge those who could engender some division among the faithful, so that charity, love, and unity reign among them. Nothing then is more convenient among the faithful than to have only one mind, as the Apostle said: "For just as the body is one, and yet has many parts, so all the parts of the body, though they are many, are only one body. So also in Christ. And indeed, in one Spirit, we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether servant or free. And we have all drunk in the one Spirit" [1 Corinthians 12:12–3]. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" [Ephesians 4:5–6].

We have found out that some new sowers of weeds, who try to corrupt the salvific foundation of this unity and peace of our faith and renew the discord that had been extirpated by the Apostle Paul, vase of choice, especially in the realms of our dear son, the illustrious Juan, king of Castile and León, audaciously affirmed that those from Gentilism or Judaism or any other error, who learned the Christian truth and were baptized and even—what is graver—their descendants, may not be admitted to honors, dignities, offices, and public notaries or witness in cases of Christians, because of their recent reception of the faith, bringing them disgrace in word and deed.

This is alien to the teaching of our Redeemer as witnessed by the Apostle Paul who said: "Glory and honor and peace are for all who do what is good, the Jew first, and also the Greek, for there is no favoritism of persons with God" [Romans 2:10–1] and: "Whoever believes in him shall not be confused, for there is no distinction between Jew and
Greek, for the same Lord is over all, richly in all who call upon him” [Romans 10:11–2], and elsewhere: “For in Christ Jesus either circumcision or foreskin is worth nothing, but only faith which works through charity” [Galatians 5:6]). Those who have walked away from the truth of Christian faith and have exceeded in things said above, whom we desire to take to the path of the true faith and warn, are not only contradicted by the quoted divine testimonies, but also by the frequent sanctions of those illustrious princes, such as Alfonso, the so-called Wise, and Enrique, and our beloved son Juan, kings of Castile and León, which were aimed to increase the faith and supported by severe penalties. We have seen those sanctions in kings’ authentic letters, supplied with their seals, and we have pondered them wisely. They established that there was no preference between the newly converts to the faith, especially from the Jewish people, and the Old Christians to keep or receive honors, offices and dignities, both ecclesiastical and civil […] and whoever sows falsehoods against the rule of Christian law, scandalizes neighbors, and acts against unity and peace, should confess his mistakes and be punished with appropriate penalties.

By our initiative, we consciously adopt, confirm, and—with the firmness of the apostolic authority—approve the orders and decrees of those princes regarding these issues as complying with the sacred canons and law. And under penalty of excommunication, we commend to each and every one of any status, rank or condition, either ecclesiastical or lay, to admit each and every one of the converts to the Christian faith and those who will convert in the future either from Gentilism or Judaism, or from any sect they may have come or will come, and their descendants of both the clergy and laity, as long as they live as good Catholics and Christians, to all dignities, honors, offices, public notaries, witness statements and everything else, to which all other older Christians are usually admitted. No difference should be made between them and other Christians, because of having recently received faith, nor should they disgrace them by word or deed, nor should they let others do such things; rather, they should contradict and oppose it with all their might; and with all their charity they should accompany them and honor without favoritism of persons. Additionally, we declare and decree that we Catholics are one body in Christ, according to the teaching of our faith, and that all those converted are part of it and that we all have to consider them as such.

However, if you find that some of them after baptism lost the sense of the Christian faith, or follow the mistakes of the Jews or Gentiles, or by ignorance or ill will do not uphold the precepts of Christian faith, in such cases goes into effect what was established in the Council of Toledo, especially in the chapter Constituit, and elsewhere, where against such apostates from the faith of Christ one says that they are not to be admitted to such honors at parity with the other good faithful, which is exactly what the quoted kings, correctly understanding the sacred canons, have applied to certain laws of their kingdoms in their mentioned constitutions—to think differently would be less than what is expected from a
Christian. Who suffers because of this scandal should go to a judge and demand that he fulfill what is right by the public authority of law and the established order, and that nobody intend, out of his own authority outside the established order, to do violence against all or any of them, which is contrary to the teaching of the divine and human laws. […]

Given in Fabriano, diocese of Camerino, in the year 1449 of the Incarnation of the Lord, the 24th of September, in the third year of our pontificate.86

*Humani generis inimicus*, echoing strongly Cartagena’s *Defensorium*, excommunicated “those who sowed zizania,” but only temporarily, and it did not prevent other anti-converso riots and the dissemination of purity-of-blood laws beyond Toledo. Fiercely promoted by the Franciscan Alonso de Espina (d. 1469) in his malicious *Fortalitium fidei* (c. 1464),87 purity-of-blood laws were adopted by the city councils of Cordova and Jaén (1473), Ciudad Real, Valladolid, and Segovia (1474), Villena (1476), and others. Oropesa’s religious order, the Jeronymites, introduced the anti-converso statutes at the end of the fifteenth century; the Franciscans accepted the statutes with a limitation up to the fourth generation in 1525, a restriction which was later abrogated (1583); and the Discalced Carmelites adopted them just two years after the Jesuits (1595). The Dominicans never applied the statutes universally, but individual convents did, such as Santo Tomás of Ávila (1496) or San Pablo of Cordova (1538). Also the military orders of Calatrava, Alcántara, and Santiago followed suit in the later fourteenth century, as did the Colegios Mayores, such as San Bartolomé in Salamanca or San Clemente in Bologna,88 and the cathedrals of Badajoz, Cordova, Jaén, León, Oviedo, Seville, Sigüenza, and Valencia.89 Yet, the con-

---

86See the original Latin text in Appendix II. For an analysis of Nicholas V’s legislation regarding conversos (there were other two bulls), see V. Beltrán de Heredia, “Las bulas de Nicolás V acerca de los conversos,” *Sefarad* 21 (1961): 22–47. Roth (*Conversos, Inquisition*, p. 101) criticized Heredia’s argumentation concerning the causes that led to the creation of the Inquisition as reflecting Heredia’s “anti-Jewish animus.”

87*Fortalitium fidei contra Iudaeos, Saracenos aliosque Christianae fidei inimicos* had numerous editions in various parts of Europe. For an analysis of the text, see Steven J. McMichael, *Was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah? Alphonso de Espina’s argument against the Jews in the Fortalitium fidei* (c. 1464) (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). See also Sicroff, *Estatutos*, pp. 100–1.


89See Kamen, *Crisis and Change*, p. 4; and Elvira Pérez Ferreiro, *El Tratado de Uceda contra los Estatutos de Limpieza de Sangre. Una reacción ante el establecimiento del*
versos continued to play important roles in both civil and ecclesiastical spheres, especially in Toledo, where one hundred years after the Sarmiento legislation the city’s archbishop promulgated discriminatory laws against converso clerics.  

Purity-of-blood statutes of Archbishop Silíceo (1547)

In none of the anti-converso laws did the 1449 Sentencia-Estatuto of Toledo leave its unlawful mark more than in the Pureza-de-sangre Statutes (1547) of Juan Martínez Guijarro (1477–1557), Inquisitor General of Spain and Archbishop of Toledo. Even though Pope Paul IV and Guijarro’s former pupil, King Philip II, ratified Guijarro’s statutes in 1555 and 1556, respectively—in spite of the latter’s earlier opposition to it—Jesuit leaders would adamantly oppose the archbishop’s attempt to impose anti-converso laws on the Society of Jesus, which had been founded just a few years earlier (1540), as we shall see in the following chapter.

Juan Martínez Guijarro—who used the Latinized form of his name, Silíceo, in order to disguise his lower-class social background—was born into a poor peasant family near Llerena (Villagarcía), an origin that would guarantee his blood’s purity. As had Loyola and his first companions, Silíceo studied at the University of Paris for many years. Upon his return to Spain, he continued his academic career at Salamanca, where he resided at the College of San Bartolomé at the time it introduced purity-of-blood statutes. Subsequently, Silíceo became Prince Philip’s Latin preceptor, an office that earned him in 1546 the most elevated episcopal office in Spain—the Primatial See of Toledo—and the cardinalate in 1554. Seeking a veiled pretext to act against the converso Cobos clan of Toledo, whose preeminent representative, Francisco de los Cobos y Molina (d. 1547), was the royal secretary who opposed Silíceo’s appointment to the archbishopric, and to sabotage the

---


89 See Sicoff, Estatutos, pp. 126–7; and Serrano, Los conversos, p. 51.

91 See Sicoff, Estatutos, pp. 127–8; and Hayward Keniston, Francisco de los Cobos, Secretary of the Emperor Charles V (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960).
nomination of the converso Fernando Jiménez as canon of the Toledan Church. Sarmiento’s avatar promulgated the pureza-de-sangre statutes in his cathedral chapter.

Siliceo’s raison d’être for his anti-converso legislation is shared with the 1449 Toledan statutes and, thus, does not need further analysis here: the converso, who inherits the bad moral inclinations of his Jewish ancestors, is unsuitable to hold any public office. Claiming the authority of the Scriptures and the Fourth Council of Toledo, he argues that the conversos “still hold on their lips the milk of their ancestors’ recent perversity.” To Silíceo, this inclination to the vice of unfaithfulness takes roots in a man already at his birth. A choice between pure and impure Christians was to Siliceo similar to a choice between bred and in-bred horses. These arguments seemed absurd even to the non-converso clerics, Pero González de Mendoza from Guadalajara and Álvaro de Mendoza from Talavera, who—supported by the numerous converso clergy of Toledo—called for the immediate annulment of the statutes. But Siliceo viewed himself as the harbinger of the second Spanish Reconquista and made every possible effort, cunning conspiracy included, to have his anti-converso laws approved by both royal and papal authorities. One of the major defenders of Siliceo’s racial discrimination was Bishop Diego de Simancas.

93 See Sicroff, Estatutos, p. 131. In his study of “the most infamous and representative” case of Cazorla in relation to the 1547 Statutes, Samson Alexander stressed that “although anti-Semitic prejudice played a role, it was predominantly about Toledan politics, opposed visions of the Church and contested notions of religious identity as either a genealogical category, something inhering in blood lines or something associated with virtue and personal piety” (see Samson Alexander, “The adelantamiento of Cazorla, converso Culture and Toledo Cathedral Chapter’s 1547 estatuto de limpieza de sangre,” Bulletin of Spanish Studies, 84/7 (2007): 819.
94 “Tienen en los labios la leche de la reciente perversidad de sus antepasados” (quoted by Sicorff, Estatutos, p. 131). On Américo Castro’s interpretation of the alleged Jewish-biblical origins of Siliceo’s statutes, see Netanyahu, Toward the Inquisition, pp. 7–8.
95 See Sicroff, Estatutos, pp. 131–2. As we have seen, this view was contrasted by Alonso de Cartagena, who—quoting Augustin—argued that a man who does not follow the vices of his parents, wherever he comes from, is honest and saved.
96 It is interesting to note in this context that Covarrubias y Orozco’s Tesoro de la lengua castellana (Madrid, 1611) defined the term raza as “the caste of pure-bred horses which are branded with an iron so that they may be recognized as such. Raza in [human] lineages is understood in a bad sense, such as having within oneself some of the lineage of Moors or Jews.” See Yerushalmi, Assimilation and Racial Anti-Semitism, p. 15.
Defensio Toletani Statuti of Diego de Simancas (1573)

An Old Christian nobleman from Cordova and a law student at the University of Salamanca and the College of Santa Cruz in Valladolid, Diego de Simancas (1513–83) held prominent positions in the bureaucracies of Crown, Church, and Inquisition: he was a judge, a bishop, and an inquisitor.98 He published his Defensio in Antwerp under the pseudonym of Didacus (Diego) Velásquez, first in 1573 and again in 1575.99 Simancas's anti-converso feelings were already known much earlier, however: he let them slip during the inquisitorial process of Archbishop Bartolomé Carranza (1503–76),100 who—as we shall see—was defended by the converso Francisco de Toledo Herrera, the first Jesuit cardinal, and by Francisco de Borja, the third superior general of the Jesuits and a protector of conversos.

Simancas's defense of Silíceo's decree, which in the former's own words prohibited "those from the circumcision," Mahometans, or heretics from receiving benefices and offices in the Church of Toledo,101 was a response to converso "machinations" against Silíceo's legislation, such as Alonso Lobo's preaching in Rome in the early 1570s, and a defense against "deceiving the pope and his ministers," which was the supposed goal of the "prolix" Apología pro Iudaeis Christianis (Paris, 1553). This last work was written by the French Franciscan biblical scholar from the Sorbonne, Henri Mauroy, who—following the example of Cartagena and Oropesa—strongly opposed the pureza-de-sangre statutes. Among many things that scandalized Simancas was the fact that Mauroy made a connection between Spanish conversos and the biblical patriarchs, which was provocatively expressed in the very work's full title: Apologia in duas partes divisa, pro iis, qui ex patriarcharum, Abrahae videlicet, Isaac, et Jacob, reliquis sati, de Christo Iesu et fide catholica pie ac sancte sentiunt, in Archiespiscopum Toletanum, et suos asseclas [The Defense

99 For a brief presentation of the work's content, see Lynn Hossain, Arbiters of Faith, pp. 179–81.
100 For a detailed analysis of Simancas's participation in Carranza's process, see Lynn Hossain, Arbiters of Faith, especially pp. 143 and 149.
101 “Silicéus decreto sive statuto vetuit, ne ii qui ex circumcisione sunt aut ex Mahumetanis, vel Haereticis nati, benefici a et ufficia deinceps in eadem Ecclesia habere possent” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 2).
(divided in two parts) of those who descending from the patriarchs, that is Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, leaving apart others, piously and saintly feel about Jesus Christ and the Catholic faith, against the Archbishop of Toledo and his followers].

Indeed, one of the main arguments, which Simancas stressed, was the repudiation of the converso “trite prattle” about their consanguinity with Jesus’ Jewish humanity descending from Abraham. Following the argumentation of Baltasar Porreño, Simancas claimed that the Toledan statutes concerned only the descendants of perfidious Jews, who had killed Christ the Lord, the Apostles, and other saints, and who—persisting for close to fifteen hundred years in their perfidy—blasphemed Christ God three times every day and wanted to kill and destroy all other Christians. To Simancas, converso consanguinity with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is impossible, for these names belong not to the flesh and nature but to grace, the promise, the faith, and the sacrament. These names pertain no more to the converso than to the Gentile faithful, who are from the faith sons of Abraham, as St. Paul wrote in his letters to Romans (4:11) and Galatians (3:7). The perfidious Jews cannot be sons of Abraham if they speak badly about the Savior. Moreover, their Talmud states that Abraham himself taught magic arts and diabolical inventions, as Hadrianus Finus had demonstrated.

---

102 See Sicloff, Estatutos, p. 214.
103 “Statuta non tangunt nisi descendentes ex perfidis Iudaeis, qui Christum Dominum et Apostolos aliosque sanctos occiderunt et per mille quingentos circiter annos in sua perfidia persistentes, ter singulis diebus Deum Christum blasphemabantur et caeteros Christianos omnes occidere ac perdere vellent” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 15v).
104 “Ad haec nomine Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, non sunt nomine carnis et naturae, sed nomine gratiae et promissionis et fidei et sacramenti: nec magis ad eos pertinent quam ad gentiles credentes: Nam qui ex fide sunt, ii sunt filii Abrahamae, ut ad Romanos et Galatas divinus scribit Apostolus (Rom. 4, Gal. 3). Igitur quando parentes illorum Iudaei perfidi, maiores autem nostri christiani fideles erant, illi non veri filii Abrahamae, sed nostri veri filii erant. Praetera non solum de Salvatore Iudaei male loquuntur et sentiunt, sed de ipso etiam Abraham aiunt in suo Talmud docuisse magicas artes et inventiones daemonum: quo plane ostendunt se non esse veros Abrahamae filios quam fabulum cum alis impiis blasphemis ac deridendis retulit Finus Hadrianus lib. 9 cap. 8” (Simancas, Defensio, ff. 16v–v).

Hadrianus Finus (Fino, Fini d’Adria) from Ferrara was the author of In Iudaeos Flagellum (Venice, 1538), a long attack against Jewish practices contained in the Talmud. On other quotations from Finus regarding the Talmud as a source of laws against Christians, see Simancas, Defensio, f. 35v.
Through a detailed analysis of Jesus’ relatives (Chapters 22 and 23), Simancas desires to convince the reader that because those relatives followed Christ faithfully, the Spanish conversos cannot be their descendants. Spanish conversos are the offspring of the Jews who killed Jesus and later found refuge in Spain after the destruction of Jerusalem.105

The association Mauroy makes between conversos and Jews, when he calls the former Jewish Christians or Jewish conversos or simply Jews, bothers Simancas.106 At the same time, the common identification of the converso with the persona of the Jew is the anthropological backbone of Simancas’s argumentation against conversos. The most frequent way Simancas refers to conversos in his Defensio is “those from the circumcision,” which refers more to converso ancestry than to reality—only Judaizing conversos may have undergone the rite of circumcision. But to Simancas, the majority of conversos continue to celebrate Jewish rites, among them “the abominable circumcisions,”107 as did “many rebellious people, mere talkers and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision group” in the primitive Church.108 He echoes here Sileceo’s claim that Jews who converted to Catholicism were motivated by fear and retained of the intent to go “back to their vomit” [as dogs do].109

“Those from the circumcision,” continues Simancas, are fairly barred from the offices of the Church of Toledo, for they are stained

105 “Addo quod novi isti Christiani non descendunt ex Iudaeis antiquis nobilibus, sed ex illis, qui excidio Hierosolymitano superfuerunt, qui, ut ait Aegesippus, viliores […] in omnem terram ventilati sunt” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 29).
106 See Simancas, Defensio, f. 2r. Alonso de Cartagena, quoting Isidor (Etymologiarum liber octavus, cap. X), opposed the use of the term iudaei baptizati for Christians of Jewish origins, since being a Jew demands a certain way of life. The term may be applied only to Judaizing Christians (see Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Díaz, pp. 336 and 339).
107 “Plerique ex Iudaeis, qui dudum ad Christianam fide promoti sunt, nunc blasphemantes Christum, non solum Judaicos ritus perpetrasse noscuntur, sed etiam abominandas circumcissiones exercere” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 31r).
108 This is the interpretation of the Pauline Letter to Titus (1:10) that, according to Simancas, was given by Aquinas: “Accedit et illud Pauli apostoli in epistola ad Titum cap. 1 dicentis: ‘Sunt multi inobiedientes, vaniloqui et seductores, maxime qui de circumciscione sunt.’ […] Et Divus Thomas enarrans verba illa ‘maxime qui de circumciscione sunt’ inquit, qui cogebant homines iudaizare” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 32). See Thomas Aquinas, Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem, 5.4, where this interpretation seems to be missing.
109 See Sicroff, Estatutos, p. 145; and Simancas, Defensio, f. 35v. Alonso de Cartagena too used this expression in his Defensorium (see Cartagena, Defensorium, ed. Verdin-Díaz, pp. 328, 332, 334, and 373).
by the blood of their Jewish ancestors, which is “like a poison that kills the entire human being.” Therefore, as the Franciscan Alonso de Espina had noted in his *Fortalitium fidei*, conversos are heirs to Jewish bad moral inclinations that are transmitted through the generations. As Jews, they are prone to abuses (proclives ad contumelias) and are—in the Bible’s own words—“a stiff-necked people,” “a crooked and depraved generation,” “a brood of vipers,” “a wicked generation,” “a perverse generation, children who are unfaithful,” “an unbelieving and perverse generation,” and “a faithless generation.” Simancas, who actually does not use Silíceo’s term of (perfidious and unfaithful) raza, concludes that the perception of recent Jewish conversos as ambitious, disobedient, idly talking, and deceiving is longstanding, and it is meritorious that they are barred or fired from some ecclesiastical benefices.

Simancas ambiguously claims that “even though soul-illnesses (animi morbi) do not pass from parents to children, the latter, however, fall into those vices by which their parents had been affected.” He quotes some popular proverbs to prove his point: “Like mother, like daughter” (Ezekiel 16:44) and “Bad egg, bad bird.” Thus, “the children of the infidel seem to be prone to infidelity.” Simancas’s predecessor, Inquisitor Silíceo, expressed this idea more eloquently (as we have seen above): “[The New Christians] still hold on their lips the milk of their ancestors’ recent perversity.” The “hereditary vices,” especially ambition, conspiracy, and greed for power, are—or according to Simancas—peculiar to

---

110 Simancas, *Defensio*, f. 23r: “quasi venenum hominem totum inficere.”


113 “Vetus ergo et antiquus est recenter conversis ex Iudaeis ambitiosos, inobiedientes, vaniloquos et seductores esse. Merito igitur a quibusdam ecclesiasticis beneficis arcenetur et eiiciuntur” (Simancas, *Defensio*, f. 32).

114 Nam etsi animi morbi ex patribus in filios non transeant, saepe tamen filii solent in ea vitia incidere, quibus parentes fuere affecti. […] Et ut alia praetereaem, vetus proverbium est ab Ezechiele relatum: Sicut mater, ita filia eius et malum ovum, malus corvus […] sic infidelium filii ad infidelitatem proni esse videntur (Simancas, *Defensio*, f. 29r). Elsewhere (f. 31r) Simancas stresses this point by quoting Cicero’s *De Officiis* (1, 32): “Plerique autem parentum praecipitis imbuti [filii], ad eorum consequiudinem moremque deducimur.”

115 “Tienen en los labios la leche de la reciente perversidad de sus antepasados” (quoted by Sicroff, *Estatutos*, p. 131). The Anglican John Foxe (1517–87) expressed a similar idea in one of his sermons: “Jewish Infidelitie…seemeth after a certaine maner their inheritable disease, who are after a certaine sort, from their mothers wombe,
Jewish conversos and more frequent in them than in others. Moreover, even Muslims are less implacable and querulous, more truthful, and of better manners than Jews.\footnote{116}

This is the reason, as Silíceo had already argued,\footnote{117} why many Spanish ecclesiastical institutions had excluded them in order to preserve tranquility and peace and avoid schisms and quarrels.\footnote{118} Following Silíceo’s Statutes, which had converso conspiracy as their leitmotiv—the conversos infiltrated the offices of importance in the Church of Toledo\footnote{119}—Simancas claims that the history of Judeo-converso conspiracy against the city of Toledo was very old. Jews helped the Muslim invaders occupy Toledo [711 C.E.],\footnote{120} they plotted against the Spanish king, as the documents of the Fourth Council of Toledo indicate; during the reign of King Juan [II], conversos conspired against the prefect of the city of Toledo [Pero Sarmiento] and other Old Christians in order to kill them and occupy the city, so that they could blatantly go back to Judaism; and they organized in Toledo the same kind of plot twice during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella.\footnote{121} Converso intrigues were

\begin{quote}

naturally caries through peruser frowardnes, into all malitious hatred, \& contempt of Christ, \& his Christians” (quoted in Adelman, Blood Relations, p. 66).

\end{quote}
unbearable in the Church of Toledo, for it was considered the most preeminent see in Spain, being the See of the Catholic Primate.\textsuperscript{122}

This portrayal of the Spanish Judeo-conversos justifies, in Simancas’s view, use of the term \textit{marranos}, a term to whose meaning and origin he dedicates much space. Even though some maintain that the term \textit{marranos} stands for any group of people descended from Jews and others claim that it refers to any infidels, Simancas stresses that the label \textit{marranos} can be applied in neither way, for not all who are stained and contaminated by the Jewish blood can be called \textit{marranos}, and not all infidels belong to this group, which—as Michael Ritius [1445–1515] wrote in his \textit{De Hispaniae Regibus}—is composed only of those baptized Jews who are false Christians.\textsuperscript{123}

But what is the origin of the word?—asks Simancas. Some argue that the Spanish Jews were named \textit{marranos}, i.e., pigs—\textit{marrano} commonly refers to a one-year-old pig and, thus, the same name was applied to those who descend from Jews and are suspected [of practicing Judaism]. But, according to Simancas, this explanation is unlikely, for Jews do not have anything in common with the quality of pigs, except the fact that when one grunts, all the others immediately run to help.\textsuperscript{124}

The author of the \textit{Defensio} subscribes instead to an older meaning of the term \textit{marrano} that comes from the Hebrew word \textit{mara}, which commonly means “to rebel.” This word is more appropriate, for Jews rebel against Christ the Lord, as Petrus Godofredus wrote under the

\begin{flushright}
coniurationes fuissent, magnas caeterum christianorum strages edidissent" (Simancas, \textit{Defensio}, f. 32v).
\end{flushright}  
\textsuperscript{122} “Plurimum quidem honoris detractebatur ecclesiae celeberrimae Toletanae cum eius praebendas ac dignitates illi occupabant, qui perfidiorum filii, vel hinc oriundi erunt quos iure vel injuria Marranos appellare solent: proclives sunt hos homines ad contumelias” (Simancas, \textit{Defensio}, f. 24r).
\textsuperscript{123} “Ac primum quidem sunt qui dicit marranos vocari eos qui ex Iudaeis aliqua ex parte descendunt, alii aiunt marranos vocari quoslibet infideles. Sed neutrum verum est, nec enim omnes Iudaeorum sanguine maculati et contaminati sunt marrani, nec infideles omnes appellantur marrani. Sed eos Hispani marranos vocari solemus, qui ex Iudaes descendentes et baptizati, ficti christiani sunt. Quod et Michael Ritius lib. 3 de regibus Hispaniae recte intellexit inquiens, ‘Qui Iudaeorum ritibus imbuti, nomine fenus sunt christiani, hi vulgo marrani dicuntur.’” (Simancas, \textit{Defensio}, f. 24r).
\textsuperscript{124} “Quidam dicunt Iudaeos ipsos ab Hispanis dictos fuisses Marranos, id est porcos a nomine vulgari quo sues unius anni marranos vocant; atque inde fuisses nomine illo infami appellabor Marranos etiam eos, qui ex Iudaeis descendunt et suspecti sunt. Sed hoc verisimile non est, nihil enim commune habent isti cum qualitate pororum, nisi quod uno gruniente, coeteri omnes ei ausiliaturi statim accurrunt (Simancas, \textit{Defensio}, f. 24r).
entry “apostate.” “Marranos are those rebellious, contumacious, disobedient, and ambiguous men who under the name of Christianity are still attached to Judaism.”

This sort of philological analysis is absent in the interpretation of St. Paul’s letters that Simancas employs to counter the converso contentions with regard to the ethnic, gender, and social structure of the Christian community. Contrary to what Cartagena and Oropesa argued, Paul’s expressions such as “there is no favoritism [acceptatio personarum] with God” (Romans 2:11); “there is no distinction between Jew and Greek” (Romans 10:12); “there is neither Jew nor Greek, servant nor free, male nor female” (Galatians 3:28); and “there is neither circumcision nor foreskin, Barbarian nor Scythian, servant nor free” (Colossians 3:11), are interpreted by Simancas as references to spiritual and not—as the New Christians claim—temporal things and, therefore, cannot be applied to condemn the Toledan purity-of-blood statutes that were aimed to deprive conversos of benefices and offices, which are temporal and not spiritual affairs. Simancas abhors the idea of Christian society

---

125 “Alii putant antiquiorem esse huius nomines originem et a verbo hebraico (mara) derivatum esse, quod inter alia signet rebellare: cum enim isti rebelles sint contra Christum Dominum, recti Marrani sunt appellati quod et Petrus Godofredus in rubrica de Apostatis confirmare videtur, multa ex Haebraeis miscens ac demum conclusens apostatas esse eos, quos Hispani Marranos vocant, qui sub nomine Christianismi, studiosi sunt Iudaismi, rebelles, contumaces, inobedientes, praevari- catores” (Simancas, Defensio, f. 25).

The Encyclopedia Judaica (13:559) explains the term Marrano as follows: “Term of opprobrium used to denigrate the New Christians of Spain and Portugal. Various origins for the term have been suggested. These include the Hebrew marit ayin (‘the appearance of the eye’), referring to the fact that the Marranos were ostensibly Christian but actually Judaizers; mohoram attah (‘you are excommunicated’); the Aramaic-Hebrew Mar Anüu (‘Mr. Forced convert’); the Hebrew mumar (‘apostate’) with the Spanish ending ano; the Arabic mura’in (‘hypocrite’); and the second word of the ecclesiastical imprecation anathema maranatha. However, all such derivations are unlikely. The most probable, as clearly shown by Farinelli’s study, is from the Spanish word meaning swine, a word already in use in the early Middle Ages, though Y. Malkiel argues plausibly for a derivation from the late Arabic barran, barrani, meaning an outsider or stranger, and a coalescence of this word with the term marrano ‘pig, pork’ derived from Latin verres ‘wild boar.’ The term probably did not originally refer to the Judaizers’ reluctance to eat pork, as some scholars hold. From its earliest use, it was intended to impart the sense of loathing conveyed by the word in other languages. Although romanticized and regarded by later Jewry as a badge of honor, the term was not as widely used, especially in official circles, as is often believed.”

126 “Paulus quidem Apostolus nihilominus in ea epistola tractat, quam de rebus hisce terrenis: eius enim doctrina de spiritualibus est, componit dissidium ortum inter novos illos Christianos, qui se putabant meliores aut perfectiores esse propter praeputium, aut propter circumcisionem. Docet utrosque divinus Apostolus apud Christum
in which there would be “no distinction between noble and ignoble, between good and bad lineage, between honorable and humble.”

This interpretation of Paul’s thought is contrary to what Pope Nicholas V expressed in his bull *Humani generis inimicus* (1449), to which Simancas dedicates Chapter 17. He questions there the authenticity of the bull that became a weapon of the converso counterattack against the Sarmiento legislation as contrary to the Catholic faith, as we have seen earlier, and against the Jesuit *de genere* decree, as we shall see in Chapter Three. Nevertheless, Simancas discusses a portion of the bull he probably read in Alonso de Oropesa’s *Lumen*. The copied paragraph (which happens to be authentic) refers to the addressee of the Sarmiento statutes: the New Christians and their descendants who “were not to be admitted to honors, dignities, offices and notaries, and testify in the trials of Christians, because of their recent receipt of faith, bringing dishonors of word and deed.” Simancas argues that the bull’s text refer not specifically to ecclesiastical benefices—as the Silíceo legislation did—but to all honors, dignities, etc. In addition—he underscores—Pope Paul IV, who confirmed the Statutes of Toledo, expressly abrogated Nicholas’s bull.

---

127 “Iam hodie nulla distinctio erit nobilis aut ignobilis, boni aut mali generis, illustris aut vilis, denique nullus erit ordo reipublicae. Absit autem ab animis fidelium tam iniqua persuasio, ut apostoli doctrina tutius rectae pulitiae formam damnare, aut subvertere videatur (Simancas, *Defensio*, f. 7).

128 “Proferunt contra statutum *Toletanum* bullam Nicolai quinti, ex qua colligunt, statutum esse contra fidem catholicam, quia, inquit, nos a veritate catholicae fidei aberrantes, ad viam veritatis deducere cupientes et Paulo post affectantes ut quisque quae recta sunt spiaet: et qui contra christianae legis normam falsa semina emitentes eorum proximos scandalizare, quae unitatis et pacis contraria sunt praepsers [...]. Cui primo respondetur eam bullam authenticam non inveniriideoque fidei carere. Deinde longe alius fuisse quod tunc tractatum: nam ut in illa scriptura (qualisquumque tandem sit) continetur, illud quod quidam asserebant novos Christianos et eorum filios non debere ad honores, dignitates, officia tabellionatus et ad testimonium in Christianorum causis perhibendum admitteri, eos verbis et factis, contumeliis afficiere. Haec sunt verba illis chartae. Ex quibus perspicum est, eos qui illa credebant et asserebant non de beneficiis quibusdam ecclesiasticis, sed generaliter ac universo de omnibus honoribus, dignitatis, officiis publicis atque adeo de testimoniiis perhibendis egisse: novos christianos iniuriiis etiam afficiere atque ea quidem omnia non aliena ob causam,
True, Pope Paul IV approved the Silíceo Statutes and issued the harshest anti-Jewish legislation (*Cum nimis absurdum*, 1555), which was supported by Ignatius of Loyola. Conversely, under the sway of the same Loyola, his predecessor, Paul III, published in 1542 the bull *Cupientes Iudaeos* (1542), which—among other things—allowed Jewish catechumens to retain property after their conversion.

In conclusion, this chapter has provided a brief historical *excursus* of the intricate and rich literature on the concept of *pureza de sangre* and its adoption in civil and ecclesiastical life of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain. We have discussed the most important and emblematic five texts that reflect the variety of approaches to the issue: Mayor Sarmiento’s *Sentencia-Estatuto* (1449); Bishop Alonso de Cartagena’s *Defensorium unitatis christianae* (1449–50); Fray Alonso de Oropesa’s *Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloria plebis Dei Israel, de unitate fidei et de concordi et pacifica aequalitate fidelium* (1450–66); Archbishop Silíceo’s *Estatutos de limpieza* (1547); and Bishop Diego de Simancas’s *Defensio Toletani Statuti* (1573). An analysis of these primary sources and their interpretation by contemporary scholars serves as a necessary framework to contextualize the discussion about the adoption and implementation of the same concept of purity-of-blood in the legislation of the Society of Jesus, which was founded by the Spanish nobleman Ignatius of Loyola and a group of his followers, many of whom were born and studied in Spain before meeting at the University of Paris and then moving to Italy to become an officially recognized new religious order. The following chapter traces Jesuit approaches to the Spanish policy of *pureza de sangre* and the role conversos played in the early Society of Jesus from the foundation of the Order in 1540 until the death of the third superior general, Francisco de Borja, in 1572, which marked a shift in the Jesuit policy towards conversos.

---

nisi quia novi christiani erant, ut bis in illa papyro relatum est, his verbis: propter novam assumptionem fidei. Iterum propter novam fidei receptionem. Igitur [...] videri non debet, si dicantur illic eam opinionem erroneam esse, nec illos recta sensisse. In statuto autem nostro omnia prius diversa sunt, nec effici ullo pacto potest, ut id hae-resis sit [...]. Postremo, illa bulla nominatim in hac parte revocata est a Paulo quarto in confirmatione statuti, his ipsis verbis: Non obstante recolendae memoriae Nicolai Papae quinti, similiter praedecessoris nostri, et aliis constitutionibus apostolicis, etc.” (Simancas, Defensio, ff. 13*–14*).

CHAPTER TWO

EARLY JESUIT PRO-CONVERSO POLICY (1540–72)

We [Jesuits] take a pleasure in admitting those of Jewish ancestry.
Jerónimo Nadal, S.J., 1554

The history of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry in the sixteenth century mirrors the earlier converso history in fifteenth-century Spain that we have traced in Chapter One: from the initial acceptance of “New Christians” and the rise of their influence and power to the consequent deep resentment of “Old Christians,” who had made increasing efforts to curb and possibly eliminate the converso presence first in the civil and then ecclesiastical institutions. Escaping from the persecuting civil society, a significant number of conversos had filled ecclesiastical ranks in Spain during the fifteenth century.¹ By the mid-sixteenth century, however, a number of Iberian church communities had closed their doors to them, especially the Order of the Jeronymites, which was characterized by its converso pro-Erasmist and alumbrado openness. Consequently, many conversos, who were rejected or feared that they would be discriminated against, found at least a temporary haven in the Society of Jesus, a new appealing religious order² that initially objected to lineage discrimination and whose spirituality in some aspects seemed akin to the Iberian movements of Erasmists and alumbrados, which had attracted many conversos.³ Additionally, the Jesuits opened many new remote frontiers for missionary activities that often became to conversos and/or their superiors a veiled opportunity to avoid intolerance at home.

² For an analysis of different motives by which the conversos may have been driven to enter the Jesuits, see Rastoin, “Les chrétiens d’origine juive,” pp. 357–63.
³ See DHCJ 1:86. Kevin Ingram characterized the alumbrados as those who “rejected Catholic dogma for mystical and quietist religious practice” (see Ingram, ed., Conversos and Moriscos, p. 5), but their spirituality and doctrine was much more complex. See, for example, Pastore, Un’eresia spagnola: spiritualità conversa, alumbradismo e inquisizione.
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This chapter shows why and how conversos played a key role in the Society of Jesus from its inception in 1540 through the generalates of Ignatius of Loyola, Diego Laínez, and Francisco de Borja. Historians have been aware of the presence of conversos in the Jesuit ranks (in the converso historiography fewer than five names of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry are usually quoted), but it has been insufficiently shown to what extent the early Jesuits richly, knowingly, and strategically benefited from their converso confreres. The presence of a prominent minority of Jewish ancestry in the Order was not always a peaceful convivencia, and its influence was periodically resented; furthermore, scholarship on early Jesuit history has minimized the importance of the internal struggle between “new” and “old” Christians in the development of the Society that reached its peak after the death of Borja in 1572. A key to comprehending the “Jewish question” in the Jesuit Order is first to be found in the approach to Jews and conversos of its founder, Ignatius of Loyola.

*Ignatius of Loyola as a “deep spiritual Semite”*

It is now a cliché to begin an account of Loyola’s Judeo-philia by quoting the testimonies of Pedro de Ribadeneyra about Ignatius’s desire to be an ethnic Jew. These testimonies come from a closet-converso Jesuit—a revealing detail that other scholars have often failed to point out—who may have been interested in spreading this information and concealing other information (as he not infrequently did on other occasions). It will be helpful, therefore, to briefly introduce to the reader the author of these accounts.

Pedro Ribadeneyra, whose name derives from the Galician town of Riva de Neira in the province of Lugo, was born on 1 November 1527 to the converso Álvaro Husillo Ortiz de Cisneros (grandson of Queen Isabella’s page and later governor of Toledo, Hernando Ortiz de Cisneros), a legal of the city council in Toledo, and Catalina de Villalobos y Ribadeneyra. As in the case of other converso Jesuit

---

4 See below our discussion on the censorship of Ribadeneyra’s biography of Laínez. See also Bataillon (*Erasmo y España*, p. 217), who argues that Ribadeneyra falsified the account of Loyola’s judgment on Erasmus’s *Enchiridion*.


Figure 1. Pedro de Ribadeneyra as the biographer of Ignatius of Loyola

Pedro de Ribadeneyra (1526–1611) from Toledo was the author of the first official biography of the Jesuit founder, Ignatius of Loyola, which has had numerous editions in various languages. The caption reads that Ribadeneyra was Ignatius’s accurate biographer. However, the French contemporary historian Marcel Bataillon charged Ribadeneyra with “the crime of the hagiographic deformation.” Indeed, Ribadeneyra, who was a closet-converso, concealed the fact that the Inquisition in Alcalá had accused Loyola of being a crypto-Jew. Modern scholarship has established Ribadeneyra’s Jewish genealogy.
families, some of his siblings became men and women religious: his brother Alfonso de Villalobos, for instance, entered the Benedictines in Valladolid. After his studies of grammar under the masters Cedillo and Venegas at Toledo, in May 1539 Pedro de Ribadeneyra followed the opulent court of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520–89), Pope Paul III’s nephew, the future intermediary between the papacy and the Society, and its major benefactor. Pedro’s widowed mother hosted him at the occasion of the funeral of Charles V’s wife, Isabella of Portugal (1503–39). Watched by his converso uncle, Pedro de Ortiz, the emperor’s ambassador in Rome, Pedro stayed at Farnese’s Roman palace for fourteen months. Fearing punishment for an unrevealed transgression, he secretly escaped from there and found a refuge in Loyola’s loving paternal arms, despite his young age of thirteen. After having raised this charming yet restless lad in Jesuit spirituality for two years, Ignatius planned that Pedro should study in Paris (1542), but he ended up in Spanish Flanders (Leuven) due to the Franco-Imperial War. After having founded a college there, he returned to Rome with the Valencian Juan Jerónimo Doménech in 1543. Subsequently, Ribadeneyra studied for four years in Padua (1545–9), where he became a friend of Juan Alfonso de Polanco, whom Loyola later recommended supervise Pedro. As Ignatius informed Ortiz about his protégé’s progress, Pedro at Padua gained a solid foundation in the humanities. Thereafter, he was ready to be sent to the newly opened college in Palermo, where he taught rhetoric (1549–52). He also preached in Sicily, even though

---

6 Polanco testified to Loyola’s special feelings towards Ribadeneyra: “El Padre Maestro Ignacio, por quererle tanto, no quiso determinar por sí acerca de sus cosas, y así las cometió al Padre Lainez y a mí” (Mon Rib. 2:264). See also John W. O’Malley and James P.M. Walsh, Constructing a Saint Through Images: The 1609 Illustrated Biography of Ignatius of Loyola (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph’s University Press, 2008), pp. 12–3.

7 Juan Jerónimo Doménech: *1516 Valencia; SJ 1539; †1592 Valencia; priest in 1538; professed in 1555. His father, who was an affluent pharmacist, helped found the Jesuit College in his native city. He was active mostly in Sicily as its threefold provincial, where he also became the confessor of Viceroy Juan de Vega. In the meantime he was rector of the Roman College after the removal of Vázquez. Mercurian sent him back to Spain in 1576. His role in the vocations of Nadal and Miró was also pivotal. He was one of the major promoters of the Morisco apostolate and Arabic studies in the Society (see DHCJ 2:1135–6).

8 Juan Alfonso de Polanco: *1517 Burgos (Spain); SJ 1541; †1576 Rome; priest in 1546; professed in 1549. Palmio considered him the leader of the converso inner circle, and much space, thus, will be dedicated to him below.


10 See Mon Ign. 1:359.
he was still a student. Upon his return to Rome, where he was called
to teach rhetoric at the newly opened Roman College and complete
his studies there, he was ordained priest in 1553 and sent again to
Flanders, with the mission to deepen the roots of the Society there
by seeking the royal support of the Jesuit-averse Prince Philip, who
remained impressed by Ribadeneyra’s oratory. There, he received the
sad news about his spiritual father’s death. In his Confessions, Pedro
described the feelings that arose in him that day: “Oh, my beloved
Father Ignatius. Yes, I call you my, for—even though you have been
the father of the entire Society—you’ve been especially of mine, because
you generated me in Jesus Christ.”

Among many episodes of his spiritual father’s life he collected for
Ignatius’s hagiography, Ribadeneyra recounted that

One day when many of us were dining together, [Ignatius] speaking of
himself about a certain topic, said that he would take it as a special grace
from our Lord to come from Jewish lineage; and adding a reason, he
said: “Why? Imagine that a man could be a kinsman by blood [secundum
carnem] of Christ our Lord and of our Lady the glorious Virgin Mary!”
He spoke those words with so much emotion that tears welled into his
eyes. This is something that deeply impressed everyone.

On another occasion, Loyola’s hagiographer observed that

On hearing our Father make the same statement, which I recounted
above, he crossed himself and exclaimed: “A Jew?” And he spitted on
the ground at this name. Our father said to him: “Now, Señor Pedro de
Zárate, let us be reasonable. Listen to what I have to say.” And then he
gave him so many reasons for this that he really persuaded him to wish
to be of Jewish lineage.
A much less-known confirmation of Ignatius’s desire to be of Jewish stock comes from the testimony of Diego de Guzmán (about whom much will be told below), which was included in his letter to Claudio Acquaviva.\textsuperscript{15} He refers there to a Jew who served Pope Paul III and later entered Loyola’s community of catechumens, where he established a friendship with Ignatius:

Chatting with him one day, he told him: “I, my father Ignatius, would prefer, if God were served, not to be born of this lineage, for these people persecuted and crucified Jesus Christ our Lord.” And our father answered him, “Do you want me to say what I feel about this? To tell you the truth, if our Lord would like me to choose this lineage to be born of, I would not choose other than yours. And the reason for this is that the Lord himself wanted to choose this lineage for him and to be son of Abraham and David and other patriarchs and kings; and of them was his most holy Mother, Virgin Mary, with her husband Saint Joseph, whom he used to call ‘My Father.’ And also the glorious Virgin, his mother, told him when they found him in the temple, ‘Your father and I were looking for you with pain.’” And hearing this response from our blessed father Ignatius, the New Christian remained very surprised and greatly consoled.\textsuperscript{16}

These expressions of Loyola’s Judeophilia are usually juxtaposed with an account of an interrogation by the vicar general of the diocese of Alcalá, who suspected Íñigo of crypto-Judaism, most likely because

\textsuperscript{15} Claudio Acquaviva: *1543 Atri (Italia); SJ 1567; †1615 Rome; priest in 1574; professed in 1576. Pius IV appointed him cameriere segreto partecipante at the papal curia. Mercurian made him rector of the Roman College and of the college in Naples. In 1576 he was appointed provincial of Naples and in 1579 of Rome. General Congregation 4 (1580) elected him superior general at the age of thirty-seven. Under his generalate, anti-converso measures were adopted; we shall analyze them in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{16} “Habiéndose catequizado en nuestra casa profesa (según entiendo), donde estaba nuestro padre, quedó con grande amistad y agradecimiento con nuestro padre y, hablando un día con el le dijo, ‘Yo, padre mío Ignacio, no quisiera, si Dios fuera servido, haber nacido de este linaje por haber esta gente perseguido y crucificado a Jesús Cristo nuestro Señor.’ Y le respondió nuestro padre, ‘¿Queréis que os diga [...] lo que yo siento en esto? Yo os digo [...] y de verdad que, si nuestro Señor quisiera darme a escoger este linaje yo quisiera nacer, no escogería otro sino este vuestro; y la razón es por haber querido el mismo Señor escogerlo para si y ser Hijo de Abraham y de David y de los otros patriarcas y reyes; y de ellos nació su santísima Madre la Virgen María con su esposo el Santo José al cual llamaba ‘el Padre mío’: y también la gloriosa Virgen, su madre, le dijo cuando lo halló en el templo, ‘Tu padre y yo os buscábamos con dolor.’ Y oyendo esta respuesta de nuestro bendito padre Ignacio, el nuevo cristiano quedó muy maravillado y con gran consolación” (ARSI, Instit. 186e, f. 355\textsuperscript{r}).
Figure 2. Ignatius of Loyola incarcerated by the Inquisition in Alcalá
The caption reads: *Compluti primum, postea Salamanticae, calumnias pro Christo et carcerem passus, ex ipso etiam carcerem animas lucratur magnoque spiritus fervor seccensus. Non tot inquit in hac urbe sunt compedes quin plures ego Christi causa percupiam* (“First in Alcalá, and then in Salamanca, having suffered calumnies and prison for Christ, from the same prison [Ignatius] gains souls and is inflamed with great fervor of spirit. He said that there were not enough shackles in that city that he would not desire still more for the sake of Christ”). Loyola was incarcerated because the vicar general of Alcalá suspected him of crypto-Judaism, most likely due to his numerous contacts with *alumbrados*/Erasmists who often were of converso background.
of his numerous contacts with *alumbrados*/*Erasmists* there. Loyola’s converso secretary, Polanco, retrospectively narrated that

When, after the time described, the Vicar Figueroa came to question him, and among other things asked him if he recommended observance of the Sabbath, he replied, “For Saturdays I recommend special devotion to our Lady, and I know of no other observances for Saturday. Moreover, in my country there are no Jews.”

This text often has been interpreted as a testament to Íñigo’s Basque pride in his blood purity (*vizcaíno* unfairly became a synonym of the Old Christian) and an expression of his “sixteenth-century Guipuzcoan soul,” which later would be spiritually transformed into Ignatius’s desire to be a Jew by blood. That conversion would occur as a result of the close friendship Loyola established with the converso Diego Laínez (and Nicolas Bobadilla) during their encounter at the University of Paris, where all moved after their studies at the Renaissance-influenced University of Alcalá de Henares that was founded in 1499 by Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, the Inquisitor General.

Some authors also have suggested that Íñigo’s *methanoia* was due to his lack of contact with Jews. This might be true, if one does not take into consideration crypto-Jews and conversos (who were commonly still considered Jews)—Loyola was born just before 1492, the *terminus

---

17 See Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, pp. 203–44; John E. Longhurst, “Saint Ignatius at Alcalá. 1526–1527,” *AHSI* 26 (1957): 252–6; idem, *Luther’s Ghost in Spain (1517–1546)* (Lawrence, Kans.: Coronado Press, 1964), pp. 103–16; and *DHJC* 1:86. Interestingly enough, some historians omitted the question posed by the vicar general in their detailed accounts of Loyola’s trials in Alcalá. See, for example, Paul Dudon, *St. Ignatius of Loyola* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1949), pp. 139–60; and Astrain, *Historia*, 1:49–55. The suspicion of Íñigo’s converso background was raised not only by Vicar General Juan Rodríguez Figueroa but also by the inquisitors during Loyola’s first trial on 19 November 1525. For the minutes of the interrogation by the Franciscan Francisco Ximénes, who testified in the process, see *Mon Ign. (Scripta)*, 1:600.

18 See *Fontes Narr.* 2:548; *Chron.* 1:37.

19 See Rey, “San Ignacio,” p. 177; Reites, “St. Ignatius and the Jews,” p. 2; and idem, *St. Ignatius and the Peoples of the Book*, pp. 122–3. To Rey’s list of anti-Jewish legislation in the Basque country, Medina adds another document, but he doubts whether Loyola was representing the same mentality ("Ignacio de Loyola," p. 3). For an interpretation of the statutes of Guipúzcoa by Américo Castro, see Netanyahu, *Toward the Inquisition*, p. 4.


22 See Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” p. 3.

post quem no Jews were allowed in Spain. However, in his story of Loyola’s interrogation in Alcalá, Polanco may have employed a rhetorical device aimed to suggest such a development to his fellow Jesuits, from whom he suffered discrimination because of his own converso background, as we shall see below. Indeed, Polanco wrote this text during the last two years of his life, after he was removed from his office in 1573 as part of Mercurian’s anti-converso “house cleansing.” It contains Loyola’s purity-of-blood-pride answer that is missing from both the paragraph describing the same episode in Polanco’s much earlier Summarium Hispanicum (c. 1548) and in what Loyola would narrate shortly before his death in 1556 to his note-taker, the converso-phobic Gonçalves da Câmara. A similar rhetorical rather than fact-based defense of Ignatius’s purity of blood was made by Jerónimo Nadal in his Apologia pro Exercitii S. P. Ignatii (1554):

Ignatius is a Spaniard from the foremost nobility in the province of Guipúzcoa in Cantabria. In this province the Catholic faith has been preserved so uncontaminated and its peoples’ zeal and constancy in faith have been so great from time immemorial that they do not allow any neophyte to live there. There is no record from the very beginnings of Christianity of anyone who was minimally suspected of heresy. This should have been enough to ward off any suspicion from Ignatius.

---

24 Everard Mercurian: *c. 1515 Marcourt; SJ 1548; †1580 Rome. 1552–7: rector of Perugia; 1558–65: provincial of Flanders; 1565–72: assistant general for Germany; 1573–80: superior general. For his most recent biographical sketch, see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” pp. 1–33. One of the early Mercurian’s biographers was Antonio Possevino, who most likely was of Jewish origin (see below). The text has remained unpublished (ARSI, *Vita 142*, ff. 1–15). Mercurian’s election and anti-converso policy will be subject of the next chapter.

25 The main source of the Summarium (see *Fontes Narr.* 1:146–256) is Lainéz’s letter-biography requested by Polanco, which does not mention, however, the question about the observance of the Sabbath (see Robert Maryks, ed., *Giacomo Laínez. Prima biografia ignaziana* [Naples: Centrum Ignatianum Spiritualitatis, 1996], pp. 33–4). Loyola’s so-called Autobiography dictated to Câmara mentioned briefly that the vicar interrogated him about many things, even whether he “had observed Saturday” (see *Acta* [61], in *Fontes Narr.* 1:448). While writing the Summarium, Polanco was Loyola’s secretary and likely gathered this information from Ignatius himself. Ribadeneyra, who was accused by Bataillon of “the crime of the hagiographic deformation” (*Erasmo*, pp. 207–8), concealed in his official biography of Ignatius this episode by reporting that nothing heretical was found during the process. Additionally, in 1585 Ribadeneyra censored this part in Maffei’s *Vita S. Ignatii*, which made Acquaviva happy (see *Fontes Narr.* 3:220). For the immense printing success of Ribadeneyra’s *Vita* and its numerous translations, including the Spanish one by Ribadeneyra himself, see O’Malley and Walsh, *Constructing a Saint Through Images*, pp. 14–5.

Whatever the motive was for defending Loyola’s purity of blood by his two closest converso associates, Ignatius’s positive attitude towards judeo-conversos—developed by numerous contacts with them before being processed at Alcalá—seems to be irreconcilable with the image of Íñigo being proud of his pure-blood lineage. Struck by the supposedly unusual benevolence of a Basque towards Jews and conversos, some scholars even speculated about the potential converso background of Loyola himself. Kevin Ingram has hypothesized in his recent Ph.D. dissertation the converso origins of Íñigo’s maternal grandfather, Dr. Martín García de Licona, who “was not just a merchant, [but] a man of letters and a financial advisor at court—that is to say his profile is very much that of a converso merchant professional.” Consequently, Íñigo too would be considered a converso. More well documented is Ingram’s claim about the converso stock of many individuals who surrounded Loyola in his “pilgrim years”: the alumbrado sympathizer of possible converso background, Juan Velázquez de Cuéllar (d. 1517)—chief treasurer (contador mayor) of King Ferdinand of Aragon (1479–1516), at whose court in Árévalo Loyola served as page for twelve years (1505–17); [g]nés Pascual from the Barcelonese merchant family and her pious circle that supported Íñigo’s stay in Manresa, Barcelona, and Paris; his two roommates at Alcalá, Lope de Cáceres and Calixto de Sá [Sáa], the alumbrado-Erasmist friends there, his confessor Manuel Miona and the pub-

---

29 Along with Ínés Pascual, it was Isabel [Ferrer] Roser (future first female Jesuit) and her husband Pere Joan Roser, a merchant from Barcelona, who took care of Íñigo’s financial needs. See ACA, DIVERSOS, Monistrol, Pergaminos, núm. 1043; and Polanco, Summarium Hispanum, 2:45.
30 One wonders whether he was related to the converso brothers whom Loyola would later admit to the Society, Manuel and Gaspar de Sá (Sáa).
lisher of Erasmus, Miguel Eguía,31 and his financial patrons during the Parisian period, Juan de Cuéllar in Antwerp and Gonzalo de Aguilera in Bruges.32 Apparently, the court of the Duke of Nájera and Viceroy of Navarre, Antonio Manrique de Lara (r. 1516–21), whom Íñigo served until his accident-turned-conversion at Pamplona in 1521, also had converso ties.33

The alumbrado environment of Loyola’s sojourn at the Complutensian University (which he later denied)34 was more extensively studied by Ignacio Cacho Nazábal in his Iñigo de Loyola el heterodoxo—without assigning it a specifically converso character, however.35 Besides pointing out the alumbrado sympathies of the Duke of Nájera and analyzing the close relationship that Loyola established with the Erasmists, Miona and Eguía, Cacho has noticed the ramifications of the connections that the converso brothers Ortiz (who were related to Ribadeneyra) had with the alumbrado circle at Alcalá. The accomplished Parisian and Salmantican biblicist, Pedro Ortiz (d. 1548), had defended his Franciscan brother, Francisco,36 from the Inquisition’s accusations in Alcalá that stemmed from the latter’s intimate spiritual relationship with the beata Francisca Hernández.37 She had found protection at the court of Velázquez de Cuéllar, where Íñigo had served as page a few years earlier, before his arrival in Alcalá. In this town, Francisca Hernández had numerous followers, whom Loyola met. It

31 See also Loyola, Autobiography [57]; Ignacio Cacho Nazábal, Iñigo de Loyola el heterodoxo (San Sebastián: Universidad de Deusto, 2006), pp. 155–6; Longhurst, “Saint Ignatius at Alcalá,” pp. 254–5; and Bataillon, Erasmo, pp. 215–7. Manuel de Miona (c. 1477–1567) from Algarve (Portugal) followed Loyola to Paris and became his confessor there. He eventually entered the Society in Rome in 1544 and worked later with Juan Jerónimo Doménech in Sicily (see DHCJ 3:2683). Miguel de Eguía y Jassu’s brothers, Diego and Esteban, befriended Loyola in Alcalá and joined the iñi- gistas group in Venice in 1537. They were from Estella (Navarra) and related by blood to the Jesuit Francis Xavier. Diego (c. 1488–1556) later became Ignatius’s confessor (see DHCJ 2:1220–1).

32 See Ingram, Secret lives, public lies, pp. 98–9.

33 See Ingram, Secret lives, public lies, pp. 88–9.

34 See his letter to King John III of Portugal from 1545 in Mon I gn. 1:296–7.

35 See especially pp. 149–91.

36 Francisco, Pedro, and Juan (the secretary of Admiral of Castile, Farique Enriquez) were born to Sancho Ortiz e Ysabel Yáñez of Toledo. Francisco entered the Franciscans in 1521, where he achieved notoriety, but as a result of the endorsement of the purity-of-blood legislation by his Order in 1525, he suffered discrimination.

was Pedro who accused Íñigo before the Inquisition in Alcalá and who would accuse him again of seducing students (his relative, Pedro de Peralta, among them)\textsuperscript{38} at the University of Paris, but he later would become Loyola’s defender and the Society’s benefactor in Rome, where he functioned as the ambassador of the Holy Roman Emperor to the pope. Indeed, in 1537 he introduced Ignatius’s companions to Pope Farnese (Paul III), who gave his blessing for their never-to-be-accomplished proselytizing mission in Jerusalem. In 1538, Ortiz secluded himself with Loyola for forty days in the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino to make the Spiritual Exercises, but he eventually discerned not to enter the Society.\textsuperscript{39} Nevertheless, he advised his younger relative, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, to do so. Years later, Pedro Ortiz’s homonymous nephew also entered the Society.\textsuperscript{40}

If we combine the results of the aforementioned studies with those of Francisco de Borja Medina—virtually the only Jesuit historian who has explored the socio-ethnic background of the early Jesuits—we can tentatively reconstruct a large web of Loyola’s converso connections. Medina, for instance, pointed out the interdependence among the cities of Burgos, Segovia, and Medina del Campo that Ignatius visited while serving at the peripatetic court of King Ferdinand (and, thus, his treasurer Velázquez) and his financial supporters during the Parisian studies: Aguilera, Cuéllar, and Cuadrado.

Gonzalo de Aguilera from Burgos was one of the major merchants and ship-owners in Bruges (the Spanish Netherlands). During his business trips to Paris, Loyola hosted him in his own room. A few decades later Aguilera would financially support the foundation of the Jesuit College in Bruges. When Loyola, in turn, went to Bruges in 1529 to seek money for his bed-and-board expenses in Paris, he dined with the renowned converso humanist from Valencia, Joan Lluís Vives, who was living next to Aguilera’s home (Hôtel den Pynappel on Langhe Winkle Street). It is interesting to note that the account of this meeting comes from the Jesuit Juan Alfonso de Polanco via his friend and Vives’s disciple, Álvaro de Maluenda (from the converso clan in Burgos, to which Polanco’s grandmother and her ancestors belonged), who

\textsuperscript{38} One wonders whether this Peralta is the later converso master of the cathedral school in Toledo, one of the principal opponents of the Silíceo statues, decribed by Samson in his “The adelantamiento of Cazorla,” pp. 823 and 832–3.

\textsuperscript{39} See Loyola, \textit{Autobiography} [96].

\textsuperscript{40} See ARSI, \textit{Hisp. 116}, ff. 129–30.
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Figure 3. Íñigo accused of seducing students at the University of Paris

Source: Vita Beati P. Ignatii Loiolae Societatis Jesu Fundatoris (Rome, 1609), plate 38 (the engraving is most likely by Peter Paul Rubens). Courtesy of John J. Burns Library at Boston College.
happened to be also Loyola’s acquaintance in Paris. Aguilera’s wife, Ana, was closely related to Juan de Castro, one of the first roommates and disciples of Íñigo in Paris (before forming the future nucleus of the Society). After earning his doctorate, Castro moved back to Burgos and entered the Vall de Cristo Cartuja near Segorbe, where Loyola visited him during his last trip to Spain in 1535.41

During another fund-raising trip to Flanders, this time to Antwerp, Ignatius was hosted in the house Den Roozenkrans of Juan de Cuéllar from Segovia, who had moved to Antwerp and had become one of the most affluent merchants in town. He was likely related to Juan Velázquez de Cuéllar, chief treasurer of King Ferdinand of Aragon, to whom Íñigo had lent his services.42 The contador’s family was known for his almbrado/converso ties, as we have seen above. In the house of Juan de Cuéllar, Loyola was introduced to another merchant, Pedro Cuadrado from Medina del Campo, who years later would provide for the foundation of the Jesuit College in his native town, where the verso Jesuits, the brothers Loarte,43 the brothers Acosta,44 Baltasar de Torres,45 Gregorio de Valencia, and José de San Julián46 also were born.47

---

41 See Francisco de Borja Medina, “Íñigo de Loyola y los mercaderes castellanos del Norte de Europa. La financiación de sus estudios en la Universidad de París,” AHSI 51 (1999): 177 and 189.
42 See Medina, “Íñigo de Loyola y los mercaderes,” p. 186.
43 For more on him, see below.
44 José de Acosta: *1540 Medina del Campo (Valladolid); SJ 1552; †1600 Salamanca; priest in 1566; professed in 1570. He was one of five sons of a converso merchant from Medina del Campo who entered the Society. In 1572 he reached Lima, where he became superior provincial (1576–82) and wrote important works on Amerindians. Acosta died in Salamanca in 1600. See DHCJ 1:10; Enciclopedia Cattolica 1:228–30. For the discussion of Acosta’s Jewish ancestry, see Claudio M. Burgaleta, José Acosta, S.J. (1540–1600). His Life and Thought (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1999), pp. 126–7. He played an important role in the convocation of General Congregation 5 (1593), as we shall see below.
45 Baltasar de Torres: *1518 Medina del Campo (Valladolid, Spain); SJ 1553; †1561 Naples; priest in 1553 (see DHCJ 4:3818).
46 José de San Julián: *c. 1544; SJ 1561 Salamanca; priest 1569 Loreto; professed 1570 Messina. He was dismissed by Acquaviva in 1589 (he belonged to the memorialistas movement), but later readmitted. He died in Naples on 29 April 1605 (see DHCJ 2:2616).
47 On other conversos who received training from the Jesuits of the town but returned to Judaism, see Miriam Bodian, Dying in the Law of Moses: Crypto-Jewish Martyrdom in the Iberian World (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), p. 58.
In the context of the converso background of so many individuals by whom Ignatius was surrounded until his sojourn in Paris, Loyola’s acceptance of Bobadilla, Rodrigues, and especially of Laínez into the group of disciples whom he attracted at the University of Paris seems to be quite logical, unless his disciples’ converso ancestry was absolutely unknown to him. That may have been true with respect to Simão Rodrigues [de Acevedo], whose possible Jewish ancestry still needs to be explored, but Bobadilla’s and especially Laínez’s converso origins were fairly known.

Had Loyola’s mythic anti-Jewish Basque pride been real, it is unlikely that the twenty-one-year-old Laínez would have followed Loyola up to Paris by way of Almazán and thoroughly submitted to his spiritual guidance and apostolic plans of proselytizing among Muslims in the Holy Land. To the contrary, even though Íñigo had already left Alcalá by the time Laínez arrived there, Lainéz must have heard about Loyola’s troubles with the Inquisition, his forty-two-day imprisonment, his interrogation by the diocese’s vicar general who suspected Loyola of marranism, and the contacts he had established at the university with so many alumbrados and/or Erasmists. Laínez chose to study theology not in Alcalá but in Paris, for he was driven by Loyola’s “mysterious fluid”—his name only sounded like a challenge. With his best friend, Alfonso Salmerón, he joined Loyola’s group (composed
Figure 4. Íñigistas in Paris: the nucleus of the future Society of Jesus

The caption reads: *Iuvenes ex Academia Parisiensi novem eligit ac socios consili sui destinat* (“[Ignatius] chooses nine young men from the University of Paris and makes them companions of his project”). Loyola’s first nine companions in Paris became the nucleus of the future Society of Jesus (among them Favre, Xavier, Lainez, Bobadilla, and Rodrigues). Nadal and Polanco, Ignatius’s future closest collaborators, did not join the group at that time, despite being in contact with the Íñigistas during their studies in Paris.
until then of Pierre Favre\textsuperscript{51} and Francis Xavier\textsuperscript{52} in 1533, after having made the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises under Loyola’s direction.

Although we can only speculate about it, it is quite unlikely that Lainez would have not revealed his Jewish ancestry to Loyola, with whom he established such an intimate relationship.\textsuperscript{53} Lainez’s family from Castilian Almazán (Soria) had been Christian already for four generations, but the awareness of its crypto-Judaic elements must have been vivid in Diego’s mind, for his father’s sister, Luisa Lainez, was tried by the Inquisition of Cuenca still in 1537,\textsuperscript{54} and quite a number of his other relatives were actually sentenced for judaizing,\textsuperscript{55} a fact that Jerónimo Nadal may have not known (or concealed) when he defended Lainez’s family as exemplary Christian:

Our Father [Lainez], even though he comes from that lineage, he knew his parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents as good Christians and noble in the world; their customs, life, and privileges were such that his family was never known for the mark of its lineage or for the danger of inconsistency in the faith.\textsuperscript{56}

Certainly, the Parisian companions must have had a better knowledge of Lainez’s family: Loyola paid a visit to Diego’s father, Juan, in Almazán, and his schoolmaster in Sigüenza, Dr. Gasca, where he traveled from his native Guipúzcoa at the end of 1535;\textsuperscript{57} and Favre

\textsuperscript{51} Pierre Favre: *1506 Villaret (Savoie); †1546 Rome; priest 1534 Paris; professed 1541. After a short period of ministries in Italy, he accompanied Pedro de Ortiz (see below) to Worms and Ratisbone, and then to Spain, where they laid foundations for a number of Jesuit colleges. Subsequently he worked in German lands, Portugal, and Flanders. Destined to participate in the Council of Trent, he died prematurely in Rome at the age of forty (see DHCJ 2:1369–70).

\textsuperscript{52} Francis Xavier: *1506 Javier (Spain); †1552 Shangchuan Island (South China Sea); priest in 1537; professed in 1541. Sent by Loyola to India in 1541, he operated also in Indonesia (1542–9) and Japan (1549–51). On his policy towards conversos, see below.

\textsuperscript{53} Possevino makes this argument in his Bibliotheca selecta (Cologne: apud Joannem Gymnicum sub Monocerote, 1607), Liber IX: “De Iudaeis, et Mahometanis, ac ceteris gentibus iuvandis,” pp. 436–41.

\textsuperscript{54} See Carrete, Judeoconversos de Almazán, p. 136.


\textsuperscript{56} “Nuestro Padre [Lainez], aunque venga de dicho linaje, conoció sin embargo a sus padres, abuelos y bisabuelos buenos cristianos y nobles según el siglo, y en sus costumbres, vida y privilegios, tales, que nunca su casa tuvo nota alguna por parte de su linaje por el peligro de inconstancia en la fe” (Mon Lainez 8:831). See Rey, “San Ignacio, “pp. 187–8, where he insists very much on the “cristanía” of Lainez by quoting the above text of Nadal.

\textsuperscript{57} See Loyola, Autobiography [90].
visited Laínez’s family in Almazán in 1542.⁵⁸ There, Loyola and Favre encountered, among others, Diego’s two younger brothers, Marcos and Cristóbal, who would later enter the Society. Perhaps at those occasions they also met Diego’s sister, María Coronel, who later married Juan Hurtado de Mendoza—a member of one of the most prominent family in Seville—and bore him two sons who would follow their uncle Diego’s vocation in the Society.

We possess very little information about these Jesuit relatives of Diego, except for Cristóbal (born in 1528), who entered the Jesuit Order no fewer than three times and often was of embarrassment to his distinguished older brother. Loyola admitted him to the Order in Rome on 27 December 1547. Restless and inconstant, Cristóbal moved from one Jesuit house to another: from Rome to Venice, to Padua, to Bologna, to Loreto, to Florence, and back to Rome. In spite of Diego’s negative judgment about his poor scholastic and spiritual proficiency, Cristóbal was ordained priest in Palermo in April 1556, but his own brother, now in the role of superior general, dismissed him three years later.⁵⁹ Even though to Nadal he was a buffoon and to Salmerón he was staining the good memory of his older brother, Borja readmitted him in 1567, only to dismiss him four years later. Finally, Claudio Acquaviva—despite his anti-converso policy—let Cristóbal reenter for the third and last time in 1582. He eventually died as a Jesuit in 1592, just a year before Acquaviva’s anti-converso decree was promulgated.

Cristóbal Laínez’s case shows that to the early Jesuit leadership the most important criterion for admitting a candidate was his spiritual and educational suitability, regardless of his lineage, even though the question of the converso background of Jesuit candidates was, of course, relevant to Loyola (and any Iberian of the time)—he would later insert it in the General Exam, which describes the admission of Jesuit candidates, as we shall see below. In this perspective, Loyola’s request that Diego Laínez preach at the baptism of the first converted Jew from the catechumen house (Casa dei Catecumeni) he had founded can be seen as a public confirmation of his incontrovertible sympathy for the converso background of Laínez, or any other New Christian, Jesuit or non.

⁵⁸ See Mon Fabri, pp. 152 and 435; and Cereceda, Laínez, p. 87.
Figure 5. Diego Laínez (1512–65), the most prominent converso Jesuit. The converso-phobic Italian Jesuit Benedetto Palmio portrayed Laínez as “an Israelite indeed—as he admitted publicly—but in whom there was no deceit” (see Appendix I, Memorial [6]). Unlike Sacchini’s, Ribadeneyra’s biography of Laínez, from which this portrait comes, silenced his Jewish ancestry. Modern scholarship has established Laínez’s Jewish genealogy, which had been already known to his contemporaries.
Figure 6. Ignatius of Loyola converting a Jew

The caption reads: *Obstinatum Iudaeum tribus hisce verbis convertit: Mane nobiscum Isaac* ("With these three words [Ignatius] converts an obstinate Jew: ‘Stay with us, Isaac’"). One of the first foundations of Loyola in Rome was the House of Catechumens (Casa dei Catecumeni), which hosted Jews willing to convert. The first Jew of that community who was baptized on Sunday, 18 September 1541, was a wealthy thirty-two-year-old man of “nice appearance and good habits,” just as the Jew represented in the center of this engraving. The two Jesuits in the rear might be Diego Laínez, who preached at the baptism, and Alfonso Salmerón, who administered the sacrament.
The Jew who was baptized by Laínez’s teen-friend, Salmerón, was a wealthy thirty-two-year-old man of “nice appearance and good habits.” The circumstances that led to his conversion were quite intriguing. He was dating for several weeks a Christian prostitute, who—charged with mingling with a Jew—was put into jail. The man himself avoided arrest by hiding in the Jesuit house for catechumens. When the Jesuits learned about his misfortune, they were able, with a support of influential people, to get the poor woman out of jail within five hours and put her into the community that Loyola ran for Roman prostitutes—St. Martha House. Soon the couple expressed their desire to marry, and the Jesuits set up a wedding that would immediately follow the baptism of the Jew. The ceremony that was held on Sunday, 18 September 1541 (not even one year after the official approval of the Society), was the kick-off event for Loyola’s earliest project of proselytizing among Roman Jews. It was celebrated with fanfare—among the guests who attended the ceremony were not only their Madama, Margaret of Austria (the wife of the pope’s grandson Ottavio Farnese), who gave her soul to the project, but also the cardinals of Santiago and Burgos, the ambassadors of the emperor [Charles V] and of Portugal, and many bishops and nobles. Loyola reported these facts two days after the event in a letter to Favre, who was accompanying the converso Imperial Ambassador Pedro Ortiz on his mission to Worms and Ratisbone. The latter’s nephew, Ribadeneyra, who was present in Rome in those years and likely at the baptism-matrimony ceremony itself, was happy to narrate in his later biography of Loyola the development of the project that regarded the coreligionists of his ancestors:

Many Jews, moved by the love of our fellow Jesuits or the good example of some of their own who were already baptized, were converted to our faith. Among them were some of the most respected Jews who were highly important for converting others because they could clearly and forcefully persuade the other Jews, showing them from Scripture that Jesus Christ our Lord is the real promised Messiah.

---

60 For her portrayal and correspondence with Loyola, see Hugo Rahner, *Saint Ignatius Loyola. Letters to Women* (Freiburg: Herder, 1960), pp. 75–92.

61 See *Mon Ign.* 1:181–4. From there Favre accompanied Ortiz to Spain, where the latter helped the former found the Jesuit colleges in Barcelona, Saragossa, Medinaceli, Madrid, Ocaña, and Toledo (see *DHCJ* 2:1369).

62 See Polanco, *Vita* 3:9; and *Fontes Narr.* 4:404.
This family chain of conversions worked, for example, in the case of a twenty-five-year-old Jewish man who had been imprisoned. His mother (who had been Christian for four years), excusing her son, asked the Cardinal of Trani [Giovan Domenico de Cupis] to give her a hand in getting her son out of jail. The cardinal turned to Ignatius, who offered a sly solution: the young Jew would be freed, if he promised to have his two-year-old son baptized and his teenage brother catechized. The promise was kept: the Jew left the prison and subsequently entered the Jesuit community of catechumens, where his son already was being prepared for baptism. Additionally, as a circular letter to all Jesuits from 1544 related,63 the young man’s wife, his sister-in-law with her husband, and his mother-in-law also promised to convert. Loyola’s secretary concluded the letter by asking God to “illuminate all other infidels, so that they abandon the darkness and receive the true light.”64

One way to illuminate the Jews was to herd them forcefully into a church and preach to them, a practice that would be legally reinvigorated by Gregory XIII’s bull *Vicus eius nos* in 1577.65 In response, the Jesuits provided preachers at the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, where Roman Jews were forced to attend sermons. One of them would later become Antonio Possevino, who after his appointment as secretary of the Society (1573) was actively engaged in the *Casa dei Catecumeni*.66 His predecessor, Polanco, wrote a circular letter to the Society in 1561, in which he reported that the vicar of Rome ordered all Jews to attend the two-hour-long sermon preached by Laínez. The latter’s zeal in converting the coreligionists of his great grandfather also was witnessed in his sermon at an auto-da-fé celebrated in Palermo.

In order to make his apostolate among Jews more successful, Loyola pressed Pope Paul III to change the papal policy towards converted Jews and to issue in 1542 the bull *Cupientes Iudaeos*, which allowed catechumens to retain their property after their conversion.67 Through

---

63 See *Mon Ign.* 1:288–9.
64 “Nuestro Señor le dé gracia para ello y a todos los otros infieles se digne iluminar para que, dejadas las tinieblas, reciban la verdadera luz” (*Mon Ign.* 1:289).
65 Pope Gregory XIII (1502–85), born Ugo Boncompagni, was pope from 1572 to 1585. Much on his role in the Society’s affairs below. On his relation with the Jesuits, see also *DHCJ* 3:2974–5.
another bull, *Illus qui pro dominici*, the same pope officially established on Loyola’s request the Confraternity of San Giuseppe, which—made up of twelve priests with Giovanni da Torano as their head—would financially support the House of Catechumens. In its seat, the San Giovanni del Mercato church (today nonexistent), the Jesuits—urged on by some prominent patrons and by the Roman synagogues themselves from which Pope Julius III (1550–5) requested an annual ten-ducat contribution—gave them bed, board, and instruction. By 1558 the Confraternity was sustaining nearly 200 catechumens and neophytes.\(^6^8\)

As James Reites has observed,\(^6^9\) Loyola’s open-mindedness towards Jewish converts must be contrasted with his support of the anti-Jewish papal legislation during the pontificate of the feared and disliked (by the first Jesuits) Pope Paul IV. Indeed, Loyola had many copies of Carafa’s most discriminatory bull, *Cum nimis absurdum* (1555), shipped to Jesuit houses, and he ordered that it be observed.\(^7^0\)

Among the many economic and religious restrictions for Jews in the Papal States, the pope’s document established the first Roman ghetto and forced Jews to wear a distinctive yellow hat (males) or kerchief (females), for “it is completely senseless and inappropriate to be in a situation where Christian piety allows the Jews (whose guilt—all of their own doing—has condemned them to eternal slavery) access to our society and even to live among us.”\(^7^1\)

Loyola, despite his reservations, obeyed the Vicar of Christ unconditionally, but the logical consequence of his acceptance of Jewish converts into the Catholic Church was his non-discrimination policy towards candidates of Jewish origin who desired to join the Jesuit Order. It seems that Loyola’s firm refusal to incorporate the Iberian purity-of-blood concept into the Jesuit *Constitutions* was the result of a long discernment. Lainez’s report of Ignatius’s pro-converso policy in the Society may suggest such a progress: “The reason why we cannot exclude them is that, if you remember, Your Reverence wrote about

\(^{68}\) On the further development of this project, see Lance Gabriel Lazar, *Working in the Vineyard of the Lord: Jesuit Confraternities in Early Modern Italy* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2005), especially pp. 112–8.


this to our Father [Ignatius], and then our Father, after carefully considering the matter and recommending it to our Lord [emphasis mine], decided against it [the exclusion], and this is what he put into the Constitutions.”

The Jesuit historian Francisco Borja de Medina brought to light a couple of Loyola’s early instructions given to his companions that confirm an evolution of the Jesuit superior general’s thought on the matter. In 1545 (just five years after the Society’s papal approval), he ambiguously wrote to one of his first Parisian companions, Pierre Favre, that the question of accepting some New Christians is being cautiously evaluated in Rome, for the Society is called to edify everybody, a goal that requires people who are not “on the files” [of the Inquisition], so that the Order’s spiritual outcome remain uncompromised:

As far as accepting New Christians, what we do here is as follows: we take well into account that the Society’s aim is to be able and to know how to edify all persons in all things. This requires people free from any mark [nota], which could hinder the spiritual fruit. However, they might do this with much more glory, talent, mortification, and good example of life. All of this would make up for and even clear up the defect [falta], and in some ways would give even greater glory to God our Lord.

Favre was given much freedom, however, in making his choices according to the local circumstances. Nine years later, Polanco (himself a converso) wrote to Diego Mirón, the Spanish superior of the Portuguese province, that Loyola was reminding him that being of New Christian lineage is not an impediment that would exclude a man from the Society, for there is no distinction between Jews and Greeks

74 In another text, Loyola explained the reason for the Society’s caution—“por la enfermedad humana y tanta indisposición de los que deben recibir la palabra divina” (Const. [250–1]).
75 “Cuanto al aceptar algunos cristianos nuevos lo que acá hacemos es bien mirado que la Compañía es para en todo poder y saber edificar a todos, por lo cual requiere personas ajenas de toda nota que impida el fruto espiritual, y esto máxime en las partes donde han de fructificar, bien fuese ya con mucha mayor gloria, talento, mortificación, y ejemplo de vida, lo que supliría y esclarecería la falta, y antes en alguna manera daría más gloria a Dios N.S., etc. Podréis hacer en esto como os parecerá según las costumbres de la tierra y condición, etc. que lo que hiciéredes y como sintiéredes ser mayor, aquello mismo tendremos por bien” (Mon Ign. 1:334–6).
united in the same spirit of the divine service, even though one must be more cautious in receiving New Christians, because they are usually difficult men. Loyola advised additionally through his secretary that subjects of this kind should not be overwhelmed by too much interrogation about their lineage, and if there was local difficulty in accepting them, they could be sent elsewhere, provided they were good subjects.

Loyola’s instruction was originated by the case of Enrique Enríques [Henrique Henríquez], who entered the Society in 1552. He was born in Oporto (Portugal) to the physician Simão Lópes and Isabel Enríques, who both converted from Judaism. Like Ribadeneyra’s brother, he reversed the order of his paternal and maternal names, a standard converso practice in the sixteenth century aimed to conceal the converso identity. Indeed, his brothers, Manuel and Baltasar, who also entered the Society, bore the name of their father (Manuel was able to become the superior provincial of Toledo until Mercurian’s anti-converso conspired election). Diego Mirón followed Ignatius’s non-discrimination instruction—since Enrique had no impediment, he was kept in the Society but sent to Spain, where he became a leading professor of casuistry and authored the first Jesuit manual of moral theology, *Theologiae moralis summa* (Salamanca, 1591). Difficulties with its approval by General Congregation 5 in 1593 (the same assembly

---

76 See Paul’s Letter to Galatians 3:27–9, which was abundantly quoted in the pro-converso writings, as we have seen in the previous chapter.

77 “Y advierta Vuestra Reverencia que el ser de linaje de cristianos nuevos no es impedimento qué excluya de la Compañía, aunque hace abrir los ojos más para el recibir los tales con pruebas suficientes, por lo que suele muchas veces hallarse en semejantes hombres, que es ser difíciles; y desto en fuera, en la Compañía *non est distinctio jud[a]ei et gr[a]eci, etc.*, cuando son unidos en el mismo espíritu del divino servicio con los otros. Y advierta V.R. que es notado de mirar mucho en esto, o por mejor decir, de tratar dello algo más que convendría al descubierto, lo cual sería para desconsolar y aún tentar no ligeramente algún bueno suspósito, a quienes toca algo desto. Es verdad que, si por la disposición de los ánimos de una tierra no fuese cosa edificativa aceptar alguno tal, diestramente se podría enderezar a otra parte, si fuese buen suspósito” (Mon Ign. 12:569).


that issued the anti-converso decree) caused Enríques’s temporary transfer to the Dominicans. Upon his return to the Society and with the support of his former converso disciple, Francisco Suárez, and Gregorio de Valencia, he participated in the Iberian separatist movement against Superior General Acquaviva known as *memorialistas*, as we shall see in the next chapter.

The most irresistible example of how much credit Loyola gave candidates of Jewish ancestry was his decision to admit in 1551 Giovanni Battista Eliano (Romano), the grandson of the famous grammarian and poet Rabbi Elijah Levita (1468–1549) who settled in Venice, whose older brother, Vittorio, also converted to Catholicism and became a censor of Jewish books in Cremona. He entered the Society at the age of twenty-one, just three months after his baptism, which had been administered by the renowned Jesuit humanist, André des Freux, or Frusius (c. 1515–56). After ten years of training, he was ordained priest and was given one of the most delicate ecumenical missions that the sixteenth-century papacy arranged—to the Copt patriarch in Cairo, Gabriel VII (r. 1526–69), and to the Lebanese Maronites. The former mission took place in 1561–2 under Laínez, who—probably bearing in mind the Mediterranean Jewish network—chose Eliano to accompany Cristóbal Rodríguez, a converso Jesuit from Hita in

---

80 Francisco Suárez [de Toledo]: *1548; †1617. For more on him, see below.
83 See ARSI, *Vitae 15*, f. 7v.
84 André des Freux entered the Society after having made his Spiritual Exercises together with his close friend Polanco under the guidance of Laínez. With Nadal and Palmio, he was part of the first Jesuit group to found the College of Messina. As a renowned Latinist, he rendered Ignatius’s *Spiritual Exercises* from the Spanish original into Latin. He edited (1558), among others, the Roman poet Martialis—the very first book printed by the Jesuits in Rome (see *DHCJ* 2:1537).

For the instrumental role of Freux and Polanco in the conversion of Eliano, see Guzmán’s letter to Acquaviva (ARSI, *Instit. 186e*, f. 354v): “[...] el Padre Bautista Romano, el cual se había convertido y bautizado en Venecia muy poco antes que lo recibiesen; y los padres que estaban allá que fueron el medio de su conversión eran el Padre Juan de Polanco y Padre Andrea Frusio de nación francés, los cuales escribieron a Roma a nuestro Padre Ignacio sobre su conversión y vocación a la Compañía y así lo llamó a Roma y luego lo recibió.”
Guadalajara who had earned his doctorate in theology at Alcalá and had been rector of the College of Gandia founded by Borja.\textsuperscript{85} The second mission took place in the late 1570s at the request of Gregory XIII. Because of his linguistic acumen (he was a professor of Hebrew and Arabic at the Roman College), Eliano was commissioned to translate the documents of the Council of Trent into Arabic and was appointed—as were many of his converso confreres—a member of St. Peter’s Penitentiary. Eliano narrated in his autobiographical letter to Claudio Acquaviva, composed in Italian, many colorful details of his first mission to Cairo, where he went incognito because of the fear of Jews that prevailed there.\textsuperscript{86} The most intriguing episodes—picked up by the Jesuit historian Sacchini in his history of the Society\textsuperscript{87}—concern the encounter with his mother, who lived in Cairo as a Jewish woman. During the encounter, she expressed her disappointment with her son’s conversion, arguing that he was too educated and good to let the Christians deceive him. Helpless to change her son’s mind and crying, Eliano’s mother let him go, but—he suspected—subsequently caused him many troubles through the Jews she knew in Alexandria, where Eliano headed after his sojourn in Cairo. As a result, the two Jesuits had to escape from Egypt, Eliano covering his face with a handkerchief so that the Jews could not recognize him.\textsuperscript{88} As Ribadeneyra put it evocatively, Giovanni Battista Romano “was a servant of God who worked and suffered a lot for the Society and God’s Church.”\textsuperscript{89} Guzmán, in his letter to Acquaviva, underscored a similar idea of distinctiveness of this Jew-turned-Jesuit:

[Giovanni Battista Romano] came out so distinctive with all his virtues, especially in the zeal to convert and win the souls of infidels as well as Christian sinners, and with so much fruit in all his endeavors, that they used to call him in Rome a portrait of St. Paul the Apostle. Fascinatingly, our Lord converted through him an entire nation of schismatics called Maronites (from the name of one whose name was Marón who perverted

\textsuperscript{85} See more on Rodríguez below.
\textsuperscript{87} See Francesco Sacchini, \textit{Historiae Societatis Iesu} (Antwerp: Ex officina filiorum Martini Nutii, 1620), vol. 2: [Laynez]. I have used the edition printed in Rome (Typis Dominici Manelphi, 1652), p. 252.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibidem, pp. 131–6.
\textsuperscript{89} See \textit{Mon Rib.} 2:379.
them with a special appearance of holiness; these were under the rule of Turks). And our Lord gave Father Bautista Romano such a grace that by his doctrine and persuasion all converted to the obedience of the Apostolic See. And he brought to Rome some of them, elderly and children, in time of Pope Gregory XIII, who founded a school for them, which was entrusted to the Society (and later was confirmed by Pope Sixtus V). I could say many other things about this blessed father, but suffice to know that he eventually died in Rome in a holy manner, always engaged in these and other holy works.\footnote{See ARSI, \textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 354'.}

Another example of the boundless trust that Loyola gave to converso Jesuits was the appointment of his and the Society’s secretary, Juan Alfonso de Polanco, who became Ignatius’s “memory and hand” until the latter’s demise. He was born 24 December 1517 in Burgos (Castile) to Gregorio, \textit{regidor} of the city, and doña María de Salinas. Polanco bore the name of his paternal grandfather Alfonso (d. 1491), who married Costanza de Maluenda (d. 1520), who married María Nuñez (d. 1423), the sister of the rabbi-turned-bishop of Burgos, Salomon ha-Levi/Pablo de Santa María, and aunt of Alonso de Burgos, whose writings we have studied in Chapter One.\footnote{On Polanco’s Jewish ancestry, see Baroja, \textit{Judíos en la España}, p. 233 (quoting Sicroff’s \textit{Les controversies}, pp. 271, 273, 278, and 279–80); Jean Lacouture, \textit{Jesuits: A Multibiography} (Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint, 1995), pp. 161–76; \textit{DHCJ}, p. 1004; and Cantera Burgos, \textit{Alvar García de Santa María y su familia de conversos}, p. 403.} As in the case of Diego Laínez and Francisco Suárez, most of his sisters were nuns, but Juan Alfonso was the only male to choose an ecclesiastical career. With this goal in mind, he studied humanities and philosophy in Paris (1535–8) under his converso fellow countryman, Dr. Francisco de Astudillo,\footnote{See Ricardo García Villoslada, \textit{Universidad de París durante los estudios de Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1507–1522)} (Rome: apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae, 1938), pp. 379–86.} who had met Ignatius there in previous years. In Paris, Polanco lived in the same college as Martín de Olave (1507/8–56), who had met Loyola at Alcalá and later would become his close friend and future Jesuit collaborator.\footnote{See \textit{Chron.} 1:34.} There he also met the
Dr. Francisco de Astudillo, 93 who had met Ignatius there in previous philosophy in Paris (1535–8) under his converso fellow countryman, ecclesiastical career. With this goal in mind, he studied humanities and his sisters were nuns, but Juan Alfonso was the only male to choose an Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1507–1522)

Sicroff’s

Another example of the boundless trust that Loyola gave to converso turned-bishop of Burgos, Salomon ha-Levi/Pablo de Santa María, and whose homonymous father (1387–1476) was a cousin of Juan Garcés García de Castro and Martín Rodríguez de Maluenda, who married María Nuñez (d. 1423), the sister of the rabbi-th. Th e latter was a daughter of Juana Maluenda, who married María Nuñez (d. 1423), the sister of the rabbi-th. Th e latter was a daughter of Juana

91 Th e tombs of both parents and grandparents of Juan Alfonso are located in the St. Nicolas Church in Burgos (see St. Nicolas Church in Burgos (see

90 See ARSI,

92 On Polanco’s Jewish ancestry, see Baroja,

93 See Ricardo García Villoslada,

94 See Scaduto, Governo, p. 183.

95 On the duties of the secretary, see Polanco’s own treatise, Del officio del secretario (Mario Scaduto, “Uno scritto ignaziano inedito. Il ’Del officio del secretario,’” AHSI 29 (1960): 305–12; and idem, Francesco Borgia, pp. 65–7).


97 See Brodrick, Origin of the Jesuits, p. 97.
helped to compose the Jesuit Constitutions and was commissioned by Loyola to translate them into Latin.

Another commission that Loyola gave Polanco and his confreres in the casa professa in Rome was to write a compendium for Jesuit confessors. Breve directorium ad confessari ac poenitentis recte obediendum was first printed in Rome and in Leuven at the very beginning of 1554. It was the only book on the Jesuit preeminent ministry of sacramental confession for twenty years—until 1574, when the first Jesuit manual for penitents, the converso Gaspar de Loarte’s “Comfort of the Tormented,” was published in Rome. The Directory had its publishing boom in the 1570s and its decline in the 1590s, when it was replaced by the works of another two converso Jesuits: Manuel de Sá’s Aphorisms (80 editions) and Francisco de Toledo’s Instruction for Priests and Penitents (166 editions) at the end of the sixteenth century. The Directory was the fourth most published Jesuit book on confession, with at least seventy-six editions (reprints and translations included). It was the only book translated into Illyrian and Slovenian, and one of the only two Jesuit confessional manuals translated into Portuguese. Ignatius of Loyola wanted every Jesuit confessor to have a personal copy of it. True, the manual was subsequently used in Jesuit ministries and even in lectures on cases of conscience. An influential Directory to the Spiritual Exercises (1555) by the converso Juan Alonso de Vitoria recommended Polanco’s text as useful in preparation for general sacramental confession. However, it is to be noted that the exclusivity of the Directory on the Jesuit penitential book market ceased in 1573 with the election of the Walloon Everard Mercurian, when Polanco was removed from the government, along with other converso Jesuits. It is not unreasonable to infer, then, that the publishing success of the Directory may well have been related to Polanco’s position of authority rather than to the manual’s intrinsic usefulness to confessors or students of cases of conscience. Indeed, even though the Directory was designed to be just a compendium to accommodate

100 Juan Alonso de Vitoria: *1538; SJ 1558; †1578. He was rector of the college in Vienna and procurator general. For a study of the conversos of Vitoria, from where the famous founder of the School of Salamanca, Francisco de Vitoria, came, see Rosario Porres Marijuan and Teresa Benito Aguado, “El Estatuto de limpieza de sangre y sus repercusiones en Vitoria en tiempos de Felipe II,” Hispania 60/2, núm. 205 (2000): 515–62.
the needs of the first Jesuits who were too busy with their ministries to dedicate much time to academic activities, it lacked a basic awareness of important shifts operative during that century. Consequently, the official edition of the *Directory to the Spiritual Exercises* from 1599 suggested a non-Jesuit contemporary text: *Enchiridion* by Martín Azpilcueta (1493–1586). The popular and authoritative *Navarrus*, as it was briefly called, was more comprehensive and reflected important socio-economic changes brewing in the sixteenth century. The Jesuits, who were consulted about the *Ratio Studiorum* (1599), overwhelmingly called for a new manual that could be used in the Society for lectures on cases of conscience. This time, Francisco de Toledo’s *Instruction*, rather than Polanco’s *Directory*, would be the answer to that need. Even though the Polish Jesuits would reprint the *Directory* more than 300 years later, by the end of the sixteenth century it was already outdated. Indeed, it employed the conservative Tutiorism of major thirteenth-century scholastics, which the Jesuits abandoned in the last quarter of the sixteenth century by enthusiastically espousing Probabilism, which a new generation of converso Jesuits would make the Jesuit ethical system throughout the next century.  

In spite of these many duties, Loyola put on Polanco’s shoulders an additional responsibility towards the end of his life (1555)—that of assistant general. This endorsement would make Polanco the key person in the transition of power after Loyola’s death, as we shall see below. In the last stage of his acute illness, Loyola put his life in the hands of a converso physician despite the widespread diffidence in Christian circles toward doctors of Jewish lineage. The physician’s name was Baltasar de Torres, and he had been physician to the viceroy of Sicily, Juan de Vega, before entering the Society after making his Spiritual Exercises with the viceroy’s Jesuit confessor, Juan Jerónimo Doménech. Polanco obtained for him a special dispensation from the papal curia so that he could practice as physician even after his ordination to priesthood (which was prohibited by canon law).

---

101 For the detailed analysis of the *Breve directorium*, see Maryks, *Saint Cicero and the Jesuits*, pp. 49–58.

102 See, for example, Diego de Simanca’s *Defensio statuti Toletani*, ff. 5v–6, which we have analyzed in the previous chapter; and Sicroff, *Estatutos*, p. 129.

103 See his biographical note above.

Loyola’s trust in conversos apparently was not shared by the superior provincial of Portugal and one of Loyola’s first companions, Simão Rodrigues. Rodrigues wrote an instruction to his subjects, *Modo que se ha de ter nos collegios da Companhia en o receber dos estudantes d’ella* (1546–50), which in its third paragraph asked them to refuse to admit New Christians or those who had been publicly suspected of heresy. Yet the evidence shows that Rodrigues, himself likely a descendant of the converso clan of Acevedo (probably blessed Ignacio de Acevedo included), followed the practice suggested by Loyola in the aforementioned letter to Mirón. A number of Portuguese conversos were admitted by him into the Society and/or sent to the Far East. Among them were: Anrrique Anrriques who—despite his juridical impediment of being earlier a Franciscan—entered the Jesuits in 1545 and was sent to Pesquería via India, where he worked for fifty-five years and composed the first grammar of Tamil; Afonso de Castro, who was born to an affluent jeweler from Lisbon and sent in 1547 to Xavier in India, from where he was dispatched to the Moro Islands, a mission that concluded a decade later with his death by crucifixion and decapitation; the expert in canon law, Antonio Gomes, who in 1548 was

---


106 See below.

107 Anrrique Anrriques: *1520 Vila Viçosa (Évora, Portugal); SJ 1545; †1602 Ponnaikayal (India); priest in 1551; professed in 1560. Received in the Society by Rodrigues in 1545, he was sent to India, from where Xavier destined him for Pesqueria. After the death of Antonio Criminali in 1549, he was elected superior regional but his appointment was opposed by Antonio Gómes because of his Jewish ancestry. His grammar of Tamil is lost (see *DHCJ* 1:178; and Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” pp. 5–6).

108 Afonso de Castro: *1520 Lisbon; SJ 1547; †1558 Hiri (Moluccas, Indonesia); priest in 1549; professed in 1552. As a young man he began to converse with Simão Rodrigues and Xavier before the latter’s departure for India. Later he became a Franciscan, but he was not fully accepted into the Order because of his origins. Therefore, he embarked in 1547 for India, where Xavier admitted him into the Society. Destined for the Moluccas, he arrived there as priest in 1549. In 1551 he was sent to the Moro Islands, where he succeeded in 1555 the superior of the mission, Juan de Bera. There, he faced conflict with Antonio Vaz, whom he expelled from the Society. In December 1557, while navigating from Moro to Ternate he was captured by the natives of Ternate, who crucified and decapitated him a few weeks later on the island of Hiri (see *DHCJ* 1:706–7). On his missionary activities, see Hubert Jacobs, ed., *Documenta Malucensia* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1974–84); Diogo Barbosa Machado, *Memorias para a historia de Portugal, que comprehendem o governo del rey D. Sebastião, único em o nome, e decimo sexto entre os Monarchas Portuguezes* (Lisbon: na Officina de Joseph António da Sylva, 1736), vol. 1, pp. 159–67;
sent by Rodrigues to India and perished in the sea near Madagascar six years later;\textsuperscript{109} Baltasar Gago, who same year was sent from Lisbon to Goa with Gaspar Berze;\textsuperscript{110} and Manuel de Távora from Coimbra, who, admitted by Berze in 1552, worked in the Moluccas and then passed to Brazil.\textsuperscript{111}

In the Far East, an ambiguity similar to Rodrigues’s can be traced in Xavier’s approach to the vexed converso question. On the one hand—as in Rodrigues’s case—we have a written testimony from 1552 that Xavier advised debarring candidates of “Hebraic lineage”; on the other hand there is evidence that he actually did accept such subjects. Not only did the aforementioned Anrique Anríques (Enrique Enríquez)\textsuperscript{112} and Afonso de Castro enter the Order, but also many others, among them Gaspar Rodrigues, who—in spite of being a former Dominican—entered the Society in 1548 in Goa,\textsuperscript{113} where Miguel da Nobrega also joined in 1550;\textsuperscript{114} Pedro de Alcáçova, who had left

---

\textsuperscript{109} Antonio Gomes: *c. 1520 Lisboa; SJ 1544; †23 April 1554. He entered the Society in Coimbra after having earned his doctorate in theology. Xavier nominated him rector of the college in Goa, the government of which produced much controversy. Therefore, Xavier fired him in 1552 and sent him back to Rome, where he never arrived (see DHCJ 2:1771).

\textsuperscript{109} Baltasar Gago: *c. 1518 Lisboa; SJ 1546 Lisboa; †9 January 1583(?). He entered the Society as priest and was sent to India in 1548. He accompanied Viceroy Noronha as military chaplain in his expedition to Sri Lanka in 1551. Javier appointed him to Japan, where he joined the Jesuit Torres and helped to compose the Japanese catechism. He returned to India in 1562 (see DHCJ 2:1549–50).


\textsuperscript{111} Baltasar Gago: *c. 1518 Lisboa; SJ 1546 Lisboa; †9 January 1583(?). He entered the Society as priest and was sent to India in 1548. He accompanied Viceroy Noronha as military chaplain in his expedition to Sri Lanka in 1551. Javier appointed him to Japan, where he joined the Jesuit Torres and helped to compose the Japanese catechism. He returned to India in 1562 (see DHCJ 2:1549–50).

\textsuperscript{112} Baltasar Gago: *c. 1518 Lisboa; SJ 1546 Lisboa; †9 January 1583(?). He entered the Society as priest and was sent to India in 1548. He accompanied Viceroy Noronha as military chaplain in his expedition to Sri Lanka in 1551. Javier appointed him to Japan, where he joined the Jesuit Torres and helped to compose the Japanese catechism. He returned to India in 1562 (see DHCJ 2:1549–50).

\textsuperscript{113} Baltasar Gago: *c. 1518 Lisboa; SJ 1546 Lisboa; †9 January 1583(?). He entered the Society as priest and was sent to India in 1548. He accompanied Viceroy Noronha as military chaplain in his expedition to Sri Lanka in 1551. Javier appointed him to Japan, where he joined the Jesuit Torres and helped to compose the Japanese catechism. He returned to India in 1562 (see DHCJ 2:1549–50).

\textsuperscript{114} Baltasar Gago: *c. 1518 Lisboa; SJ 1546 Lisboa; †9 January 1583(?). He entered the Society as priest and was sent to India in 1548. He accompanied Viceroy Noronha as military chaplain in his expedition to Sri Lanka in 1551. Javier appointed him to Japan, where he joined the Jesuit Torres and helped to compose the Japanese catechism. He returned to India in 1562 (see DHCJ 2:1549–50).
the Society in Portugal but was readmitted by Xavier;115 Gomes Vaz (whose grandparents the Inquisition burned in Serpa), who spent his energies as missionary in Goa;116 and Antonio Dias, who worked in Goa for thirty years.117

In Medina’s view, Xavier’s ambivalence may have originated from his uncertainty—perhaps because of Rodrigues’s instruction that could have been brought to him by one of the many Jesuits who traveled from Portugal to Asia—above what Loyola had decided in respect to converso candidates. At any rate, except for minor incidents, the openness towards converso candidates continued after Xavier’s death. For example, in 1556 Luis de Almeida, a merchant and surgeon from Lisbon, joined the Jesuit mission in Funai, where he founded a hospital and worked later in other parts of Japan, as several monuments to him testify today in the cities of Nagasaki, Hondo, and Oita;118 Fernão de Narbona was admitted in 1557 and worked as a pharmacist in Goa;119 in 1561 Antonio Belo entered the Society in Goa and became a renowned professor of music;120 beginning in 1565 Gabriel Oliveira operated the Goan mission;121 in 1569 (the year of death of his converso relative, Juan de Ávila) Antonio Francisco de Critana was admitted and destined for the Philippines, where he perished in the sea four decades later;122 Baltasar Dias traveled from Coimbra to the Moluccas

116 Gomes Vaz: *1542 Serpa (Beja, Portugal); SJ 1562; †1610 Lisbon; priest in 1568; professed in 1584 (see DHCJ 4:3910).
117 Antonio Dias: SJ 1551; †1581 (see Fejér, Defuncti 2:61; and Wicki, “Cristãos-Novos,” p. 350).
118 Luis de Almeida: *1525 Lisbon; SJ 1556; †1583 Kawachinoura (Kumamoto, Japan). See DHCJ 1:81–2.
119 Fernão de Narbona: *c. 1536; †1579 (see Wicki, “Cristãos-Novos,” p. 350).
120 Antonio Belo: *1523; SJ 1561 Goa; †1571. (see Wicki, “Cristãos-Novos,” p. 351; and Fejér, Defuncti, 2:25).
121 Gabriel Oliveira: *c. 1534 Plasencia; SJ before 1564; professed 1584; †1599 (see Fejér, Defuncti 2:164; and Wicki, “Cristãos-Novos,” p. 351).
122 Antonio Francisco de Critana: *1548 Almodóvar del Campo (Spain); SJ 1569; †1614 in the sea in front of Luzon (the Philippines); priest in 1573; professed in 1592. After he had studied Japanese in Yamaguchi, he worked in the college Todos los Santos in Nagasaki (1598–1614), from where he was expelled by the Japanese government. He embarked on a small ship towards the Philippines and perished at sea. His body was transferred to the San Ignacio College in Manila. His beatification process was opened in 1901 (see DHCJ 2:1005).
before 1559 and worked for ten years in India and Malaysia;\textsuperscript{123} and in 1570 Pedro Ramón from Saragossa entered the Society to become a missionary in Japan, where he died as martyr.\textsuperscript{124}

In cannot be denied, however, that there was a certain ambivalence among the early Jesuits that testifies to their unease over the converso question that the young Society of Jesus unavoidably had to face. The assurance of Loyola’s true spirit that inspired the Jesuit practice comes from the most authoritative legal Jesuit document, the \textit{Constitutions}, which he composed over time almost until his death in 1556. In this he was assisted by his secretary Polanco and frequently consulted his trusted converso companions Nadal, Cristóbal de Madrid, and Manuel de Sá.\textsuperscript{125} The part that addresses the question of converso admissions is contained in the \textit{General Exam}. Contrary to the interpretation given to this text by the converso-phobic Italo-Portuguese lobby in the twenty-year period between General Congregations 3 and 5 (1573–93), the jurist García Alarcón argued (as we shall see in the last chapter) that being of Jewish origin did not constitute a legal impediment for Jesuit candidates and that the goal of the question inserted into the \textit{General Exam} was merely to supplement the information about the candidate. Indeed, this text is found not in the section on impediments but in the one that lists questions that should be asked by the candidate’s examiner.\textsuperscript{126} Moreover, Medina pointed out that in the 1550 version of the text on which Loyola was working, such a question was taken out, probably at the request of Alfonso Salmerón.\textsuperscript{127} Just before his death, however, Loyola added the question again (this is in the so-called text B of 1556), with a slight change of wording but without changing its non-discriminatory intent: “si viene de christianos antiguos o modernos.”\textsuperscript{128}

If anybody had doubts about how to interpret the converso question in the Jesuit \textit{Constitutions}, which were not binding until their

\textsuperscript{123} Baltasar Días: “c. 1508 Portugal; SJ 1549 Coimbra; priest before 1549; professed 1559 Moluccas; †21 August 1571 Goa (\textit{DHCJ} 2:1112).

\textsuperscript{124} Pedro Ramón: *1549; SJ 1570; †1611 (see Fejér, \textit{Defuncti}, 2:190; \textit{DHCJ} 4:3289; and Donnelly, “Antonio Possevino,” pp. 10–1). His Jewish ancestry was revealed by Possevino in his memorial to Acquaviva (see AHSI, \textit{Inst. 184/II}, f. 351r).

\textsuperscript{125} On Sá and Madrid, see the following paragraphs in the text.


\textsuperscript{127} “Véase si aquella demanda (si viene de cristianos viejos o nuevos) se ha de dejar” (see Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” p. 7).

\textsuperscript{128} In Medina’s opinion, this formulation would differentiate now between the candidates coming from all non-Christian religions and not just from Judaism.
promulgation in 1558, Loyola—physically stuck to his chair at the
Roman curia—made clear its meaning through his envoys to the
Jesuits in the provinces across Europe, most of whom had never met
Loyola in person. The most prominent among them was Ignatius’s
plenipotent commissary, Jerónimo Nadal Morey.

_Jerónimo Nadal’s opposition to the purity-of-blood legislation_

The Jesuit career of the Majorcan Jerónimo Nadal is fascinating, so let
us emphasize in this paragraph those biographical details that help us
understand his support of Loyola’s pro-converso policy. For twenty
years before his decision to become a Jesuit he resisted Loyola’s eff orts
to make him part of the íñigistas group in Paris: “The fish escaped his
hook,” as he put it in his Diary. Nadal resisted Loyola’s indirect and
direct attempts to win his commitment due to his fear that he would be
reported for heresy in his native city of Majorca (later called Palma),
a fear that had kept him far from Loyola already during his studies
at the University of Álcala nine years earlier (1526–7). Nadal’s fears
were not allayed even after a personal meeting with Loyola in Paris,
during which he was told a story of Loyola’s trial by the Inquisition
of Salamanca: waving the New Testament in his hand, Nadal made
himself aloof from Loyola and his group.

The reasons for this fear that Nadal provided in his diary are incon-
gruous. On the one hand he denied that he avoided Loyola because
of his troubles with the Inquisition in Salamanca, but on the other
he confessed that he feared being reported at home by a Franciscan
friend from his native Majorca, who was living in Paris. Nadal’s deci-
sion to join the Jesuits only after he learned that the Holy See legally
recognized them would suggest that he feared being denounced to the
Majorcan Inquisition for being part of a group that had no official
approval and was tainted by Loyola’s contacts with (converso) alum-
brados/Erasmists. One is impelled to ask, however, why Loyola’s com-

129 See Robert A. Maryks, “Abnegación en los escritos de Jerónimo Nadal (1507–
130 Jerónimo Nadal, Chronicon [39], in Mon Nadal 1:14: “Itaque elapsus est ab eius
hamo tunc piscis” (the numbers between the brackets refer to editor’s paragraphs).
131 Nadal, Chronicon [10]: “Sensus animi mei sic fuit: nolo his me adiungere: quis
scit an incident aliquando in inquisitores?”
132 See Nadal, Chronicon [1], [8], and [10].
On the one hand he denied that he avoided Loyola because of his own fear of being reported at home by a Franciscan. Nadal confessed that he feared being denounced to the Majorcan Inquisition for being part of a group that had no official recognition. The reasons for this fear that he provided in his diary are inconclusive. Nadal’s fears were not allayed even after a personal meeting with Loyola in Paris, at the University of Álcala nine years earlier (1526–7). Nadal’s fears were not allayed even after a personal meeting with Loyola in Paris, at the University of Álcala nine years earlier (1526–7). Nadal’s fears were not allayed even after a personal meeting with Loyola in Paris, at the University of Álcala nine years earlier (1526–7). Nadal’s fears were not allayed even after a personal meeting with Loyola in Paris, at the University of Álcala nine years earlier (1526–7).

Initially Jerónimo Nadal [Morey] was suspicious of Ignatius’s orthodoxy and he refused to join his group in Paris but a decade later he became one of Loyola’s most influential collaborators. Invested with delegated power, he traveled throughout Europe, explaining the Jesuit Constitutions. He stressed that they did not discriminate against candidates of Jewish ancestry and thus adamantly opposed the purity-of-blood policy of Archbishop Siliceo. Most probably Nadal was a descendant of Majorcan Jews.
panions did not share Nadal’s fear. Indeed, the first íñigistas whom Loyola sent to Nadal’s in Paris were Manuel de Miona and Laínez, who may have had more reasons to fear accusations of heresy, as we have seen earlier.

Due to the anti-Spanish atmosphere in Paris, Nadal departed for Avignon (1537), where he received his doctorate in theology and was ordained priest (1538). From there he finally returned to his native Balearic island, where he experienced a long spiritual crisis that was deepened by an uneasy relationship with his wealthy family and the death of his mother. Once Nadal was assured by a circular letter from Francis Xavier that the Society of Jesus was formally recognized by the papacy, he decided to go to Rome (1545), where one of the first Jesuits he met was Diego Laínez, whom he had dismissed ten years earlier in Paris. The latter did not become any less adamantly and tried again to convince the former to make Spiritual Exercises in order to discern his vocation. In his unyielding efforts, Laínez was aided by Alfonso Salmerón, who may have shared with Nadal his excellent knowledge of Hebrew that the former learned as a boy in his native Toledo (perhaps in the same Judeo-converso community where his future close friend and biographer, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, had been born eleven years later).

Nadal did not appreciate Laínez’s and Salmerón’s dogged determination, yet the persistence of another Jesuit, a son of a wealthy pharmacist from Valencia, Juan Jerónimo Doménech, who was Loyola’s secretary at that time and with whom Nadal could speak in his native Catalan, led him to meet Loyola again. Four months later, Nadal gave up his resistance by engaging in the Spiritual Exercises, during which he eventually decided to enter the Jesuit Order (November 1545).

---

135 Nadal, Chronicon [19–20]: “No me encontraba bien con mi tío Morey. Murió mi madre y me vieron en un luto indecoroso por ella. Mi hermano se casó no solamente sin que yo lo supiese y sin consultarme, sino que tampoco me invitó” (translation from Latin into Spanish is mine). On the nobility of Nadal’s family, see Joaquin Maria Bover, Nobiliario Mallorquin (Barcelona: José J. De Olañeta Editor, 1983), pp. 258–9.
J.N. Hillgarth in his Readers and Books in Majorca 1229–1550 (Paris: CNRS, 1991), vol. 2, p. 700, published an inventory of the rich library of Nadal’s father, notary Antoni Nadal. For the association of various Nadals with the profession of notary public, see ACA, Diversos, Monistrol, Pergaminos, núm. 0629, 0632, 0703–5, 0710–2, 0721–2, and 2055.
After just four months, Loyola appointed Nadal minister of the Jesuit headquarters (which in Jesuit jargon means the person in charge of the administrative-economic care of a community), and as such he had to bury Pierre Favre (August 1546), who had tried after Lainez to convince Nadal to join their group in Paris. Some months later (March 1547), Nadal welcomed to the community the new secretary of the Society, Juan Alfonso de Polanco, who had entered the Order just a few years earlier.

Nadal got to know Polanco well during one year of daily meetings that were held in the Jesuit headquarters, but then he was appointed the superior of a group destined to open the first Jesuit school in Messina, and he left Rome on 18 March 1548. After four years of work in Sicily, Nadal returned briefly to Rome to take his solemn religious vows. Those four years had been a period of intensive work on the Jesuit Constitutions by Loyola and Polanco. Nadal received the task of explaining them upon his return to Sicily in May 1552, but especially upon his appointment to the Commissary for the Iberian Jesuit provinces a year later (1553). This appointment made him the most authoritative interpreter of the Jesuit way of proceeding to Jesuits who had never met Loyola in person. And Nadal had been a Jesuit for only eight years.

It is during this one-year mission to Iberia that Nadal had to face the issue of admitting Judeo-conversos into the Order. Upon his arrival in June 1553 at Alcalá, Nadal met a Jesuit for whom he—and Polanco—had little respect but who was the first superior provincial of Spain and a relative of Loyola: Antonio de Araoz.136 Loyola himself knew about Araoz’s questionable demeanor and especially his love for the courtly life (he used to spend more time at court than in his provincial office), yet he judged it necessary to keep Araoz in charge precisely because of his good contacts with the Spanish courts—which were vital in order to support the Society’s expansion in the region.137 (Only Loyola’s successor Lainez would suggest, in a letter written by his secretary Polanco to Nadal, that Araoz should be removed from his office.)138 From that court, and especially from his penitent, the Prince

---

136 On Araoz’s anti-converso sentiments, see Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” pp. 8–9.
137 Nadal wrote in his report to Loyola on 14 May 1554: “El doctor Araoz restará en su provincia, y spero en el Señor nuestro mirará más a los particulares que antes, y se apartará más de negocios seculares que trata muchos” (Mon Nadal 1:252).
138 See Mon Nadal, 1:786 (where Polanco sarcastically calls Araoz “el amigo”); see also ibidem, p. 470.
of Éboli, Ruy Gómez de Silva (c. 1516–73), Araoz heard voices increasingly requesting that the Society refuse candidates of Jewish ancestry, and he made himself the Jesuit harbinger of the Iberian policy of *pureza de sangre*. The Basque Jesuit viewed the Jesuit leadership’s pro-converso policy as poison, and it disturbed him so much that at some point he was close to leaving the Society.

Replying to Araoz, Loyola’s converso secretary wrote:

> About not accepting New Christians, our Father is not persuaded that God would be served this way. But it seems good to him that one ought to be more circumspect with them. If over there [in Spain] the attitudes of the court or of the king are against admitting them, send them here if they are worthy candidates, as we have written other times. Here one does not look at the matter so closely in the light of what is the race of one who is seen to be a good person, just as nobility does not suffice for admission if the other qualifications are lacking.

Araoz’s anti-converso attitude was stubbornly rebutted by Nadal. In Spain, he received much support in his objections to Araoz’s anti-converso campaign from Francisco de Borja, whom his assistant Benedetto Palmio would accuse of excessive love for and credit to New Christians, as we shall see below. This conflict—underestimated by the Italian Jesuit historian of the period, Mario Scaduto—can be well observed in the case of admission to the Society of two disciples of Juan de Ávila, who himself was of Jewish ancestry: the converso

---

139 “Father, until the Society is somewhat better known and established in Castile, it would seem very appropriate to think over the matter of receiving New Christians [gente verriac], for, in the opinion of many, this alone is a poison” (see *Epp. Mixtae* 1:241).


141 See *Mon Ign.* 5:335. Loyola’s opposition to Araoz’s discrimination against converso candidates became a weapon in Jesuit pro-converso writings. See, for example, Guzmán’s letter to Acquaviva (*ARSI, Instit. 186e*, f. 354v): “Saber que el espíritu y el sentimiento de nuestro Bendito Padre Maestro Ignacio de su santa memoria fue muy continuo a esto, lo cual se sabe evidentemente por claros testimonios. Uno es que escribiéndole sobre ello el Padre Antonio de Araoz (el cual era entonces único provincial en toda España fuera de Portugal) por alguna duda que el tenía, le respondió tan sacudidamente, diciéndole: ‘Absit, Dios nos guarde de pensar tal cosa,’ como si le propusiera una cosa contra la fe católica; y así también se confirma esta su voluntad y sentimiento.”

142 See *ARSI, Instit. 106*, f. 102.

Dr. Gaspar de Loarte (d. 1578) from Medina del Campo; and Don Diego de Guzmán (d. 1606) from the high nobility of Seville. From a report Nadal sent to Loyola in July 1553 we learn that Francisco de Borja eagerly admitted the two, but somehow secretly—they were working for the bishop of Calahorra, Juan Bernal Díaz de Lugo, but nobody knew of their affiliation. Araoz insisted that they had to be expelled and was supported in it by another Jesuit official, Bartolomé de Bustamante (1501–70), who talked about the issue to Don Diego de Tavera, an inquisitor and relative of Guzmán, arguing that the latter should not belong to the Society because of “that imperfection [tacha].” Guzmán objected that there was no reason to refuse their admission and that the Jesuits would act wrongfully if they expelled the two men. Nadal ordered Bustamante not to take any decision until he received further instructions. As he informed Loyola, his plan was first to show a chapter of the Jesuit Constitutions to the Inquisition’s Council, or to explain them orally, so that Guzmán could remain in the Society. And Loarte made it clear that if Guzmán could not stay in the Society, neither would he.

Nadal was following here what Ignatius had expressed in a letter addressed to the Jesuit Francisco de Villanueva (whom Siliceo considered a converso): in no way would the Jesuit Constitutions assimilate

---

144 As were the mentioned earlier families Acosta, Torres, Valencia, and San Julián.

145 Guzmán was the son of Don Rodrigo Ponce de León (Count of Bailén) and Doña Blanca de Sandóval (ARSI, Hist. Soc. 177, 284’–287’). See also Chron. 2:328, 420, 647; 3:340 and 345; Litterae Quadr. 4:645, and Fray Luis de Granada de la Orden de Santo Domingo, Vida del Padre Maestro Juan de Ávila y las partes que ha de tener un predicador del Evangelio (Madrid: Edibesa, 2000), p. 153.

146 After they did their Spiritual Exercises with Borja at the end of 1552 in Oñate (see Mon Borgia 3:132; Chron. 3:331, 340; Epp. Mixt. 3:123). Borja also received there another one of Ávila’s disciple, Antonio de Córdoba, the son of Marquise de Priego.

147 See Scaduto, Azione, p. 617.

148 Before entering the Society he was secretary to the cardinal archbishop of Toledo, Juan de Tavera (see DHCJ 1:580).

149 It seems that the same reason made Bustamante begrudge Ávila’s admission to the Society. Bustamante’s judgment suggests Guzmán’s converso lineage, even though it has been doubted by the majority of experts who wrote on this episode (see, for example Rey, “San Ignacio,” p. 184; and Medina’s article on Guzmán in DHCJ 2:1857–9).

150 See Reites, “St. Ignatius and the Jews,” p. 25. Siliceo’s claim was probably not groundless. Francisco de Villanueva (1509–57) from Villanueva de Placencia (Cáceres) entered the Society in Rome in 1541. Loyola employed him in the affair of the converso Juan de Ávila’s entrance to the Society. See Baldomero Jiménez Duque, “Juan de Ávila en la encrucijada” Revista Española de Teología 29 (1969): 445–73; M. Ruiz
the policy of the archbishop, who should take care of his own business rather than interfere with the internal issues of the Society. The problem was that the flourishing College at Alcalá—a hotbed of Jesuit (converso) vocations—was located within Silíceo’s diocesan jurisdiction. Ironically enough, it was Francisco de Villanueva, together with the converso Manuel López and Maximiliano Chapelle, who inaugurated this college in 1546, and Beatriz Ramírez and Mencía de Benavente—the old alumbrado friends of Loyola from Alcalá—had financially supported its foundation.

This part of Nadal’s report to Loyola is of extreme importance in the history of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry, for it confirms what we have observed above: according to Loyola, Nadal, and later on Ribadeneyra, Possevino, Guzmán, Mariana, and Alarcón—and contrary to the anti-converso party that would prohibit the admission of conversos forty years later—the Jesuit Constitutions did not consider Jewish ancestry an impediment for admission to the Society.

---

151 [Rome], 2 January 1552, in Cartas de San Ignacio de Loyola (Madrid, 1874–89), vol. 3, pp. 13–21.
152 Perhaps it is Maximilían Capella, who pronounced his four vows in January 1566 (ARSI, S. Andr. Germ., ff. 34–5), who represented the Lower German Province at the Congregation of Procurators in 1568 and took part in General Congregation 3. Sometimes his name has a French form, Maximilien de la Chapelle, and he is said to be originally from Lille (Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 10) or from Flanders (DHCJ 4:3977). Palmio mentions in his memorial a certain Capilla [16], but it is uncertain whether the two are the same Jesuit.
153 Jurado, “San Juan de Ávila y la Compañía de Jesús,” pp. 153–72; and DHCJ 4:3976–7, where the article’s author, M. Ruiz Jurado, avoids the true motive of the conflict between the Society and the Inquisitor.
154 Ribadeneyra, Vida de doña María de Mendoza, fundadora del Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús de Alcalá de Henares.
155 Ribadeneyra, “De Prognatis genere Hebraeorum Societatis aditu non excluden-
dis,” in Mon Rib. 2:374: “Es contra nuestras constituciones, las cuales non excluyen a los tales, ni por impedimento esencial, ni por secundario ser de tal o tal generación.”
156 In his letter to General Congregation 5 asking for the exclusion from the Society of subjects of Jewish ancestry, Manuel Rodrigues, an assistant general for the Province of Portugal and a leader of the anti-converso party (see Chapter Three), argued as follows: “Petitur a Congregatione ut decretum conficiat, quo statuatur ut confessi (id est homines qui ex Iudaeorum sanguine emanant) in Societatem admissi non possint. Quam […] haec petitio sit, constare ex eo potest quod confessorum admission pugnat cum bono Societatis nomine, cum realitate ista atque cum Constitutionibus” (ARSI, Inst. 184/II, f. 356).
The final solution Nadal adopted in this case was what Loyola boldly suggested for other morasses of the kind: to object to the discriminatory anti-converso policies in Iberia by sending converso candidates to Rome, where—as Polanco proudly stressed in a letter commissioned by Loyola—such discrimination did not exist:

As to your suggestion to our Father to remove the distinction between New and Old Christians in the Society, he had already removed it, for those who are good and suitable to our institute are accepted here without distinction; but there in Spain, being things of the Society still tender, in order not to excite many contradictions, which impede foundations and the course of the divine service, it is necessary to use somehow these distinctions, not being clarified outside what is clear inside, that is, that there is no favoritism of peoples or lineages. However, we have written there, and this is the intention of our Father, not to bar any good subject because of his descent from Jews or Moors; and if an outrage is feared in one place, the subject can be moved elsewhere; and if he does not fit well in Spain, send him to us in Italy, where there are not such biases, which certainly seem unworthy of such good and intelligent Christians who are in Spain.  

Nadal explained this Jesuit policy to the converso-phobic Archbishop Silíceo, who was willing to burn all Jesuits for their alleged converso

---

158 “Quanto al quitar nuestro Padre la distinción de christianos nuevos y viejos en la Compañía, ya la tiene quitada, porque sin distinción se aceptan por acá los que son buenos y aptos para nuestro instituto; pero allá en España, por ser las cosas de la Compañía aún tiernas, por no excitar tantas contradicciones, que impidan las fundaciones y el curso del divino servicio, es menester usar así algún modo de estas, no se aclarando tanto en lo de fuera, cuanto se siente en lo de dentro, que no hay aceptación de personas ni linajes [Romans 2:11]. Todavía se ha escrito allá, y esta es la intención de nuestro Padre, que no se deje de aceptar ningún buen supósito por descendir de moros o judíos; y si se teme desedificación en una parte, que le muden a otra; y no cabiendo bien en España, nos los envíen a Italia, donde no hay esos respectos, que, cierto, parecen bien indignos de christianos tan buenos y de tan buenos entendimientos como los hay en España” (Mon Ign. 9:150).

See also Guzmán’s letter to Acquaviva against the 1593 decree: “Pues vimos los que nos hallamos en su tiempo que se recibían en Roma algunos sujetos sin hacer dificultad ninguna el ser de este linaje, por muy cercano o fresco que fuese antes en cierta manera por ellos, los recibían más fácilmente, si tenían las otras partes convenientes para ser recibidos” (Inst. 186e, f. 355r) and Ribadeneyra’s opinion on the issue in Mon Rib. 2:279: “Entre los hombres más insignes en santidad, letras, prudencia y raros dones de la Compañía, algunos ha habido deste linaje.” Alarcón, Guzmán, and Ribadeneyra follow here an old argument that had been made in the fifteenth-century pro-converso writings by, for example, Alonso Díaz de Montalvo and Alonso de Cartagena, as we have seen in Chapter One.

159 See Chron. [501].
background,\textsuperscript{160} when the two reluctantly met head-on in Toledo in February 1554.\textsuperscript{161} In his much later letter to Acquaviva against the 1593 decree, Guzmán would remind him that Silíceo had offered Nadal a sly deal: “If you bar in your Constitutions the converso candidates, I shall build you a great college.” Accosting the archbishop, Nadal had abjured it as contrary to Ignatius’s will and intention.\textsuperscript{162}

Consequently, Nadal sent a message to Medina [del Campo], where Loarte’s family lived, inviting Loarte and Guzmán to come with him to Rome, after having pronounced their first religious vows. Nadal justified his decision in his report to Loyola in May 1554: neither Loarte nor Guzmán had any impediment. Furthermore, he expressed his hope that the Lord be served not only in Spain by their spiritual work but also in Rome by their financial support for the Jesuit projects there—Guzmán and Loarte were carrying with them 300–400 ducats and held approximately 9,000 \textit{maravedíes} of benefits.\textsuperscript{163}

Nadal’s wish was fulfilled. Loarte, who was already fifty-six when he entered the Society and who died after twenty-four years of working mostly in Italy, became one of the most prolific, published, and translated spiritual writers of the first generation of Jesuits. He was particularly interested in writing on the distinctive aspects of Catholicism: Christ’s passion, devotion to Mary Mother of God, and sacramental confession. He published \textit{Esercitio de la vita Christiana} (Genoa, 1557), \textit{Instuttaione et avisi, per meditar la Passione di Christo} (Rome, 1570), [\textit{Trattato} dell’i remedii contr’il gravissimo peccato della bastem-mia} (Venice, 1573), \textit{Istruttione et avvertimenti per meditar i misteri del Rosario} (Rome, 1573), \textit{Conforto de gli aflitli} (Rome, 1574), \textit{Trattato delle sante peregrinationi} (Rome, 1575), \textit{Antidoto spirituale contra la

\textsuperscript{160} See Mon Nadal 1:233: “El arzobispo dice que todos somos cristianos nuevos”; and a letter to Loyola by Francisco de Villanueva from 1551, quoted by Astrain, \textit{Historia}, p. 353: “[Silíceo] comenzó a decir que nos quemaría a todos.”

\textsuperscript{161} At the occasion, Nadal delivered in Toledo some letters to the converso family of Pedro de Ribadeneyra.

\textsuperscript{162} “Y por proseguir esta razón de la intención y voluntad de nuestro bendito padre Ignacio acerca de este punto se confirma con lo que sucedió al padre Jerónimo Nadal cuando vino a España a publicar las Constituciones por orden de nuestro padre, que fue cuando el arzobispo de Toledo Silicio se mostró contrario a la Compañía, especialmente porque entendió que se recibían también los de aquel linaje como los demás; y dijo al padre Nadal lo cual yo se lo oí, ‘Haced constitución de no recibirlos y yo os fundaré un gran colegio de vuestra Compañía.’ Y le respondió el padre Nadal, esto no se dará en ninguna manera, entendiend que tal cosa sería contra la intención y voluntad de nuestro padre Ignacio” (ARSI, \textit{Instit. 186e}, ff. 354v–355).

\textsuperscript{163} See Mon Nadal 1:257.
He was followed in the Society by his brother Baltasar, also a disciple of Juan de Ávila, who left Nadal a telling auto-biographical note: “I have [also] two widowed sisters in Medina and two married brothers in Granada, all rich. [...] I had a very good library that I left to the Society, in which I studied the Scripture and sacred doctors.”

Diego de Guzmán, after being trained by Loyola in Rome, where he was immediately named minister of the casa professa (1554–5), became a confidant of Leonora Álvarez de Toledo (1522–62), Duchess of Tuscany, while taking care of the Jesuit College in Florence. In 1562 he replaced his old friend Loarte as rector of the college in Genoa. Subsequently, he taught catechism in many parts of Italy. Based on this and prior experience with Juan de Ávila, Guzmán wrote Modo per insegnar con frutto la dottrina christiana [A Way of Teaching Christian Doctrine Successfully] (1585). He desired to go to Brazil as a missionary, but because of his impaired hearing and ignorance of the local language, Borja instead required his presence in Rome (1567), where he directed the House of Catechumens. Twenty years later he returned to Seville, where he spent the last two decades of his life. Guzmán would oppose the anti-converso decree of 1593 in an unpublished letter to Ribadeneyra that we shall analyze in Chapter Four.

Nadal was so far from discriminating against Judeo-converso candidates that, after Loarte and Guzmán, he admitted other disciples of Juan de Ávila, removing in this way the last doubts of the latter that the anti-converso policy of Iberian Jesuits was contrary to the course of Loyola and the Jesuit Constitutions. Nadal reported to Loyola from Valladolid in March 1554 that after he and Ávila met in Cordoba, Father [Diego] Santa Cruz from Lisbon, Father [Cristóbal] Carvajal from Valencia, and another two of Ávila’s unnamed disciples

---

164 See DHCJ, 3:2402–3.
165 See Mon Nadal 1:605.
166 See Scaduto, Governo, pp. 579–82.
167 See ARSI, Opp. NN. 55, ff. 135r–137.
168 “Después que hay este decreto, se han retirado muchos sujetos que tienen partes muy esenciales y de grande estimación y que fueran muy estimados y de gran fruto en la Compañía” (Diego de Guzmán, “Las razones que hay para que el decreto de la Quinta Congregación General se haya de abrogar y deshacer que determina que no sean recibidos los que son de linaje de Judios o de Moros,” in ARSI, Inst. 186e, ff. 353–8).
169 He was born in Granada in 1518 and died in 1594.
170 He was born in Talaván in 1518 and died in Placentia in 1557.
entered the Society. One of the latter was taken by Nadal, together with Loarte and Guzmán, to Rome, and from a joyful letter by Polanco to Francisco de Borja one infers that his name was Manuel de Sá. He was born in 1528 into a converso family from Villa de Conde (Portugal). Still as a novice, Sá was asked by Loyola to examine the Jesuit Constitutions before their promulgation. As a professor of theology and exegesis at the Collegio Romano (1556–72) he contributed with the converso Diego de Ledesma to the elaboration of the Ratio Studiorum. Like his other converso confreres (Loarte, Polanco, and Toledo), he became a prolific author of manuals for confessors: his Aphorismi Confessariorum (Venice, 1592) had at least eighty editions, including its Japanese translation issued in Nagasaki in 1605.

No doubt, Nadal was sincerely convinced that Jewish ancestry was not an impediment for Jesuit candidates. In a passionate discussion over the admission of a converso candidate by the name of Santander,

---

171 See Mon Nadal 1:226–7. M. Ruiz Jurado, in his “San Juan de Ávila,” p. 158, lists twenty-eight of Ávila’s disciples who entered the Society. One of these two must have been either Luis de Santander or Alonso Ruiz, about whom much will be said below.


173 Diego de Ledesma: *1524 Cuéllar (Segovia); SJ 1556; †1575 Rome; priest in 1557; professed in 1560. For more on him, see below.


175 A further confirmation of Nadal’s view on the issue is his letter to Loyola about the acceptance of Ávila himself to the Society: “El P. Doctor Torres se ha partido para Córdoba… Va animado mucho con esperanza que el Mtro. Ávila mismo ha de entrar en la Compañía, y yo le dije que me parecía bien, habida la dispensación, porque ha sido fraile, y no he sabido aún si profesó. Hanme movido a conceder esto dos cosas. Lo uno lo que me dicen Villanueva y otros, que ha deseado V[uestra] P[aternidad] traerle cuando le mandó visitar, etc.; la otra el juicio de D. Antonio, que muy especialmente lo desea, y también el P. Francisco y el doctor Torres, todos lo tienen por gran cosa que entrase: por el contrario, hay el impedimento dicho, ser viejo y enfermo, cristiano nuevo, y perseguido en tiempo pasado por la Inquisición, aunque claramente absuelto; y después de los suyos ha tomado la Inquisición algunos, no sé si de todo absueltos. […] Tiene grandes partes, gran entendimiento, mucho espiritu y letras muchas, y talento grande de predicar y conversar, gran fruto, especialmente en Andalucía, y está en gran crédito de todos” (Mon Nadal 1:249). Pedro Ribadeneyra in his stubborn criticism of the Jesuit anti-converso policy brought an example of Ávila: “El P. Mtro. Ávila dijo que por dos cosas se podría perder la Compañía: la primera, por admitir a ella mucha turba; y la segunda por hacer distinción de linajes y sangre” (Mon Rib. 2:381).

176 It must have been Luis (Diego) de Santander (1527–99) from Écija (Seville). Like Loarte and Guzmán, he was a disciple of Juan de Ávila. With Baltasar Piñas, he
he replied: “We [Jesuits] take a pleasure in admitting those of Jewish ancestry.”

In this context, a narrative of Nadal’s alleged strong anti-Jewish sentiments reported by his secretary Diego Jiménez in the *Commentary on the life and virtues of Fr. Nadal*, written in the 1560s, must raise historians’ eyebrows. Jiménez naively recounts that during his stay in Avignon, Nadal was offered a position of chief rabbi by the Jewish community there, for he knew Hebrew so well. But he categorically refused the offer with indignation by calling the Jews “marranos,” and “diabolical spirits and heretics in the Law of Moses.” The French soldiers, hearing Nadal arguing with the Jews in Hebrew, called Nadal himself a “marrano.” However, in his personal diary, Nadal presented a quite different version of this episode. He narrated that during the turmoil that resulted from the war between France and Spain, one of the French soldiers took Nadal, who was holding in his hand a Hebrew Pentateuch, by his beard and exclaimed: “You, Jewish dog!” Nadal did not report that he responded to that offence.

It is, thus, hard to reconcile Nadal’s supposed Judeo-phobia, as portrayed by his secretary Jiménez, with his alacrity to admit into the Society candidates of Jewish ancestry, as portrayed in his own writings.

What was Jiménez’s purpose, then, in informing his Jesuit readers

worked with *moriscos* (see Medina, “La Compañía de Jesús y la minoría morisca,” *AHSI* 57 (1988): 3–136) and was confessor of the converso Teresa de Ávila, whom he helped found her convents in Medina del Campo (1567) and Segovia (1574), where he was rector of the first Jesuit college. Alonso Rodríguez was his disciple in Valencia. Santander was an outspoken opponent of the anti-converso decree, whose consequences he personally experienced—Baltasar de Santofimia (likely himself a converso) opposed his appointment as rector of the college in Écija, and Cristóbal Méndez contested his nomination as rector in Seville. Also his two brothers, Jerónimo (1541–74) and Antonio (b. 1539), entered the Society (see *DHCJ*, pp. 3499–500).

177 “Disputavi etiam acriter contra opinionem Soti, quod ordo correpotionis evangeliaca non esset servandus in crimine haereseos: conquestus est apud me quod non recuperemus, qui ductunt a judaem originem; se id scire de Araozio et Mirone. Respondi ita non esse; sed habere nos delectum in illis recipiendis” (*Mon Nadal* 2:21). This and other stories show clearly that the early Jesuit leadership’s opposition to the converso discrimination was one of principle, for it was against the Jesuit Constitutions, contrary to what Foa suggests in her “Limpieza versus Mission” (pp. 307–8).


179 See *Mon Nadal* 1:4–5.

180 Jesuit documents on the subject show that Jesuit Judeo-phobia and converso-phobia, as well as Judeo-philea and converso-philea, went hand in hand, even though one could object that a converso-phobe could be at the same time a Judeo-phile, or vice versa. Apparently it was not so among early Jesuits, because of the common genealogical identification of conversos with Jews.
about Nadal’s anti-Jewish invectives in Avignon, the veracity of which cannot be uncritically accepted, although a few historians who commented on it do consider Jiménez’s version reliable?181 Is it possible that Jiménez’s account was an attempt to assure his Jesuit confreres that Nadal himself was not of Jewish descent? One way of answering that question is by exploring Nadal’s likely converso background. In addition to the connection made earlier, there are a number of additional hints that might point to Nadal’s Jewish origins, which he, as almost all other converso Jesuits, may have kept strictly undisclosed.

The first tip comes from the topography of the city of Majorca. Nadal’s native home and that of his mother’s family were located next to the church of Santa Eulalia—the center of the converso (chueta) quarter in the City of Majorca throughout the sixteenth century.182 Still today, the two streets in that neighborhood, Carrer Pare Nadal and Calle Morey, testify to Jerónimo Nadal’s family roots.183

The second hint comes from the archives of the Spanish Inquisition. At least four conversos who bore the name of Nadal were tried by this tribunal at the end of the fifteenth century (Gaspar in 1489, the dyers Pablo and his wife Martina in 1497, and Pau, who was a tailor),184 and

---


182 The chueta quarter is to be distinguished from the Jewish one that was adjacent to it, even though both pertained to the same parish of St. Eulalia. I personally confused the two quarters in my “Jerónimo Nadal” (DEI, p. 1315), following M. Ruiz Jurado in his “Jerónimo Nadal” (DHCJ 2:2793).

183 In the past, there was another street in the Santa Eulalia quarter, Calle de Nadals (today Calle de la Campana), named after the family of Nadal, who owned a house there in the second half of the sixteenth century: “El Magnifico Antonio Nadal, Ciudadano militar, que fue el último poseedor de la casa, la vendió a Bernardo Barrera […] en 10 de mayo de 1599. El Antonio Nadal citado, las había adquirido de Pedro Jerónimo Nadal […] en 4 de Julio de 1563, y este a su vez por compra a la Magnifica Beatriz Dezcallar […] en 24 octubre de 1560” (Diego Zaforteza y Musoles, La ciudad de Mallorca. Ensayo histórico-toponímico [Palma de Mallorca: Ajuntament, 1960], vol. 4, pp. 321–2). I have not yet been able to establish the connection of these Nadals to Jerónimo. When the latter departed from Majorca in 1545, he left on the island his only brother, Esteban Nadal (see Nadal, Chronicon [35]: “Navegué solo hasta Barcelona, dejado el cuidado de los asuntos familiares a mi hermano Esteban, bajo la supervisión de mi tío Morey”). At any rate, this information indicates the bond of various Nadals with the chueta quarter of the city.

184 See Lorenzo Pérez, ed., Anales Judaicos de Mallorca (Palma de Mallorca: Ripoli, 1974), p. 237; and Pérez, Inquisición de Mallorca, Reconciliados y relajados, 1488–1691 (Barcelona: [M. Perdigó], 1946), Index.
at least one in the seventeenth century (Rafael Nadal Pomár de Benito in 1679).185

The third hint involves possible converso associations of the surname Nadal.186 Bishop Bernardo Nadal Crespí (bishop 1794–1818) was the first head of the Majorcan Church to allow chueta candidates to enter the priesthood. Jaume Nadal, together with the well-known prominent converso families of Valls, Aguiló, Fuster, Pomár, and Segura, in 1672 was a co-founder of the Majorcan Sociedad de Seguros de Transportes Maritimos.187 With such strong circumstantial evidence, little doubt remains about Nadal’s Jewish ancestry.

Nonetheless, when the life of Ignatius of Loyola began reaching its zenith, the professed Jesuits in Rome elected Jerónimo Nadal vicar general, as soon as he returned from his trip to Spain, accompanied by Diego de Guzmán, Gaspar de Loarte, and Manuel de Sá (November 1554). Because he was often away visiting the Jesuit provinces across Europe, the daily duties of the government were fulfilled by his converso collaborators, Polanco and Madrid.

The latter was born in 1503 to a converso family of Daimiel near Toledo. He arrived in Rome as a theologian of Cardinal of Trani, Giovan Domenico de Cupis (1493–1553), who would become one of the major supporters of Loyola’s apostolate with Roman Jews. Remaining the cardinal’s guest and associate, Madrid began collaborating in the Jesuit project for the Roman prostitutes, the St. Martha House. In 1550, his brother Alfonso entered the Society, and Cristóbal followed suit in 1554. Only one year later Loyola appointed him his assistant general for Italy, while entrusting him with the care of the Casa Professa and the supervision of colleges, even though he had not yet pronounced his final vows and thus was not de iure a full Jesuit. These numerous duties did not prevent Madrid from fulfilling Ignatius’s request (which Salmerón and Andrés de Oviedo had failed to fulfil)188 to compose

---

185 See AHN, Inquisición, lib. 364, f. 249r and Lleonard Mutaner i Mariano, ed., Ralación de los Sanbenitos 1755 (Mallorca: Miquel Fonf, 1993), pp. 20–1. Note that the surname Pomár is a typical name among Majorcan chuetas, who practiced endogamy. Thus, it is very unlikely that Raphael’s mother, Pomár, would have married a non-chueta.


187 Gabriel Cortés Cortés, Historia de los Judíos Mallorquines y de sus descendientes cristianos (Miquel Font: Mallorca, 1985), vol. 1, p. 182; and Cortés Cortés, Origen Genealógico de algunos Apellidos existentes en Mallorca e Historia de los Judíos de España (Valencia: Ediciones Franva, 1965), Index.

188 For more on Oviedo, see below.
a kind of Eucharistic directory, *Libellus de frequenti usu sacramenti Eucharistiae*. Its first anonymous edition appeared in Naples already in 1556, and the official one was printed by the Jesuits in Rome in 1557. Later editions of Madrid’s booklet were often bound with Polanco’s *Breve directorium* that we have analyzed above. Cristóbal de Madrid was one of the only two Jesuits (the other one was André de Freux) who were present at Ignatius’s death 31 July 1556.

_The converso triumvirate: the election of Diego Laínez_

When Ignatius died, his vicar general, Nadal, was far away in Spain—the news about Loyola’s death, transmitted by Ribadeneyra, reached Nadal only in September 1556 at Alcalá. It was his task now to organize a general congregation that would elect a new superior general of the Society. However, according to the Society’s secretary Polanco, Nadal’s appointment expired with Loyola’s death. Thus, Polanco informed Nadal that the professed Jesuits in Rome had congregated and elected a new vicar general, Diego Laínez. Even though Nadal may have had some legal ground to claim that he still had the right to exercise his office, he embraced and recognized immediately the election of Laínez. He rushed back to Rome by horse to support the latter in his difficult task of convoking the congregation—a task that would be delayed for two years due to the war being waged between King Philip II and Pope Paul IV. During this interregnum period, the Society was governed by Laínez and his devoted collaborators Polanco, Nadal, and Madrid.

The accumulation of power in the hands of these few was profoundly resented by one of Ignatius’s early companions, the eccentric Nicolás Bobadilla. He campaigned against the triumvirate at the papal court and elsewhere, arguing that Laínez was being manipulated by his associates. He also claimed that the Jesuit *Constitutions* had to be approved by the ten founding fathers (and not just by Ignatius, whom he accused of being a “malign sophist”), and that until then the three men had no legal authority. In his memorial to the governor of Loreto, Gaspare de’ Dotti, sent from Rome in 1557, Bobadilla wrote: “Laínez is good, but he allows himself to be governed by his two sons, who have fallen

---

189 See Mon Nadal 2:53.
into many errors, as you will see in the attachment."190 The attached document is Bobadilla’s *Disordini fatti in poco tempo in questo malo loro governo* [Disorders made in a brief time in this bad government of theirs]. Among the thirteen accusations, its author wrote in the first paragraph that “the three, Laínez, Polanco, and Nadal […] secluded themselves for many days and discussed among them certain things and not in public with the [general] congregation.”191 It is interesting to note that this accusation is similar to what Benedetto Palmio would write later about the role of conversos during General Congregation 3, as we shall see below.

Bobadilla’s argumentation was harshly criticized by Nadal, who accused him of being ambitious, worldly, seditious, and an unquiet soul (these epithets are typical in the anti-converso writings of the period, as we have seen in the previous chapter). Then Bobadilla reached for another type of weapon. Benedetto Palmio suggested that Bobadilla, in his attempt to dismantle the New Christian “triumvirate” in Rome,192 pointed out to Pope Paul IV (who was known for his antipathy toward Jews and Spaniards and, therefore, also toward Laínez)193 that Laínez and many of his collaborators were of Jewish lineage, even though Araoz and Palmio claimed that Bobadilla himself belonged to the same stock. Perhaps Bobadilla made these charges in order to veil his own *Morisco* background.194 A hint that this is so is that Bobadilla was not Nicolás’s real name. His family name was Alonso y Pérez, and Bobadilla [del Camino] was a town in Placencia where he was born c. 1509. This “rough and rustic like his native land”195 Spaniard studied rhetoric and logic in Valladolid and then philosophy at the University of Alcalá, where he earned his baccalaureate. There, like Laínez and Salmerón, he must have heard of Ignatius. Subsequently

---

189 See *Mon Nadal* 4:105.
190 “Laínez è buono, ma lasciarsi governare di due figliuoli suoi, i quali l’hanno precipitato in tanti errori, come vedrà per l’allegata” (*Mon Nadal* 4:105).
192 To my knowledge, Palmio’s memorial is the only document that interprets the crisis after Loyola’s death in terms of the converso conflict. On different interpretations of Bobadilla’s discontent, see *DHCJ* 1:464–5; and Scaduto, *Governo*, pp. 45–7.
194 See S. Pey Ordeix in his *Historia crítica de San Ignacio de Loyola… Estudio analítico de la vida e historia del santo fundador de la Compañía hecho directamente sobre los documentos de los archivos nacionales y extranjeros, especialmente de los secretos del Vaticano, de la inquisición y de la Compañía* (Madrid: Impr. de A. Marzo, 1916), p. 222; and ARSI, *Vitae* 164, f. 17r–v.
Figure 8. Nicolás Bobadilla (c. 1509–90)—the converso opponent of the “converso triumvirate”
he began studying theology, first in Alcalá under Juan de Medina and then back in Valladolid under Diego de Astudillo (both masters were of probable converso ancestry), but he eventually followed the fame of Loyola up to Paris, where he joined the íñigistas. In the context of his anti-converso conspiracy at the papal court, which—according to Benedetto Palmio—was the beginning of how “the worms infested the apple,” one ought not be surprised to learn that Bobadilla eagerly assisted at the burning of the Talmud (“and other heretic”) books in Ancona in 1554.

In spite of Bobadilla’s conspiracy, however, the pope was assured through his envoys, Cardinal Alberto Pio di Carpi and Cardinal Michele Ghislieri, that all Jesuit priests in Rome, except for Bobadilla and his French confrere Ponce Cogordan (1500–82), recognized Laínez’s authority as vicar general. In addition, Nadal successfully persuaded the papal circles that Loyola’s Constitutions did not contain any error. Subsequently, Laínez called for the congregation to meet in June 1558. Now the provincial congregations had to elect their delegates according to the rule established by Polanco and Nadal (superior provincial plus two elected professed delegates). The first to do so was the Italian province. Not surprisingly, Laínez, Polanco, and Nadal were chosen to represent it.

As the assembly gathered, Laínez wanted to prevent the election of any ambitious person and for that purpose composed a document consisting of twelve canons. Nadal objected to it by arguing that those were not part of the Jesuit Constitutions. Nadal’s criticism resulted in a rumor that he was conspiring to become superior general, but Polanco’s investigation, requested by Laínez, proved the rumor to be false. With the papal blessing obtained by Laínez and Salmerón, the First General Congregation began. In the room where Ignatius died, on 2 July Laínez was elected Loyola’s successor with thirteen out of twenty votes. Nadal received four votes, and three other candidates

---

196 See ARSI, Vitae 164 f. 17’.
198 See Scaduto, Governo, p. 94.
199 See ARSI, Congr. I, f. 3’; and Inst. 222, f. 210’.
200 See Mon Nadal 2:59–60.
(Broet, Lanoy, and Borja) received one each.\footnote{94} Polanco reported in
a letter to Oliviero Manareo that the results of voting brought much
joy and consolation to all but Laínez.\footnote{94} Neither for the electors nor
for the Judeo-phobic Pope Paul IV, who approved the election with a
moving speech,\footnote{94} was Laínez’s converso lineage—that he made pub-
lic at the occasion—\footnote{94} any impediment to his election to the highest
administrative post in the Society of Jesus, despite the discontent of
the Spanish court and attempts of later Jesuits to conceal it.

One of the earliest Jesuit historians who adamantly opposed these
attempts to falsify Laínez’s ancestry was the Italian historian Francesco
Sacchini (1570–1625). When his History containing the information
about Laínez’s Jewish background appeared in 1622, many Spanish
Jesuits overwhelmed Superior General Mutius Vitelleschi (1563–1645)
with requests to delete it:

The Province of Toledo, united in a congregation, unanimously petitions
our Reverend Father General to see to it that what is written in the second
volume of the History of the Society about the ancestry of Father James
Laynez is deleted. We beg for the removal of so great a slur on the sweet
memory of so great a Father. Let there be no mention of it whatever in
the second edition, and in this first we ask that Father General would
immediately cause the page containing this foul blot which damages the
whole Society to be cut out and replaced by another asserting the purity
and nobility of the Father’s lineage. We give a few of the many reasons
which may induce his Paternity to grant the petition. First, what the
History discloses about the birth of this great man is false, as witnesses
of the utmost probity who have investigated the matter testify. Secondly,
even if true, it would serve no useful purpose but cause the greatest harm
and be downright sinful to brand a General of the Society and one of its
founders with that infamy. Thirdly, the vile imputation is not confined
to our Father Laynez alone but reflects on all his kin… Among others,
the Marquis of Almazán who is not ashamed to count the Father among
his relatives is deeply offended by it…

\footnote{94}{See Mon Nadal 2:62.}
\footnote{94}{See Mon Laínez 3:394–7.}
\footnote{94}{See Mon Laínez 3:398–9 and 8:665–9. Possevino claimed that Paul IV wanted
to make Laínez a cardinal and that some cardinals wanted him to be elected as pope
after the former’s death (see AHSI, Inst. 184/II, f. 351’).}
\footnote{94}{See Possevino’s memorial (AHSI, Inst. 184/II, f. 350’): “P. Giacopo Laínez nato
però in Almanzano di padre quale si sa. Il quale P. Laínez eletto poi in generale, et
esso ricusandolo con accennar anco ingenuamente il suo nascimento, la congrega-
ze, unita di quei primi padri che [sono] venuto [e] avevano il sincero spirito della
Compagnia, giudicò nel cospetto di Dio frivola ogni obiezione, la quale nascesse dalla
considerazione di simili rispetti del mondo.” See also Possevino’s letter to Sacchini in
AHSI, Vitae 162, ff. 59–60’.
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Figure 9. The Italian Jesuit historian Francesco Sacchini (1570–1625)
Sacchini, whom the Toledan Jesuits asked to be punished, straightforwardly replied:

Verily I am a luckless miserable fellow and scarcely could there be a more wretched creature, for who will spare a little sympathy for one who manages to offend everybody? Many a year now have I been sweating over my books, fondly hoping by my labors and torments to please God in the first place, then our fathers now in Heaven with Him, and after that the present and future Society, as well as my neighbor in general. And behold the result, the evil fruit of my honest endeavors. I have gravely offended God, villainously degraded and disgraced a most eminent and saintly man now reigning with Him, wounded the Society itself by fixing on it a foul blot and dishonor, and even contaminated my neighbor with infamy…. O Father of mercies, in Thy infinite goodness forgive me! And may the good fathers of Spain listen with patience to what their wicked son, if son he may be called, has to say in his own defense, so that though condemned unheard, he may be not punished without a hearing…. I therefore declare that what is revealed in the History is so certain as to leave no possible room for doubt in the mind of any prudent man acquainted with the proofs on which it rests. The first proof is that the fact was known throughout the Society from the beginning. I have been hearing of it for thirty-five years, and never until now have I come upon anyone who doubted it. Many of our older fathers have read my History and not a man of them regarded the statement about Laynez as news to him. Indeed, I have been widely congratulated for not having passed it over. Cardinal Bellarmine and his confessor, Father Fabius, together with five former assistants to the General, all men well versed in the study of our origins, had not the slightest doubt about the truth of the story. Nor had the assistants who revised the History nor Father General himself. Father Antonio Possevino expressly asserts its truth, and Father Ribadeneyra plainly signifies the same in several places. While Father García Alarcón, an assistant, was on a visitation of the provinces of Castile and Toledo he addressed to Father General a memorial giving reasons why the decree about the non-admission of New Christians should be modified. In this he wrote as follows: “Our holy Father Ignatius admitted men of Jewish extraction who by their sanctity and learning have rendered our Society illustrious and at the Council of Trent preserved its institute inviolate.” None but Láinez can be in question here, for though there were other fathers at Trent on him alone fell the responsibility of defending the Society in the Council. Let the older fathers still happily among us be asked for their opinion and I guarantee that they will answer in my sense. Why, the Province of Toledo itself at a former congregation held in the year 1600 signified the same thing when petitioning for a modification of the decree about New

205 We shall analyze Alarcón’s memorial in Chapter Four.
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We shall analyze Alarcón’s memorial in Chapter Four.

I come upon anyone who doubted it. Many of our older fathers have read my history, and not a man of them regarded the statement about the Provincial Congregation of Toledo in 1649, requesting this time early Jesuit pro-converso policy (1540–72) Interestingly enough, the same kind of petition was sent to Rome by the Provincial Congregation of Toledo in 1649, requesting this time that the information about the Jewish ancestry of Polanco be deleted from Sacchini’s History.  

---


207 See ARSI, *Congr.* 74, ff. 79–80. Sacchini’s text in question was the following: “Eo demum descendit Pontifex, ut libera Congregatio esset: cum eo tamen, ut si forte Hispano homini munus imponeretur, ante promulgationem sibi significaret. Quod plerique, coniectura haud dubia, repellendo Polanco accipere: sive is Neophytus, ac favere Neophytis putaretur, sive etiam a quopiam timentur, ac praevertim ab Edmundo Augerio, qui ad eum ex Hispania redeuntem cum Borgia, de nimo inter cetera Nationum studio delatus fuerat” (Sacchini, *Historiae Societatis Iesu*, vol. 4 [Everardus], liber 1, pp. 6–7).
The quoted words of Sacchini reflect the spirit of Loyola that the delegates of General Congregation 1 wished to preserve. They decided that the *Constitutions* written by Ignatius could not be altered, for they believed—to use García Alarcón’s later observation—that he probably had received their substantial points from God himself.\(^{208}\) Thus, Loyola’s non-discrimination policy towards candidates of Jewish ancestry was sanctioned. The Congregation subsequently approved the Latin official translation of the *Constitutions* rendered by Polanco, who took into consideration the notes suggested to Loyola by himself, Madrid, and Nadal. The latter was commissioned by the assembly to write a commentary that, under the title of *Scholia in Constitutiones*, would be recommended as normative by the following General Congregation 2 (1565).\(^{209}\)

The authority of the “converso triumvirate” was also upheld at the administrative level. General Congregation 1 elected them as assistants general to Diego Laínez—Madrid for Italy and Sicily; Polanco for Spain; and Nadal for Germany, Flanders, and France. Additionally, Madrid continued to be minister of the *casa professa*, Nadal to supervise the Roman College, and Polanco to head the secretariat, exercising also an office of the *admonitor* to the superior general.\(^{210}\) Nadal requested from the congregation that the assistants general be given the right to vote *ex officio* and to keep their offices until the election of the next superior general.\(^{211}\) Remembering clearly the lack of full comprehension of the vicar general’s function after Loyola’s death (Nadal vs. Laínez), a Congregation’s committee that included Polanco and Nadal—without having enough time to redact a document—declared that the vicar general had the function not only to convocate a general congregation to elect a new superior general but also to replace the superior general during any absence from Rome. That was a prescient clarification, for Laínez would be absent from his headquarters quite often. The longest absence was due to his (and Polanco’s) participation in the colloquy of Poissy (1562) and in the last session of the Council of Trent in

\(^{208}\) “[... ] quod nos a Patre nostro Ignatio accepimus eumque probabiliter credimus illud a Deo immediate recepisses quoad omnia substantialia” (ARSI, *Inst. 184-I*, f. 304).


\(^{210}\) The *admonitor*’s job was to “admonish the general with due modesty and humility about what in him he thinks would be for the greater service and glory of God” (*Const.* [770]).

\(^{211}\) See ARSI, *Congr. 20a*, ff. 10 and 176.
1563. They were accompanied there by Nadal, who joined them on his way back from Spain, from where, in spite of being entrusted with Laínez’s powers, he was forced to leave on request of the converso-phobic royal official, Ruy Gómez, a penitent of the Jesuit Antonio de Araoz. Cristóbal de Madrid was appointed vicar general in Rome for that period, temporarily flanked by Ribadeneyra.

Ribadeneyra continued to enjoy much influence during Laínez’s generalate. With Salmerón he was entrusted with another mission to Flanders in 1557, where he accompanied Cardinal Carlo Carafa (1517–61).208 From there he flanked Count of Feria in his embassy to the dying “Bloody Mary,” Queen Mary I Tudor (1516–58). Taking advantage of this opportunity to travel to London, Ribadeneyra was asked to explore the possibility of establishing the Society there, but the rise in power of Queen Elizabeth I (1533–1603) forced the young Jesuit to return hastily to the Continent. This brief yet memorable visit to England influenced Ribadeneyra’s later work on the ecclesiastical history of the English Reformation, Historia eclesiástica del cisma del Reino de Inglaterra. In 1559, Laínez summoned him to Rome, where Ribadeneyra was given supervision of the Germanicum College and became visitor of the colleges in Amelia, Perugia, and Loreto. After the latter mission Laínez admitted him to the solemn profession in September 1560 and promoted him to the post of superior provincial of Tuscany, arguing that “the new provincial has a talent of preaching, of doctrine, and of spirit. Besides, he is a prudent person, trained to deal with important affairs in his many years in the Society from its beginning, and very familiar with our Father Ignatius.”210 In 1561 Laínez made him an associate of Salmerón, who was nominated vicar general during Laínez’s and Polanco’s trip to France and Trent.

Upon his return from this exhausting journey, the fifty-three-year-old Diego Laínez died at dawn on 19 January 1565, Francisco de Borja present at his deathbed.214 Polanco flanked the latter, who—elected vicar general—was now in charge of preparing the Second General Congregation that met on 21 June 1565. The assembly of delegates elected Borja as the new superior general on the first ballot, with thirty-one
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208 “[. . .] quod nos a Patre nostro Ignatio accepimus eumque probabiliter credi-mus illud a Deo immediate recepisse quoad omnia substantialia” (ARSI, f. 304).
209 See Scaduto, Governo, p. 109; and idem, Mon. Rib. 1:xi.
210 Th e authority of the “converso triumvirate” was also upheld at the Congregation that the vicar general’s function aft er Loyola’s death (Nadal vs. Laínez), a prior general.211 Remembering clearly the lack of full comprehension of the quoted words of Sacchini refl ects the spirit of Loyola that the delegates of General Congregation 1 wished to preserve. Th ey decided that the
213 See Mon Rib. 1:xi.
214 See Mon Borgia 3:727.
out of the thirty-nine votes, many of which must have been cast by conversos, whom—according to Palmio—he loved unconditionally.

*Francisco de Borja’s infinite love of conversos*

Among the participants in the congregation were, of course, Bobadilla, Madrid, Nadal, Polanco, Ribadeneyra, and Salmerón, but other converso or pro-converso Jesuits also were electors. Ignacio de Azevedo, Juan Gurrea, Diego de Guzmán, Gaspar de Loarte, Manuel López, Cristóbal Rodríguez, Manuel de Sá, and Juan Alonso de Vitoria. Also Bartolomé Hernández, Diego Miró, Juan de Montoya, Alfonso Román, Juan Suárez, and Marcelo Vaz may have shown their pro-converso sympathy, given that each one of them may have had a converso background.

We have already followed the career of Manuel de Sá and the Siamese friends, Guzmán and Loarte; and the relation of the Toledan provincial, Manuel López, to the Salmantican moral theologian Enrique Enríquez has already been mentioned. But the careers of Ignacio [Inácio] de Azevedo and Cristóbal Rodríguez were no less remarkable. Azevedo came, like López, from Oporto (Portugal), where he was born in 1526 to a former priest, Manuel de Azevedo, and a former nun, Francisca de Abreu, and perhaps was related to the prominent Jesuit Simão Rodrigues [de Acevedo]. Ignacio’s maternal converso grandfather, João Gomes de Abreu (married to Joanna de Mello), was a famous poet and navigator. His younger brother, Jerónimo, was captain-general of the island of Ceylon [Sri Lanka] (1594–1612), where he welcomed Jesuit missionaries. Azevedo entered the Society in Coímbra in 1548 and subsequently was named rector of the Jesuit College at Lisbon and provincial of Portugal. Borja would appoint him the first visitor of the new Jesuit province in Brazil,215 where he would spend three

215 The beginnings of the Jesuit presence in Brazil are marked by the work of José de Anchieta Llarena (1534–97) from San Cristóbal de la Laguna (Tenerife, Canary Islands). He was born to a rich landowner who was originally from the Basque Country, Juan López de Anchieta (related to Ignatius of Loyola), and was a descendant of one of the conquerors of Tenerife, Mencia Díaz de Clavijo y Llarena, who was of Jewish ancestry. He co-founded the cities of São Paulo (1554) and Rio de Janeiro (1565) and is also considered the first Brazilian writer. Related to him was also another Jesuit, Luis Anchieta (1652–83) from La Orotava (Tenerife). He was born to María Ana de Abreu and Juan de Anchieta. Under the
years. On his second trip to Brazil in 1570, his flotilla Santiago was captured on 15 July near the Canary Islands by the Huguenot pirates led by Jacques Sourie. He and his thirty-nine young companions were stripped down, chopped in pieces, and thrown into the sea. Among them was a nephew of Teresa of Ávila, the Jesuit novice Francisco Pérez Godoy (b. 1540). The pope in 1854 beatified these forty Jesuits, known as the martyrs of Brazil, even though the efforts of the beatification had already begun with Antonio de Vieira (1608–97) in the seventeenth century.

Cristóbal Rodríguez—who is mentioned in Palmio’s memorial as part of the converso circle—after his doctorate in theology at Alcalá was appointed rector at the College of Gandía that had been founded by Borja. He accompanied Borja during his visit to Valladolid, and during the absence of Araoz, Rodríguez was named rector and vice-provincial of the two Castilian provinces (1559). As noted before, Rodríguez was sent with Giovanni Battista Eiano on a papal mission to the Copt patriarch of Alexandria in Egypt. Inquisitor Ghislieri would employ him also in the mission to the Valdese in southern Italy (1563), and Borja would choose him to govern the newly created Jesuit province of Rome (1567). On 7 October 1571, he would be one of the seven Jesuits present at the battle of Lepanto, where he accompanied don John of Austria (1547–78), at the pope’s request. Towards the end of Borja’s term, he would be appointed rector of the St. Peter Penitentiary in Rome. At the very conclusion of Laínez’s mandate (1565), he was appointed provincial of Tuscany, and as such he participated in General Congregation 2. (Rodríguez’s military courage was characteristic also of another converso Jesuit, Hernando de Torres, who died as a chaplain in the Great Armada in front of the Irish coast.)

pseudonym of Christóbal Pérez del Christo, he published a work on antiquities of the Canary Islands (see DHCJ 1:158).

216 See Polanco’s letter to Vázquez in ARSI, Ital. 68, f. 193v.

217 Cristóbal Rodríguez: *1521 Hita (Guadalajara, Spain); †1581 Naples; SJ 1554; priest before 1554; professed in 1559. See DHCJ 4:3395; Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 127; and Mario Scaduto, “La missione di Cristoforo Rodríguez al Cairo (1561–1563),” AHSI 54 (1958): 233–78.

218 Hernando de Torres: *1537 Portugal; SJ 1569 Cádiz; †1588. He had relations with the Jews of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), who offered him a reward for marrying a Jewish woman, which he refused. In turn, he took with him a rabbi’s son and made him Christian in Rome. See DHCJ 4:3821; and Francisco de Borja Medina, “Jesuitas en la armada contra Inglaterra,” AHSI 58 (1989): 35.

Figure 10. Bl. Ignacio de Azevedo (1526–70)—the martyred missionary of Brazil
After the choice of the new superior general, General Congregation 2 also elected *in absentia* an assistant to Francisco de Borja for Spain, Antonio Araoz, even though his own province had not chosen him as elector for that assembly. A moving letter from Borja to Araoz sheds some light on the reason why the converso Jesuits must have voted unanimously for this controversial relative of Loyola, whose blatant converso-phobic policy Benedetto Palmio juxtaposed in his memorial to the pro-converso openness of Borja:

> Your Reverence must not be surprised that no letters have come from me recently, since with my new cross the burden of my work increases. But now that this morning the general congregation elected you assistant by a majority of all except one or two votes, Joseph is unable to restrain himself any longer from congratulating his dearest brother [*Genesis 43:30*]. He entertains a good hope that your arrival here will mean great service to God through your advice and aid in the affairs of His new plant, the Society of Jesus, of which *you were among the first members after the original ten fathers*. [...] Your Reverence knows my unfailing love for you, and that many waters cannot extinguish it. Come, then, Father, in that same spirit of affection with which you are desired, so that it will be possible to say truly of us two in our measure, “sicut in vita se dilexerunt ita in morte non sunt separati…” *Pater carissime*, pray for me and let me know the day of your departure [Italics mine].

Polanco, Ribadeneyra, and Salmerón wrote letters that were similarly friendly in tone, but Araoz interpreted his election as an attempt to remove “from Spain a terrible person, feared by some as a plotter and by others as an obstacle to the despoiling of the country of money for Rome and of men for Italy,” and, doggedly supported by his royal-courtier protector, Prince Ruy Gómez, he never showed up in Rome, excusing himself—as he had done seven years before—on the grounds that the heat of Rome was harmful for his health. When Araoz failed to take up his office after three years, Borja replaced him with Nadal. Benedetto Palmio, who—together with Diego Miró

---

220 See *Mon Borgia* 4:28.
221 See *Mon Salmerón* 2:25–6.
222 See Bartolomé Alcázar, *Chrono-historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Provincia de Toledo, y elogios de sus varones illustres, fundadores, bienhechores, fautores, è hijos espirituales* (Madrid: Juan García Infanzón, 1710), vol. 2, pp. 96–9.
223 For the interpretation of this election by Sacchini and Astrain, see Astrain, *Historia*, 2:225.
(Portugal) and Everard Mercurian (Northern Europe)—was chosen to be a new assistant general by the Congregation, lost, in turn, the chance to have Araoz in Rome to do battle against Borja’s predilection for conversos.\textsuperscript{225} His main targets were especially Polanco, who was reappointed secretary of the Society for the third consecutive time and \textit{admonitor} to the general for the second time, and Ribadeneyra, who was appointed visitor in Lombardy (1569) and assistant general for Spain (replacing Araoz) and Portugal (1571). Among other converso Jesuits who—to the dismay of Palmio—would fly to Borja like the proverbial bees to the flower, were Francisco de Toledo, Pedro de Parra, Diego de Ledesma, Alonso Ruiz, Hernando de Solier, Dionisio Vázquez, and Gaspar Hernández.

Francisco de Toledo Herrera was born on 4 October 1532 to Alfonso de Toledo, an actuary in Cordova, and Isabel de Herrera. His Jewish ancestry became notorious during the inquisitorial process of the converso Archbishop of Toledo, Bartolomé Carranza de Miranda, whom Toledo (and Borja) tenaciously defended.\textsuperscript{226} At this occasion, Inquisitor Matías de Hinestrosa requested Toledo’s exclusion from the process because of his Jewish lineage—his grandfather had been tried for judaizing\textsuperscript{227} and his grandmother and great grandparents had been burned at stake.\textsuperscript{228} He studied philosophy first in Valencia and then under Domingo de Soto (1494–1560) at Salamanca, where he became a professor at the age of twenty-three. Influenced by the preaching of the converso Jesuit, Antonio de Madrid,\textsuperscript{229} Francisco entered the Society

\textsuperscript{225} See ARSI, \textit{Vitae} 164, f. 20v.
\textsuperscript{226} See Scaduto, \textit{Francesco Borgia}, p. 34. Carranza came from the Peñalosa family of Seville.
\textsuperscript{227} Benedetto Palmio in his autobiography mentioned that his and other relatives’ \textit{sanbenitos} were hanged in [the cathedral of] Cordova: “L’Ambasciatore di Spagna [Juan de Zúñiga] sentendo questi ragionamenti sparsi per la Corte disse al Papa che quest’huomo era novissimo cristiano et che erano in Cordova abitelli dell’Avo et [di] altri suoi parenti” (ARSI, \textit{Vitae} 164, f. 24).
\textsuperscript{228} See Astrain, \textit{Historia}, 2:64–5. Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras has established in his “Censura inédita del Padre Francisco de Toledo, S. J.,” \textit{Revista Española de Teología} 29 (1969): 15–9, that the document quoted by Astrain is extant in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid (\textit{Inquisición}, libro 597, f. 43): “Este Maestro Francisco de Toledo es de linaje de judíos mui bajos y notorios de Córdova, hijo de Alonso de Toledo, escrivano público, cuyo padre fue por judaizante reconciliado y truxo sanbenito, y creo que fueron quemados la madre y abuelos; y en resolución es de este linaje y casta notoria verísimamente.”
\textsuperscript{229} Antonio de Madrid: *1520 Cádiz; SJ 1555; †1563 (see Fejér, \textit{Defuncti}, 2:132; Astrain, \textit{Historia}, 2:505–7; and \textit{Mon Nadal}, 2:541).
whom Toledo (and Borja) tenaciously defended. At this occasion, the converso Archbishop of Toledo, Bartolomé Carranza de Miranda, Jewish ancestry became notorious during the inquisitorial process of Alfonso de Toledo, an actuary in Córdova, and Isabel de Herrera. His Vázquez, and Gaspar Hernández.

Parra, Diego de Ledesma, Alonso Ruiz, Hernando de Solier, Dionisio the proverbial bees to the flower, were Francisco de Toledo, Pedro de verso Jesuits who—to the dismay of Palmio—would fly to Borja like for Spain (replacing Araoz) and Portugal (1571). Among other con-

was reappointed secretary of the Society for the third consecutive time notoria verísimamente.”

escrivano público, cuyo padre fue por judaizante reconciliado y truxo sanbenito, y es de linaje de judíos mui baxos y notorios de Córdova, hijo de Alonso de Toledo, Inquisición, libro 597, f. 43): “Este Maestro Francisco de Toledo (1969): 15–9, that the document quoted by Astrain is extant in the Archivo Histórico

altri suoi parenti” (ARSI,

quest’huomo era novissimo cristiano et che erano in Cordova abitelli dell’Avo et [di] [Juan de Zúñiga] sentendo questi ragionamenti sparsi per la Corte disse al Papa che

227 Benedetto Palmio in his autobiography mentioned that his and other relatives’

225 See ARSI,

229 Antonio de Madrid: *1520 Cádiz; SJ 1555; †1563 (see Fejér,

228 See Astrain,

Francisco de Toledo Herrera was born on 4 October 1532 to

29

Figure 11. Francisco de Toledo [Herrera] (1532–96)—the first Jesuit cardinal

in 1558. The following year Nadal sent him to Rome, where Laínez appointed him as master of novices and professor of philosophy and theology at the Roman College. Ten years later the pope named him as apostolic preacher (an office that he would hold for twenty-four years) and theologian of the Apostolic Penitentiary. Several popes sent him on diplomatic missions to Austria, Poland, Germany, Bavaria, France (the reconciliation of King Henry IV), and Flanders (the retraction of Michael Baûs) and engaged him in the revision of the Vulgata text. In recognition of his services to the Apostolic See, he was the first Jesuit to be created cardinal (17 September 1593), titular of S. Maria in Transpontina. As we shall see in the next chapter, he would play an important role in the conflict between Superior General Acquaviva and the Spanish provinces at the dawn of General Congregation 5. Toledo’s position in this affair provoked much anger in Benedetto Palmio, who disparaged his Jewish ancestry and called him a “monster” in his autobiography. 230 He died in 1596 and was buried in a monumental tomb in the patriarchal Liberian Basilica in Rome. Toledo’s posthumous Instruction for Priests and Penitents (1596) had the largest editorial success among Jesuit books on sacramental confession, reflected by at least 166 editions published before 1650—an average of three per year. 231

Cardinal Francisco de Toledo was followed in the Society by his two nephews, Baltasar and Francisco [Vázquez] Suárez [de Toledo]. Their other siblings—as in the case of other converso families—also entered the religious life: Pedro became a priest, and Marcelina, Inés, and María entered the Jeronymite convent of Santa Paula in Granada. Other two siblings married: Juan Vázquez Suárez de Toledo married Antonia Vázquez de Gumiel y Medina, and Catalina Utiel de Toledo became the spouse of Juan Trillo y Armenta. This numerous offspring has been born to Gaspar Suárez de Toledo, an attorney who had married Antonia Vázquez de Utiel, Cardinal Toledo’s sister. As a child he had moved from his native Toledo to the newly reconquered Granada (1492) with his parents, Alonso de Toledo (the major-domo of the

Catholic kings, whose father, the jurado Alonso Suárez de Toledo, had served King Enrique) and Leonor de la Torre, and two siblings, Juan Suárez de Toledo who would become a priest and Gaspar Suárez who would become a military officer. Some of the relatives of this Toledan converso family of Suárez Vázquez de Toledo, whose ancestors came from León to Talamanca near Toledo after the Christian victory at Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212, were: Álvarez de Toledo, the archbishop-cardinal of Burgos; don Francisco de Toledo, viceroy of Peru; and the Jesuits Cipriano Soárez and Juan de Mariana.

Francisco Suárez’s brother, Baltasar, was among the first Jesuits to be sent to the Philippines, but he died exhausted by travel conditions en route there in 1581. Francisco himself exceeded the fame of his maternal uncle as one of the most influential Jesuit theologians. He was born in 1548 in Granada. Following his father’s profession, he studied law at Salamanca since 1561, and there he entered the Society in 1564. As a Jesuit he continued his studies of philosophy and theology in Salamanca. Ordained priest in 1572, he taught theology at Ávila, Segovia, Valladolid, Rome, Álcalá, Salamanca, and Coimbra. He published, among other works, De Incarnatione (1590), De mysteriis vitae Christi (1592), De Sacramentis (1595), Disputationes Metaphysicae (1597)—the main expression of his philosophical thought—De Poenitentia (1602), De auxiliis (1603), De virtute et statu Religionis (1608–9), De Legibus (1612)—for which he is considered the father of international law—and Defensio fidei catholicae (1613). His contribution was important to the development of Probabilism—the main ethical system of the Society since the latter quarter of the sixteenth century. The Doctor Eximius, as Suárez was called, extensively wrote on the legal aspects of the 1593 decree de genere, arguing that, without any


236 See DHJC 4:3654–62.

doubt whatsoever, General Congregation 5 had the power to amend the Jesuit *Constitutions* by adding the impediment of origin (barring converso candidates from entering the Society).238 Rather than an expression of his racism,239 Suárez’s endorsement of Acquaviva’s anti-converso legislation was probably a way of concealing his own Jewish ancestry.

Toledo’s and Suárez’s inclination towards casuistry was also characteristic of Pedro de Parra, who was born in 1531 in Sanlúcar la Mayor (Seville); he entered the Society in 1553, was ordained priest in 1559, and was admitted to the solemn profession by Borja in 1566. He taught at the Roman College: philosophy (1560–3), Scripture (1573–6), and theology (1564–76). Like Francisco de Toledo, he was appointed to the committee to revise the *Vulgata*. Afterwards, he replaced Sebastião Morais240 in teaching moral theology at the College of Brera (Milan), where his converso fellow, Manuel de Sá, was also a professor. He authored the unpublished *De casibus conscientiae summa* and *In Evangelium Ioannis*. The Jesuit historian Scaduto considered him one of the most excellent professors in Rome. Indeed, his pupil from the Roman College, Silvio Antoniano, lauded him in a letter to Cardinal Borromeo: “He has from God this particular talent of easiness and clarity in teaching, and he is especially well trained in cases of conscience.”241

Parra’s colleague at the Roman College was Diego de Ledesma. Born in 1524 in Cuéllar (Segovia), he changed his name from Villafanna (Villa Cuéllar) as he entered the Society in 1556 under the sway of Ribadeneyra, whom he had met in Leuven.242 Just one year after his admission he was ordained as priest in Rome, where he led the works of a committee dominated by his converso fellows—Francisco de Toledo, Manuel de Sá, Pedro Parra, Diego de Acosta,243 and Pedro

---

238 See Francisco Suárez, *Tractatus de religione Societatis Jesu* (Brussels: Greuse, 1857), p. 84.
240 Sebastião Morais: *c. 1535 Funchal (Isla de Madeira); SJ 1550 Coimbra; priest 1560 Évora; professed 1569; †19 August 1588, Mozambique (see *DHCJ* 3:2737).
241 “Ha da Dio singolare talento della facilità e chiarezza all’insegnare, e soprattutto bene esercitato e risoluto nei casi di coscienza” (Scaduto, *L’opera di Francesco Borgia*, p. 328). One wonders whether he was related to the venerable Juan Sebastián de la Parra (1546–1622), a Jesuit missionary in Peru (see *DHCJ* 4:3542–3).
242 See *Mon Rib*. 1:64–5.
243 Diego de Acosta (1535–85) was one of the five sons of a converso merchant from Medina del Campo (Valladolid) who entered the Society (the most famous of
from Medina del Campo (Valladolid) who entered the Society (the most famous of Parra (1546–1622), a Jesuit missionary in Peru (see Bene esercitato e risoluto nei casi di coscienza” (Scaduto, 1560 Évora; professed 1569; †19 August 1588, Mozambique (see Ribadeneyra, whom he had met in Leuven.242 Just one year after his admission he was ordained as priest in Rome, where he led the works of a committee dominated by his converso fellows—Francisco de Toledo, Manuel de Sá, Pedro Parra, Diego de Acosta,243 and Pedro Morais240 in teaching moral theology at the College of Brera (Milan), afterwords, he replaced Sebastião Morais: *c. 1535 Funchal (Isla de Madeira); SJ 1550 Coímbra; priest (Seville); he entered the Society in 1553, was ordained priest in 1559, and was admitted to the solemn profession by Borja in 1566. He taught at the Roman College: philosophy (1560–3), Scripture (1573–6), and theology (1564–76). Like Francisco de Toledo, he was appointed to the committee to revise the Constitutions of the Society (1564–76). He was the Jesuit historian Scaduto considered him one of the most excellent professors in Rome. Indeed, his pupil from the Roman College, Silvio Antoniano, lauded him in a letter to Cardinal Morais240 in teaching moral theology at the College of Brera (Milan), the characteristic of Pedro de Parra, who was born in 1531 in Sanlúcar la Mayor (Seville), where his converso fellow, Manuel de Sá, was also a professor. He was appointed to the early jesuit pro-converso policy (1540–72) 109


Figure 12. Francisco Suárez [de Toledo] (1548–1617)—the converso supporter of the anti-converso legislation
Perpiñan—with the goal of producing a uniform pedagogical code for Jesuit schools, the *Ratio studiorum*. As a preliminary text for this project, he composed *De ratione et ordine studiorum Collegii Romani* (1564–5). He also can be considered the author of the decree issued by Borja, *De opinionibus in philosophia et theologia tenendis* (1565). Ledesma also produced a Latin grammar (Venice, 1569) and a catechism (1571) that was rendered into many languages. In 1566, together with Nadal, he was appointed pontifical theologian for the Diet of Augsburg. With Ribadeneyra he was visitor of the province of Lombardy that had been governed by Benedetto Palmio. The latter resentfully wrote of Ledesma in his memorial that “if Father Ignatius were alive, he wouldn’t keep him in the Society for one hour, judging him an enemy of the Society and exterminator of peace and union” [8].

No less versed in classics was Cipriano Soáres, who—in spite of his Castilian origins—entered the Society in Lisbon because of his converso origins from both sides. He was related to the Toledan clan of Suárez de Toledo, whose descendant was the aforementioned Francisco Suárez. His *De arte rhetorica* was the most published Jesuit manual on the subject and was used in Jesuit colleges for more than two hundred years.245

Another one of Borja’s protégés, Dionisio Vázquez (1527–89) from Toledo—the main target of Palmio’s memorial and the future leader of the *memorialistas* movement—studied theology at Gandía after joining the Jesuits in 1550 and accompanied Commissary Borja in his
travels through Spain.\textsuperscript{246} The latter convoked him to Rome in 1566 to support Polanco in the secretariat of the Society for the Spanish provinces.\textsuperscript{247} Against Palmio’s advice, Borja appointed Vázquez rector of the Roman College in 1568, visitor in Naples in 1570, and vice-provincial in Naples in 1571. Vázquez participated in General Congregation 3 as an elected delegate of the Neapolitan province.\textsuperscript{248}

Gaspar Hernández (1528–75) was Vázquez’s fellow countryman. He entered the Society in 1554, and Borja admitted him to the profession in 1563; just one year later Borja appointed him rector of the College of Naples. With Polanco, Hernández accompanied Borja in his last visit to Iberia (1571–2).\textsuperscript{249} In a letter to Borja, Salmerón offered accolades of his aptitude for government affairs:

One doubts whether anybody else could come here to fulfill his duties with more attention. He is well known out of house and much loved by illustrious and important people who chose him as their spiritual father with much advantage.\textsuperscript{250}

Nevertheless, Mercurian would send him back to Spain and later dismiss him from the Society.

Hernando de Solier (1526–1603) from Segovia received his doctorate \textit{in utroque iure} from the University of Bologna and entered the Society as priest in 1555 under the sway of Borja. In 1566 the latter named him procurator general of the Society before admitting him to the solemn profession (1569). Pius V appointed him, together with Francisco de Toledo Herrera, an examiner and the first rector of St. Peter Penitentiary (1570–3). Mercurian would send him back to Spain with Ribadeneyra, a close friend of his and of Luis de Santander.

\textsuperscript{246} See Mon Borgia 3:311, 314, 321–2.
\textsuperscript{247} Palmio claimed in his autobiography that “contese [sic] fra Dionisio e Polanco fu grande” (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, f. 25\textsuperscript{v}).
\textsuperscript{248} Acquaviva would commission him to write Borja’s biography, which was nevertheless prohibited from being printed and remains unpublished (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 80}). See \textit{DHCJ} 4:3911 (where Dalmases does not mention his Jewish ancestry); Scaduto, \textit{Catalogo}, p. 151; idem, \textit{Francesco Borgia}, pp. 57, 70, 75, 77–8, 87–8; Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” pp. 21, 28; and John W. Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” in McCoog, \textit{Mercurian Project}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{249} See Scaduto, \textit{Catalogo}, p. 75 and 164, where there is no mention of his dismissal; and idem, \textit{Azione}, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{250} “Si dubita che possa venire qui un altro che disimpegni più acuratamente il proprio ufficio...; è molto conosciuto fuori di casa e molto amato da persone illustri e di qualità che lo hanno preso come padre spirituale con notevole profitto” (\textit{Mon Salmerón} 1:566–9).
(The troika would be charged by the provincial of Toledo, Antonio Cordeses, with composing a *memorial* against some practices in the Society to the nuncio Nicolás Ormanetto, as we shall see in the next chapter.) Solier’s homonymous uncle was an archpriest and canon of the cathedral of Segovia. Upon his death in 1592, he left to the Jesuit college in the city an inheritance, which the superior general ordered managed not by his Jesuit nephew but his relative, Doña Antonia de Solier.251

Alonso Ruiz, who began his Jesuit career as novice master in Granada (1562–4),252 was summoned by Borja to do the same job in Rome, where he introduced to the Jesuit life the future foremost Polish Jesuits: St. Stanisław Kostka (1550–68) and Piotr Skarga (1536–1612); the anti-converso superior general, Claudio Acquaviva; and his martyred nephew, Rodolfo. Borja admitted Ruiz to the profession of four vows with Pedro de Parra. During the Third General Congregation, in which he would take part as superior of the Roman province, he was responsible for the redaction of the *Ordo Novitiatus*.253 He was superior of the Roman province 1571–4 and, after his removal from Rome, rector of the colleges in Granada and Oviedo. In 1580, together with Baltasar Piñas, he went as missionary to Peru, where—after being rector of the college in La Paz (Bolivia), vice-provincial of Quito, and visitor of Panama, he died back in Peru.

Benedetto Palmio harshly criticized Ruiz’s and his patron Borja’s spirituality. He argued in both his memorial and autobiography254 that “the excessive credit and favor” given by Francisco de Borja to converso Jesuits was due to the monastic influences by which he had been affected before becoming a Jesuit. That impact would have inclined Borja to a spirituality that—according to Palmio—was alien to the spirit that God had communicated to Ignatius and resulted from Devil’s deceit:

---


252 Alonso Ruiz: *1530 Hita (Cordova); †1599 Arequipa (Peru); SJ 1554 Cordova; priest 1555; professed in 1566.


254 See ARSI, *Vitae 164*, ff. 33sqq.
Even though Borgia was a good and saintly person, he did not conform to the spirit of Ignatius, having been trained by Fra Giovanni [Juan de Tejeda], and so he had learned many things from other men religious, with whom he was acquainted for a long time, rather than from Ignatius. This was clearly seen during Borgia’s generalate, because he would have introduced many new things, if he could, and actually he did introduce some, for he believed Ignatius did not have a good knowledge of religious institutes. Borgia thought this way, for he did not know, nor had he reached the high of Ignatius’s spirit and of what he understood in the Society.

The spiritual figures that exercised their authority on the Duke of Gandía were Salvador de Horta, Pedro de Alcántara, and the Franciscan Juan de Tejeda, who claimed to have prophetic visions of Borja as an angelic pope destined to reform the Church. Tejeda exercised influence on some Jesuits in Gandía, where he was a guest in the Jesuit college, most notably on its rector, Andrés de Oviedo, with whom Borja did his novitiate. This “solitary sparrow on the roof,” as Borja dubbed him, was likely—as was Tejeda—of converso background. He was born in Illescas in 1517 and entered the Society in Rome (1541) already as priest. He earned his Master of Arts in Alcalá and became a doctor in theology at Gandía. He was renowned in the Society for his monastic inclinations (disappointed with too little time dedicated to prayer in the Society, he unsuccessfully asked to spend seven years in the desert), but his influence in the Society was virtually eliminated by his appointment in 1555 as auxiliary bishop of the Jesuit patriarch of probable converso lineage, Melchor Nuñes Barreto, in Ethiopia, where he died in solitude and poverty in 1577. Perhaps under the sway of Oviedo and the converso Luis de Granada, Borja—who was also fascinated by the Carmelite spirituality of Teresa of Ávila—sent to General Congregation 1 (which he could not attend) a memorial proposing to extend time for prayer and to impose as mandatory certain penances in the Society. These monastically inclined proposals did not arrive on time, but the newly elected Superior General Laínez refused Borja’s
suggestions later, anyway. Once elected general, Borja was empowered by the congregation to lengthen the time for prayer, with the condition that he take into account the differences between regions and persons.\textsuperscript{259} Cristóbal Rodríguez and Miró also seemed inclined to the cloister.\textsuperscript{260} By this charge, Palmio suggested in his memorial ([7]) that Borja and his converso protégés created a sort of a religious order within the Jesuit Order, more similar in its spirituality to monks or Carthusians. At the same time, Nadal and Polanco persistently opposed this kind of asceticism.\textsuperscript{261}

As during Laínez’s generalate, Polanco accompanied the Jesuit superior general on his trips outside Rome: to Florence in 1567, where Pope Pius V—to whom Polanco was already lending his services to reform the papal Dataria\textsuperscript{262}—employed the Jesuits in negotiating an agreement with Cosimo de’ Medici (1519–74); and to Iberia and France in 1571, where the two supported Cardinal Michele Bonelli (1541–98) in his political negotiations with the respective monarchs. Before his departure, Borja named Nadal vicar general of the Society.

In France, Polanco was caught by fever, and Borja continued traveling to Italy without him. When Polanco eventually caught up with Borja in Ferrara in June 1572, the latter, in turn, fell ill. At the beginning of August, the physicians allowed Borja to continue his journey, however. He departed from Ferrara on 3 September towards Loreto. There, the physicians were consulted again, and they consented to allow Borja to proceed to Macerata, where Polanco had to remain because he fell ill again. Borja continued his trip without Polanco and arrived in Rome on 28 September. Two days later he died. Even though Palmio accused Polanco of forcing the general, who was presumably dying, to continue his return trip to Rome (so that he would die and be replaced), the professed fathers of Rome elected Polanco as the new vicar general, even before he arrived back in Rome, while he was

---

\textsuperscript{259} See Decretum 29 in Padberg, \textit{For Matters of Greater Moment}, p. 120; and Scaduto, \textit{Francesco Borgia}, pp. 97–8.

\textsuperscript{260} See Scaduto, \textit{Francesco Borgia}, pp. 100 and 102.


\textsuperscript{262} Dataria is an office of the papal chancery from which are given (Lat. \textit{data}) graces or favors, recognizable in \textit{foro externo}, such as benefices, etc. Polanco’s engagement in this office was likely due to his expertise of \textit{scriptor apostolicus} that he had acquired prior to his entrance to the Society, perhaps at the University of Bologna.
recovering from his illness in Macerata.\textsuperscript{263} Juan Alfonso de Polanco had to recuperate and focus his energies as quickly as possible, for he was about to face the most challenging storm of his Jesuit career.

In conclusion, this chapter has shown why and how the Jesuits of Jewish lineage played a key role in the Society of Jesus and how the early Jesuits richly, knowingly, and strategically benefited from their converso confreres. I have argued that the key to understanding why the Jesuit Order became a haven for conversos is to be found in the approach to the “Jewish question” of its founder, Ignatius of Loyola, who had numerous contacts with the converso spiritual and merchant network before he founded the Society. His adamant stress on the constitutional principle of non-discrimination in accepting candidates regardless of their lineage, as far as they were suitable for the Jesuit life, was supported by his close converso collaborators, especially Jerónimo Nadal and Juan Alfonso de Polanco—the key figures in the institutional and spiritual development of the early Jesuits. Loyola’s non-discrimination legacy became an integral part of the converso policy of his two successors, Diego Laínez—who himself was a converso—and Francisco de Borja. The period of interregnum after the death of Loyola in 1556 and the election of Laínez in 1558 was a time of political crisis, during which anti-converso resentments emerged and were manipulated for the first time. Contained by the protector of conversos, Francisco de Borja, this animosity exploded after the latter’s death in 1572, shifting the Society’s policy towards its converso influential minority. The following chapter will explain why and how it happened.

The death of Superior General Francisco de Borja in 1572 marks a turning point in the history of converso Jesuits, whose influence—after thirty years of holding high posts of responsibility in the Jesuit administration—began to fade. As after the deaths of Borja’s two predecessors, Loyola and Lainez, the anti-converso Jesuits seized the momentum of political transition by campaigning against the converso presence in the central administration, with the support of external lay and ecclesiastical officials. This time the scheme was successful—the anti-converso Italo-Portuguese lobby managed to block the election to the generalate of the converso Juan Alfonso de Polanco and—conspiring with the pope—managed to elect a candidate who was neither converso nor pro-converso. From the very start of his tenure, the newly elected superior general, Everard Mercurian, began to “cleanse the house”: he deprived all converso Jesuits of governmental posts in Rome, Italy, and possibly in other parts of Europe. Consequently, the period of the converso political sway ended, shifting the approach of the Jesuit administration in Rome away from both candidates and members of Jewish ancestry, a shift which under Mercurian’s successor, Claudio Acquaviva, would eventually result in the discriminatory legislation of 1593. It officially barred conversos from joining the Society of Jesus and dismissed those who were not yet full members of the Order. This chapter explores the raison d’être of the anti-converso policy under Mercurian and Acquaviva between 1573 and 1593.

When, as elected vicar general, he convoked the Third General Congregation to meet on 12 April 1573,¹ the converso Juan Alfonso

¹ “On October 1, 1572, after Saint Francis Borgia had been taken to his blessed immortality, the professed present in Rome chose Father Juan de Polanco in his place, with the power of vicar” (Padberg, For Matters of Greater Moment, p. 135).
de Polanco was the most prominent figure in the Society of Jesus—he had been a senior administrator in the general curia in Rome since his appointment by Loyola in 1547 as the Society’s secretary. Because the previous two vicars general, Laínez and Borja, had been elected superiors general at the subsequent general congregations, Polanco was considered the most probable candidate for this highest post in the Society. After all—to the dismay of Benedetto Palmio and the Portuguese—the Spanish electors dominated the Congregation. They governed all but one Italian province (the only Italian provincial was Francesco Adorno from Lombardy): Alonso Ruiz administered the Roman province, Alfonso Salmerón the province of Naples, and Juan Jerónimo Doménech the province of Sicily (we should keep in mind, though, that Naples and Sicily were politically under Spanish rule in the sixteenth century). Additionally, the province of Portugal was in the hands of Spaniards—Borja named the Valencian Diego Miró vice-provincial of Portugal in 1563 and assistant general for that province during his entire generalate (1565–72).2

In addition to these officials, there were nineteen other Spaniards present at General Congregation 3 (nine from Spanish provinces, six from non-Spanish provinces, three from the general curia in Rome, and one for reasons of seniority): Diego Avellaneda (representing Austria), Pedro Bernal (Andalusia), Nicolás Bobadilla (as the co-founder of the Society), Antonio Cordeses (Aragon), Miguel Gobierno (Toledo), Luis de Guzmán (Toledo), Cristóbal de Madrid (general curia), Gregorio de Mata (Andalusia), Juan de Montoya (Sicily), Jerónimo Nadal (general curia), Baltasar Piñas (Aragon), Alfonso de Pisa (Upper Germany), Juan de la Plaza (Andalusia), Antonio Ramírez (Naples), Pedro de Ribadeneyra (general curia), Juan Suárez (Castile), Miguel de Torres (Portugal), Dionisio Vázquez (Naples), and Pedro Villalba (Aragon).3

Among these participants of the congregation were many converso or pro-converso electors who could counter-balance the Italo-Portuguese anti-converso connivance: not only Madrid, Nadal, Ribadeneyra, and Salmerón but also Manuel López, Baltasar Piñas, Alfonso de Pisa,

---

2 After the crisis with the first provincial of Portugal, Simão Rodrigues, the next superior provincial appointed by Loyola in 1552 was the Spaniard Miguel de Torres (1509–93), who was then reappointed for the additional two terms 1555–61. Later he was also rector in Lisbon, where he was the queen’s confessor (see DHCJ 4:3824). On Portuguese-Spanish tensions fueled by the patriotism of the former, see Nuno da Silva Gonçalves, “Jesuits in Portugal,” in McCoog, Mercurian Project, pp. 719–20.

3 See Padberg, For Matters of Greater Moment, p. 715.
Antonio Possevino, Alonso Ruiz, Dionisio Vázquez (and perhaps Diego Avellaneda, Diego Miró, Juan de Montoya, Juan de la Plaza, Antonio Ramírez, and Pedro Bernal whose possible converso ties are still to be examined).

Most of the converso delegates were prominent Jesuits. Manuel López, brother of Enrique Enríquez, was already mentioned in the previous chapter as an elector for General Congregation 2, as were Alonso Ruiz and Dionisio Vázquez. Baltasar Piñas (1528–1611) from Sanahuja (Lérida) was admitted to the solemn profession in Rome by Láinez; he introduced the “Padri di Jesù”—as they were called there—in the Aragonese Sardinia (1559) and organized the first Jesuit schools on the island: in Sassari (1563) and Cagliari (1565).

Alfonso de Pisa was born in 1528 in Toledo to the uncle of Cardinal Cisneros’s physician, Dr. Gonzalo de Pisa from Almagro, and Elvira de Palma. He entered the Society in 1552 in Alcalá, where he studied philosophy and mathematics after his studies of physics, mathematics, and medicine in Salamanca and Toledo. Like many other converso candidates, Nadal took him from Spain to Rome, where after his prompt ordination in 1555, Pisa taught cases of conscience at Loreto (1556–8) and metaphysics at the Roman College (1558–9). On Nadal’s request, Pisa’s notes on Martin Chemnitz’s Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita (Cologne, 1562) were made available to a theologian from Coimbra, Diogo Paiva de Andrade (1528–75), in his confutation of the Melanchtonian disciple. After earning his doctorate in theology in Rome, Pisa taught in Dillingen and Halle, where he prepared a critical edition of the Council of Nicaea’s legislation (1572), whose Arabic parts were later translated by the Italian Jew-turned-Jesuit, Giovanni Battista Eliano. In 1573 he represented together with Peter Canisius the Jesuit Province of Upper Germany at General Congregation 3. In

4 Juan de la Plaza was close to Teresa of Ávila; as novice master he admitted many converso disciples of Juan de Ávila, and his socius was the converso Alonso Ruiz (mentioned in Palmio’s memorial); after the election of Mercurian he was sent to distant Peru (see DHCJ 3153–4). Juan de Montoya was visitor and provincial in Sicily under Borja and, like Plaza, was sent to Peru, where he died in 1592 (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 102). Palmio harshly criticized him in his autobiography. For the Inquisition’s investigation of Avellaneda’s genealogy, see AHN, Inquisición, lib. 580, f. 150r and lib. 583, ff. 168v, 211r; and that of Bernal, ibidem, f. 236r.

5 See Astrain, Historia, 2:57–8; and Scaduto, Azione, pp. 338–42.


1575 he would be destined to open a Jesuit mission in Transylvania, but Pisa encountered a strong opposition to this appointment: the anti-converso Superior Provincial Lorenzo Maggio accused him of being an Averroist,8 and another confrere argued that, among other reasons, Pisa was too fat.9 Whatever argument prevailed, Alfonso de Pisa was diverted to Poznań (Posen), from where he transferred to the ancient city of Kalisz in Poland, where he died in 1598.

Born into a family of goldsmiths that moved from Piedmont to Mantua via Milan and changed their name from Ca(g)liani, Antonio Possevino (1533–1611) entered the Society in 1559, lured by the preaching of his future enemy, Benedetto Palmio. Borja sent him with Mercurian to visit the Jesuit provinces of France and Aquitaine, which—after Borja’s death—he represented at General Congregation 3, where he was elected secretary to the new Superior General Mercurian. Following his engagement in the mission to Roman Jews after General Congregation 3, as we have seen in the previous chapter, he influenced Pope Gregory XIII’s decision to create a college of neophytes that would train preachers to convert Jews in Italy and the Levant.10 He was one of the most prolific Jesuit writers, authoring close to forty books. The most famous of them was the Bibliotheca selecta, part of which was dedicated to the conversion of Jews. Through this and other writings, Possevino would become one of the fiercest opponents of purity-of-blood legislation in the Society, as we shall see in the next chapter.

In spite of this significant pro-converso presence at General Congregation 3, the close-knit Italo-Portuguese lobby gained ground in the assembly and was crafty enough to successfully conspire against Polanco’s election and his pro-converso supporters.

Italo-Portuguese anti-converso lobby at General Congregation 3

The Portuguese delegation led by Leão Henrikes11 secretly carried to Rome a letter that Henrikes’s penitent, Cardinal Infant Henry of

---

9 See the letter of Francisco Antonio to Mercurian in ARSI, Germ. 136, ff. 199–200 (208).
11 The Portuguese Jesuits attending the Congregation were Pedro da Fonseca and Inácio Martins. Leão Henrikes was a substitute for the sick provincial Jorge Serrão
Th e Portuguese delegation led by Leão Henriques 11 secretly carried in the assembly and was crafty enough to successfully conspire against the Society, as we shall see in the next chapter.
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14 King Sebastian I of Portugal (1554–78). One wonders whether he advised Sebastian to write that letter, for Câmara’s aversion towards conversos was well known (see Rodrigues, História 2/1:334–5). On the alleged homosexual relation between the two, see Harold B. Johnson’s article, “A Pedophile in the Palace” (<http://people.virginia.edu/~hbj8n/pedophile.pdf>).

15 “Father Vicar asked when and in whose company he should seek the customary blessing of the Supreme Pontiff. The decision was that it should be sought as soon as possible, and that Father Vicar with Father Salmerón and others whom Father Vicar would choose from among the several nations to accompany him should proceed in
of the congregation, about the number of Spaniards among the voters, and about the national background of the previous superiors general. Gregory remarked that somebody should be chosen from a nation other than Spain, and, in spite of Polanco’s protest against limiting freedom of conscience of the electors, the pope specifically suggested the name of the Walloon Everard Mercurian, then dismissed the delegation with his blessing.\footnote{Astrain, \textit{Historia}, 3:9sq.}

Consequently, while Antonio Possevino was addressing the congregation with an opening discourse, Cardinal Gallio of Como\footnote{Bartolomeo Gallio (1527–1607) was the Cardinal Secretary of State 1572–85. He was born near Como and hence was called “cardinal of Como” (see \textit{The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church}: http://www.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1565.htm).} arrived and informed the congregation that he was representing the pope’s will to prevent the election of any Spanish candidate.

Prepared to obey, [the Jesuits], nonetheless, offered reasons for their request. The papal order contravened the Jesuit Constitutions in an extremely important provision. It would be difficult for the delegates to fulfill their oath to choose the person best suited to be general under the papal restriction. It could open the way to ambitious scheming for the office. The person elected would be in the difficult situation of knowing that he had been named, as it were, by force, and the members would find it equally difficult to obey someone imposed on them by outside pressure. It would seem as if the Pope favored some nations and turned away from others. Friendship and concord within the Society could be supplanted by disagreements and national hatreds. The faithful could be scandalized by the exclusion from the generalate of a nation to which the Society owed so much. Heretics would rejoice to hear of divisions in the Society. On the other hand, Catholic princes would attempt to take this opportunity to split the Society, removing their subjects from obedience to the general judging that their nation was discriminated against because of such exclusions. Gregory was reluctant to rescind his own order, but finally told the delegation that the congregation was free to elect whomsoever they chose, but that it remained his personal desire that he be a non-Spaniard. If, nonetheless, they elected a Spaniard, he wanted to be informed before any public announcement.\footnote{These are the congregation minutes (ARSI, \textit{Congr. 20b}, f. 210') paraphrased in Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” pp. 54–5).}

The next day, on 23 April 1573, the assembly chose Everard Mercurian as the next superior general on the first ballot by a majority of twenty-seven votes.

\footnote{the name of the congregation to request the blessing” (Padberg, \textit{For Matters of Greater Moment}, p. 135).}
Everard Mercurian’s “house cleansing”

In spite of the death of the anti-converso royal minister, Ruy Gómez de Silva, and his Jesuit protégé, Antonio Araoz, in 1573, the anti-converso lobby found eager support in the newly elected superior general, Mercurian (general 1573–80). From the very first years of his office he proceeded to “cleanse the house”: he removed from Rome (and possibly from Italy or even Europe) many converso Jesuits, in spite of their undisputable contributions and merits. Polanco, after almost three decades in office, was moved away from Rome and sent to Sicily, a measure that seemed too harsh even to his major enemy, Benedetto Palmio. Ironically, Mercurian replaced Polanco as secretary with Antonio Possevino (most probably a closet-converso), who four years later (1577) was sent with a diplomatic mission to convert the king of Sweden. After the mission’s failure, he engaged in diplomacy with the Russian czar, the Polish king, and the Austrian emperor. Jerónimo Nadal, who after the election of Mercurian absconded into the bucolic Jesuit villa of Tivoli at the outskirts of Rome, eventually “fled” to Austria. Pedro de Ribadeneyra, after thirty years of holding major administrative offices in Italy, was sent back to his native Toledo. He was accompanied there by his close converso friend, Hernando de Solier. Alonso Ruiz was sent first to Granada and few years later to Peru, where he died in 1599. Baltasar Piñas also ended up in Peru. Alfonso de Pisa, as we have seen, was sent to Great Poland, where he passed the rest of his life. Gaspar de Loarte was moved away to Valencia, in spite of his advanced age of eighty, where he still engaged in the mission to Moriscos. Dionisio Vázquez, Borja’s protégé, was sent back to Spain, where he organized a rebel movement against the central government in Rome, known as memorialistas. Pedro de Parra and Manuel de Sá were sent to Milan. Cristóbal

---

19 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, *Vitae 164*, ff. 42–5).
22 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, *Vitae 164*, f. 45).
23 *Mon Rib.* 1:782.
Rodríguez ended up in Flanders, from where he was further sent to Peru. Gaspar Hernández, in spite of Salmerón’s strong support, was dismissed, as were Rodrigo Mena and Juan Gurrea. Even the co-founder of the Jesuits, Salmerón, was replaced by the thirty-two-year-old Acquaviva and sent to Madrid in 1575.

Ironically, Mercurian’s segregation policy created new opportunities for some converso or pro-converso Jesuits who had occupied high-ranking positions in the Jesuit administration: they were able to reinvent themselves as prolific writers. Three clear examples are Polanco, who spent the last years of his life composing the first multi-volume chronicle of the Society; Nadal, who produced his monumental Evangelicae Historiae Imagines that contained 153 superb engravings by Passeri, Vos, and Wierix (Plantin: Antwerp 1593); and especially Ribadeneyra, who between 1574 and 1611 composed an impressive number of writings on history, historiography, asceticism, and politics, many of which went through many editions and translations, assigning him a foremost place among the writers of the Spanish Siglo de Oro. Among other works, he composed Vida del Padre Ignacio de Loyola, Fundador de la Religión de la Compañía de Jesús (Madrid, 1583, the Castilian rendition of the Latin original from 1572); Historia eclesiástica del Cisma del reino de Inglaterra (Madrid, 1588); Tratado de la tribulación (Madrid, 1589); Vida del Padre Francisco de Borja, tercer General de la Compañía de Jesús (Madrid, 1592); Vida del Padre Maestro Diego Laínez, uno de los primeros compañeros de San Ignacio y segundo Prepósito General (Madrid, 1594); Vida del Padre Maestro Alfonso de Salmerón (Madrid, 1594); Tratado de las virtudes, intitulado “Paraíso del Alma” compuesto por Alberto Magno (Madrid, 1594); Libro de meditaciones, soliloquios y manual del glorioso Doctor de la Iglesia San Agustín (Madrid, 1594); Tratado de la religión y virtudes

---

24 Rodrigo Mena: *1525 near Palencia; SJ 1558; priest in 1561. He was dismissed in 1574 in Rome (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 97).
25 Juan Gurrea: *1533 Saragossa; SJ 1554; professed in 1554; priest in 1559. He was rector of the College in Modena and Parma when Palmio was the provincial of Lombardy. Before General Congregation 2 he was elected procurator of Lombardy and as such participated in the congregation that elected Borja. Gurrea was dismissed in December 1580 (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 72). Curious is an episode from other manuscript sources, reporting that Palmio requested that Gurrea stop wearing his ermine hats and chamois boots (Ital. 116, f. 116).
que debe tener el príncipe cristiano (Madrid, 1595); Confesiones del glorio
Doctor de la Iglesia San Agustín (Madrid, 1598); Flos Sanctorum
o Libro de las vidas de los santos (Madrid, 1599); Illustrium scriptorum
Societatis Iesu cathalogus (1602); Tratado en el cual se da razón del
Instituto de la Religión la Compañía de Jesús (Madrid, 1605); Manual
de oraciones para el uso y aprovechamiento de la gente devota (Madrid,
1605); Relación de lo que ha sucedido en el negocio de la canonización
del Bienaventurado Padre Ignacio de Loyola (Madrid, 1609); and
Vida de doña Estefanía Manrique Castilla, fundadora con don Pedro
Manrique, su hermano, de la casa profesa de Toledo (Madrid, 1880).
Some of his works remain unpublished yet today (for example, the
copious Historia de la Compañía de Jesús de las provincias de España
y parte de las del Perú y nueva España y Philipinas (ARSI, Hisp. 94);
other minor writings were published in the Jesuit series of Monumenta
Historica, among them Tratado del gobierno del nostro santo Padre
Ignacio [que] tenía (Mon Ig. 1:441–91) and De no impedir la entrada
en la Compañía a descendentes de judíos (Mon Rib. 2:374–84).

The latter writing deals with the persecution of conversos in the Society
and will be analyzed in detail in the next chapter. One of the issues dis-
cussed in this text was the participation of conversos in the revolt of
some Spanish Jesuits against their central government in Rome.

Memorialistas’ revolt against Rome

Arguably, the discriminatory policy of Mercurian—one that was sub-
sequently endorsed also by Acquaviva—and the defeat of the converso
lobby during General Congregation 3 triggered the anti-Roman move-
ment by Iberian Jesuits known as memorialistas.27 Contrary to what
the closet-converso Ribadeneyra, and after him numerous historians,
argued in an attempt to minimize the participation of his fellow con-
verso Jesuits in this movement,28 it must be admitted that many of
its members, if not the majority, were of converso background. In
alleged plots against their superior general in Rome, Mercurian, and
especially against his successor, Acquaviva, who was accused of anti-
Spanish authoritarianism, the memorialistas sent secret memorials to

28 See Mon Rib. 2:191.
the Spanish court and Inquisition, and the Holy See, asking for the reform of the Jesuit Institute and, especially, for the autonomy of the Spanish Jesuit provinces. Among these memorialistas were many of the Jesuits mentioned earlier in this book.

As we shall see below, Benedetto Palmio in his memorial ascribes the leading role in the movement to the converso Dionisio Vázquez, who—as we have mentioned—was a protégé of Francisco de Borja and was deprived of his administrative office in Naples by Borja’s successor, Mercurian, and sent away to Spain in 1574. One could argue that Vázquez’s active role in the memorialistas movement was a sort of revenge for the discriminatory policy of Mercurian and Acquaviva.

The Spanish historian Antonio Astrain, whose account of these events certainly needs a less biased revision, assigns responsibility for the separatist agenda of the movement not only to Vázquez but also to the converso Henrique Henríquez, mentioned earlier in this book, and two other Jesuits, Francisco Abreo and Gonzalo González. Little is known about the latter, but the former’s Jesuit career must have been the subject of much chatting among his confreres, as we shall see in Ribadeneyra’s memorial. Born in 1530 in the town of Fuente Guinaldo near Ciudad Rodrigo, Abreo studied law in Salamanca and subsequently taught there and in Oviedo. Mercurian refused to admit him to the profession of solemn vows, and Acquaviva dismissed him in 1592.

His career, birthplace, and name suggest converso origin, as do those of other memorialistas, such as Juan Bautista Carrillo, Diego

---

29 For the interpretation of this movement through the lens of the crisis of the “partido castellano” and the transformation of the Spanish monarchy, see José Martínez Millán, “La crisis del ‘partido castellano’ y la transformación de la Monarquía Hispana,” Cuadernos de Historia Moderna 2003 (Anejo 2): 15–7.
30 See DHCJ 4:3911.
31 See Astrain, Historia, 3:372. See also AHN, Inquisición, lib. 361, ff. 470r–v and lib. 581, ff. 111r–112r, 114r, 116r–v, 119r–120r, 153r, 156r, 159r, 185r.
32 See Astrain, Historia, 3:364–70.
35 Juan Bautista Carrillo: priest in 1586; dismissed in 1591. For his gloomy portrayal, see Astrain, Historia, 3:521–7. See also AHN, Inquisición, lib. 581, ff. 340r, 361r, 366r and lib. 582, f. 21r.
de Santa Cruz,\textsuperscript{36} Fernando de Mendoza González,\textsuperscript{37} Juan Bautista Pacheco,\textsuperscript{38} Gaspar Sánchez,\textsuperscript{39} and Gaspar de Valpedrosa.\textsuperscript{40} Jewish ancestry is unquestionable, however, in the case of other members of the movement: Jerónimo de Acosta (brother of José), Jerónimo (Romano) de la Higuera,\textsuperscript{41} Gaspar López,\textsuperscript{42} Manuel López,\textsuperscript{43} and Alonso de Polanco (nephew of Juan Alfonso de Polanco: AHN, Inquisición. lib. 581, ff. 53', 245', 295').

\textsuperscript{36} Diego de Santa Cruz: *1518 Granada, SJ 1550 Coimbra; †1594; priest 1543. He was a disciple of Juan de Ávila (see Jurado, “San Juan de Ávila,” p. 158).

\textsuperscript{37} Fernando de Mendoza González: Born in Calahorra, he was a friend of Juan Bautista Carrillo. Mendoza asked to be dismissed from the Society in 1591, but Acquaviva did not grant his request. Befriended by the Count of Lemos, Fernando Ruiz de Castro, and his wife, Catalina de Zúñiga, he accompanied them to Naples, where Fernando was appointed viceroy. Acquaviva’s eventual attempts to dismiss him led to Pope Paul V’s solution of appointing Mendoza bishop of Cuzco in Peru (1608), where he eventually died in 1617. Astrain dedicates a long paragraph to a disapproving portrayal of him (see Astrain, Historia, 3:652–77).

\textsuperscript{38} Juan Bautista Pacheco: *c. 1550 Ucés (Cuenca, Spain); SJ 1572; †1614 Madrid; priest in 1618; professed in 1590. He was known for his proposal to found jesuitas descalzos, characterized by poverty and dedicated to the apostolate of moriscos. Acquaviva put him into prison. Francisco de Borja Medina suggested his Judeo-Christian ancestry, based on his surname and provenience (DHCJ 3:2941), but also, his first name was one of the most common among conversos. For Astrain’s judgment on his “semi-comic” attempt to found the descalzos Jesuits, see his Historia, 3:643.

\textsuperscript{39} Gaspar Sánchez: He was born in Andalusia. His main ministry was preaching in the provinces of Andalusia and Toledo. He made his final four vows in Seville on 19 November 1570 (ARSI, Hisp. 1, ff. 132 and 134). The letter from Ignacio del Castello to Acquaviva on 10 February 1592 would suggest that he wrote a memorial to the Inquisition (see Astrain, Historia, 3:380 and 426).

\textsuperscript{40} Gaspar de Valpedrosa: On his role in the memorialistas movement, see Astrain, Historia, 3:430.

\textsuperscript{41} Jerónimo (Romano) de la Higuera: *1538 Lisbon; SJ 1562; †1611 Toledo; priest in 1561; professed in 1590. He was a descendant of the majordomo of Cardinal Mendoza (see Linda Martz, “Converso Families in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Toledo: The Significance of Lineage,” Sefarad 48 (1998): 137) and a disciple of Juan de Ávila. He published a number of works on the history and geography of ancient Iberia (see DHCJ 2: 1923–4 and Netanyahu, Toward the Inquisition, pp. 78–80). On the critical analysis of these works, see a recent study by Mercedes García-Arenal and Fernando Rodríguez Mediano, “Jerónimo Román de la Higuera and the Lead Books of Sacromonte,” in Ingram, ed., Conversos and Moriscos, pp. 243–68.

\textsuperscript{42} Likely he was a brother of the converso memorialistas, Manuel López and Enrique Enriquez. He was a disciple of Juan de Ávila.

\textsuperscript{43} Manuel López: *1525 Oporto, SJ 1545; †1603 Álcala; priest 1579. Two of his brothers became Jesuits. One of them was Enrique Enriquez (see above). Their mother’s family of Benthalho was related to the founder of the Jewish community in Amsterdam, whose niece was the mother of Baruch Spinoza (see DHCJ 3:2416). Manuel was appointed provincial of Toledo (1568–73) and, as such, participated in General Congregation 3 (see above). For his role in the memorialistas movement, see Astrain, Historia, 3:378–80.
Other *memorialistas* mentioned by the Spanish historian Astrain were: Francisco Estrada,\(^{44}\) Alonso Gómez,\(^{45}\) Juan Landino,\(^{46}\) Miguel de Medina,\(^{47}\) Pedro Montano,\(^{48}\) Juan Osorio,\(^{49}\) Pedro Palto,\(^{50}\) Francisco Portocarrero,\(^{51}\) Pedro Ruiz,\(^{52}\) José San Julián,\(^{53}\) Francisco Trujillo,\(^{54}\) Juan Valles,\(^{55}\) Rodrigo Vargas,\(^{56}\) and Miguel Vázquez.\(^{57}\) Even though, according to Melchor de Valpedrosa’s *Diario* of General Congregation 5, virtually all the *memorialistas* were conversos,\(^{58}\) which can be explained in terms of a sort of sociological bond among conversos as a minority threatened by the dominant Old Christians,\(^{59}\) the question of whether their participation in the movement gives that movement an exclusively converso character needs a more comprehensive and unprejudiced answer that is worthy of a monograph.\(^{60}\)

Nonetheless, Benedetto Palmio, the former assistant general to Borja and Mercurian, never doubted that conversos were behind the vindictive *memorialistas* movement. And he enthusiastically grabbed a pen to prove his point.

\(^{44}\) According to Astrain (*Historia*, 3:574), he acted in Toledo in cooperation with Juan de Mariana.

\(^{45}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:375 and 427.

\(^{46}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{47}\) Born in Baeza; dismissed by José de Acosta (Astrain, *Historia*, 3:500).

\(^{48}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{49}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:426; and *DHCJ*, 3:2616.

\(^{50}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{51}\) He was admitted to the profession on 20 August 1582 (ARSI, *Hisp.* 2, ff. 21–22).

\(^{52}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:428 and 431; and *DHCJ*, 3:2616.

\(^{53}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:430–1; and *DHCJ*, 3:2616.

\(^{54}\) See AHN, Clero-Jesuitas, leg. 252, f. 579; Astrain, *Historia*, 3:428 and 431; and *DHCJ*, 3:2616.

\(^{55}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{56}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{57}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:432.

\(^{58}\) See Astrain, *Historia*, 3:610. Melchor de Valpedrosa was likely the brother of Gaspar, a member of the *memorialistas* movement (see above).


\(^{60}\) See Medina, “Los precursores de Vieira,” pp. 494–7, where he criticizes Astrain’s biased judgment on the movement.
Benedetto Palmio’s converso-phobic memorial

The internal battle against those Jesuits who had Jewish ancestry that has been described so far is portrayed in a virtually unknown manuscript memorial.61 This untitled and unsigned text is bound in the codex *Institutum 106*, ff. 92–132, of the Jesuit Archives in Rome (ARSI), adjacent to another manuscript by the same hand, *De gubernatione Societatis*. The document is undated, but some internal information allows us to establish the approximate time of its writing. The *terminus ante quem* of the text is likely the year 1589, when Dionisio Vázquez, who is referred to in the document as being still alive ([8]), died. The *terminus post quem* of the document is probably the year 1584, when Pope Gregory XIII inaugurated a grand new edifice for the Roman College (hence its future name of Gregorian University), an event to which the text seems to allude ([32]). Additionally, the overt criticism of Mercurian (whom Palmio conspired to replace)62 in the past tense ([31]) might suggest that the memorial would have been addressed to Acquaviva after the latter’s election as superior general in 1581, but before his decision to bar converso candidates from admission into the Society in 1590 (still before General Congregation 5).63 The text resembles three other “memorials on union” written at Acquaviva’s request by his assistants general Lorenzo Maggio, Paul Hoffaeus, and Manuel Rodrigues in the 1580s. In its tenor, the memorial also bears a resemblance to the latter’s *De hominibus baptizatis ex progenie Judaeorum*, written to Acquaviva in 1584. In it, Rodrigues alludes to Palmio’s memorial against *confesos* that he would write to Acquaviva from Venice 12 March 1588.64 Rodrigues’s description of its content

---

61 Memorial is a literary genre and means here a written statement of facts presented in conjunction with a petition to a royal or religious authority. Hence memorialistas—a group of Jesuits who sent such documents to the Spanish king and Inquisition, and to the pope, which was discussed above.


63 Some chronological inconsistencies must be noticed, however. In the same paragraph ([21]), Palmio states that Vázquez is still the vice-provincial of Naples and that he was fired from that office.

64 “Duodecimo Martii anni 1588 Venetiis scripsit Pater Benedictus Palmius ad patrem generalem nostrum Claudium Aquavivam, quibus ait, post mortem Laynez cum esset vicarius generalis pater Franciscus Borja, quosdam patre Hispanos zelosos misisse ad summum pontificem Pium IV multa ac magna memoralia contra confesos, quibusque dicebat patrem Borja esse eorum fautorum atque caput, continebaturque in eis longus catalogus confessorum Hispanorum, inter quos numerabantur fere omnes patres Hispani, qui tunc Romae gubernabant. Petebant hi zelosi a summum pontifice ut
strongly suggests that he alludes to the same memorial that is the subject of our text. It is possible that it also echoes a pro-converso memorial composed by Antonio Possevino a decade earlier.\textsuperscript{65}

A sixteenth-century amanuensis wrote it in a neat hand, but it has corrections and interpolations by another hand. A comparison of the document’s content and the author’s handwriting with other manuscripts of his acknowledged authorship (especially \textit{Vitae 164}, ff. 118–83)\textsuperscript{66} unambiguously reveals that those corrections and interpolations were made by the same hand. Therefore, our manuscript has the value of an autograph. An additional piece of information about its author can be gathered from the text itself, for he often uses the first person singular. The author states that he was one of the four consultants of Ignatius [of Loyola] ([11]);\textsuperscript{67} that he came back to Rome from Milan, where he was summoned by Cardinal Borromeo\textsuperscript{68} during his first year of office of [general] assistant ([12]); that in this office Everard Mercurian was his colleague ([13]); that he was [superior] provincial of Lombardy ([18]); that he visited the pope in Frascati with [Peter] Canisius\textsuperscript{69} after the death of Cardinal [Otto Truchsess von Waldenburg].

\textsuperscript{65} Cohen (“Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” pp. 543–61) convincingly argues, following Astrain (\textit{Historia} 3:7–9) and Donnelly (“Antonio Possevino,” p. 5), that Possevino’s memorial was criticizing Palmio’s anti-converso attitude.

\textsuperscript{66} See the description of the manuscript in \textit{Fontes narr.} 3:152–5.

\textsuperscript{67} See Chapter 32 of Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}.

\textsuperscript{68} Carlo Borromeo (1538–84) was a nephew of Pope Pius IV, who appointed him cardinal and secretary of state in Rome. He made the Spiritual Exercises with the Jesuit Juan Bautista de Ribera, who subsequently became his spiritual director. After his sacerdotal and episcopal ordination in 1563, he moved to his archdiocese of Milan, where the following year he founded a seminary whose direction was given to the Society. In 1565 he offered to the Jesuits the college and church of San Fedele, where the first community moved in 1567. Borromeo also called the Jesuits (1572) to teach in a newly established university at Brera (see \textit{DHCJ} 1:496–7; and Flavio Rurale, “Carlo Borromeo and the Society of Jesus in the 1570s,” in McCoog, ed., \textit{Mercurian Project}, pp. 559–605).

\textsuperscript{69} Peter Canisius *1521 Nijmegen (the Netherlands); SJ 1543; †1597 Fribourg (Switzerland); priest in 1546; professed in 1549. He participated in the Council of Trent and was among the first Jesuits (with Palmio and Nadal) to open the school
of Augsburg\textsuperscript{70} ([28]); and that he was reappointed assistant general by General Congregations 2 and 3 ([28]).

All this information unquestionably points to Benedetto Palmio (or di Palmia) as the memorial’s author. He was born on 11 July 1523 to the Parmesan couple Antonio di Palmia and Chiara Botini,\textsuperscript{71} who gave him a Christian and classical education that he continued at the University of Bologna (c. 1540–6).\textsuperscript{72} Under the sway of the converso Diego Laínez\textsuperscript{73} and Juan Jerónimo Doménech,\textsuperscript{74} Benedetto joined the Society of Jesus in 1546. After twenty months of formation with Loyola in Rome,\textsuperscript{75} he was sent to Messina with Nadal and Canisius, among others, to open the first Jesuit school, where he taught rhetoric.\textsuperscript{76} During his five-year sojourn in Sicily, Palmio was also intensely engaged in preaching. In 1553 he was called to Rome, where he was ordained priest and for four years studied philosophy and theology at the Roman College. A year after his final vows in Padua (1559), where he then supervised its first Jesuit college, Laínez appointed him the first superior provincial of Lombardy (1559–65). Upon the request of Cardinal Borromeo, Palmio resided in Milan after 1563. Subsequently, he was elected assistant general for Italy under Borja (1565–72) and Mercurian (1573–80). Recognized for his exquisite talent in preaching,\textsuperscript{77} he was appointed by Pope Pius V as the first Jesuit \textit{concionator apostolicus}. During General Congregation 4 (1581),

\textsuperscript{70} Otto Truchsess von Waldburg (1543–73) was a cardinal-bishop of Augsburg, but since 1568 he lived in Rome. He founded the university and seminary in Dillingen, which he subsequently gave to the Jesuits (1564).

\textsuperscript{71} Palmio’s father died prematurely at the age of forty-five. His mother had been born to the noble Parmesan, Pier Antonio Botini, and the Milanese Ippolita Giambacorti. Benedetto had five brothers; an older one, Francesco, also entered the Society (see Chapters 1–2 of Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}; and Pietro Tacchi Venturi, S.J., \textit{Storia della Compagnia di Gesù In Italia}, 2 vols. in 4 parts (Rome: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1950), vol. 2/1, p. 363).

\textsuperscript{72} See Chapters 4 and 9 of Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}. There he also studied law and philosophy.

\textsuperscript{73} See Chapters 3–4 of Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}; Laínez visited Parma with his confrere Pierre Favre in 1540; the Palmios hosted them.

\textsuperscript{74} See the biographical note on him in Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{75} For the detailed description of this period, see Chapters 11–19 of Palmio’s autobiography published in \textit{Fontes narr.} 3:155–70.

\textsuperscript{76} See Chapter 21 of Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}.

\textsuperscript{77} It was noted by Nadal (\textit{Mon Nadal} 1:756–7) and Polanco (\textit{Chron.} 1:369 and 2:220–1, 230).
Cardinal Borromeo unsuccessfully pressured Pope Gregory XIII\textsuperscript{78} to suggest that his protégé be a candidate for the position of superior general of the Society. Consequently, after sixteen years, Palmio abandoned the Jesuit headquarters and moved to Ferrara, where he wrote both his autobiography and the present memorial. He died there on 14 November 1598.\textsuperscript{79}

Palmio composed his memorial in seven unequal parts, corresponding to the number of causes of the above-mentioned division in the Society of Jesus. “The first cause and origin of our evils has proceeded from the multitude and insolence of Spanish neophytes, and from the excessive credit and favor given them by Father Francisco de Borja” ([12]). In this part ([1]–[12]), Palmio attempts to offer historical background for the presence of neophytes in the Society of Jesus, a presence which he describes as a pestilence and diabolical zizania: New Christians originated in Spain after the conversion of Jews following the edicts of the Catholic Monarchs\textsuperscript{81} and were fought by the Inquisition, the Church of Toledo, and religious orders, for “where a New Christian was found, it was impossible to live in peace” ([3]).

Due to the infamous character of the New Christians, Loyola had the Jesuit Constitutions require that a candidate be asked whether he was a New Christian, so that a few of them could be accepted and those accepted would be well known. This is why major Jesuit tasks in Iberia were given to the Old Christians Francis Xavier, Simão Rodrigues [de Azevedo], Nicolás de Bobadilla, and Antonio de Araoz ([4]).

The present troubles the Society suffers could have been avoided if this initial restriction on New Christians had been perpetuated. However, because “those who governed in Rome were almost all neo-

\textsuperscript{78} Pope Gregory XIII (1502–85), born Ugo Boncompagni, was pope from 1572 to 1585. Much on his role in the Society’s affairs below.


\textsuperscript{80} Ironically, “those who sowed zizania” is a frequent expression in pro-converso texts, among them the bull *Humani generis inimicus* by Nicholas V; see also the treatise *Contra algunos zizañadores de la nación de los convertidos del pueblo Israel* by Lope de Barrientos, edited by A. Getino in “Vida y obras de Fr. Lope de Barrientos,” *Annales Salmantinos* (1927): 181–204.

\textsuperscript{81} The wave of Jewish conversions actually began, as we have seen in Chapter One, a century earlier in the wake of pogroms in 1391, or even earlier.
phytes” ([5]), they were able to conspire against the superior provincial of Spain, Araoz, and were able to make sure that their supporter, Francisco de Borja, was appointed commissary for Spain [so that the latter would supervise the former]. Borja “opened the doors so wide to this sort of people [New Christians] that almost no other people were being admitted in Spain and the Old Christians, realizing this situation, were escaping from the Society” ([5]). As a result, the Spanish king, Philip II, labeled the Society “a synagogue of Hebrews” ([5]).

New Christian dominance was opposed by Loyola’s successor, Diego Laínez, who “was an Israeliite indeed—as he admitted publicly—but in whom there was no deceit” ([6]). Yet the conversos were able to pursue their political agenda, due to Laínez’s numerous travels outside Rome and his premature death ([6]). Another reason why the New Christians’ wickedness (in Palmio’s view) thrived under Borja’s generalate was Borja’s exposure to converso monastic influences before his entrance into the Society, which altered the spirit of Ignatius, whose

---

82 Other sources for this information are the anti-Semitic and anti-converso texts of the Portuguese assistant general, Manuel Rodrigues, entitled De baptizatis ex progenie Iudaeorum, or De gente bizayna (ARSI, Inst. 186e, f. 338): “Replena est Hispania Iuda[es], ut feratur Regem Philippum dixisse Societatem esse synagogam Iudaeorum”; Lorenzo Maggio’s De unione animorum in Societate: restauranda e servanda (ARSI Inst. 178, f. 155); and an anonymous petition to bar the conversos (ARSI, Inst. 184 II, f. 356): “Quod ad bonum nomen attinet, Romae adest, qui asserit Societatem in Hispania apellari Marranada per congregationem Marranorum, sic enim appellant Iud[a]eos. Adest etiam in Romana provincia [this is Pedro de Mouria, brother of Cristóbal, a high royal official] quem Rex Catholicos reprehendit quid ingressus fuerit Societatem dicens Entrastes en una sinagoga (o relegión) de Judos, hoc est ingressus es in synagoga Iudaeorum.” Archbishop Silíceo expressed a similar fear, that his church would be dubbed “second Synagogue,” in his letter to the pope: “Si hunc seminum nostra Ecclesia susciperet en Canonicum, dabitur omnibus causa quamlibet turpibus hominibus obtinendi huiusmodi ecclesiasticas sedes, cui rei V.S. providerit brevi futura erit Ecclesia Toletana (quae princeps est in Hispania) altera Synagoga” (see Sicroff, Estatutos, p. 131). On the relationship between Phillip II and conversos, see Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, Los judeoconversos en la España moderna (Madrid: Mapfre, 1993), p. 61: “Parece evidente que los reyes de España nunca sintieron el problema converso de la forma primaria y elemental que se advierte en la mayoría de los españoles de su tiempo. Desconfiaban en ellos como grupo, pero apreciaban las cualidades de muchos y se sirvieron de ellos sin los remilgos ridículos cada vez más extendidos. Lo hizo Fernando el Católico, y también Felipe II sabía hacer excepciones a la ley de la limpieza.”

83 No doubt Borja was influenced by Spanish monasticism—before entering the Society he was in close contact with Salvador de Horta, Pedro de Alcántara, and Juan de Tejeda who was his companion in Gandía. The latter’s influence is mentioned by Palmio in his autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 33sq). Borja did his spiritual exercises with Oviedo, who was renowned in the Society for his monastic inclinations
purity Borja’s assistants general (Palmio above all) were committed to preserve. These influences were also represented, in Palmio’s view, by four New Christians who held influential posts in Rome: Dionisio Vázquez, Cristóbal Rodríguez, Alonso Ruiz, and Diego de Ledesma. The latter devised the plan of dividing the Roman College, a plan that Palmio vigorously opposed as assistant general for Italy ([7]–[8]).

The spirit of Borja stood in contrast to that of Araoz, who in Palmio’s eyes was “a man of sound judgment and singular virtue” ([4]). Borja’s spirit produced a division between New and Old Christians in Spain that affected the Society in Rome, where “in previous times not even a word of such a division had been heard and one lived with a simplicity, union, and peace comparable only to that described in the Acts of the Apostles” ([9]). The division of the Society into two parties led by Araoz and Borja was so profound that before General Congregation 1 (convoked after Loyola’s death), a booklet that contained the description of this conflict and a long list of New Christian Jesuits was presented to Pope Paul IV. The pope, continued Palmio, appointed Cardinal Borromeo to investigate the crisis ([9]). The cardinal consulted Palmio, whom he “trusted very much” ([10]), and was advised to let the Jesuit congregation, which was about to convene, deal with the problem on its own. But to Palmio’s dismay, the crisis remained unresolved, for under the newly elected Superior General Borja “the number and the authority of neophytes increased” ([10]). Things went from bad to worse and produced new scandals during the next congregation, General Congregation 3 ([10]).

The problem of New Christians went back, Palmio pointed out, to the very beginning of the Society. He noticed it, being Ignatius’s advisor, and talked about some “troubled and tempted” New Christian Jesuits

(see Manuel Ruiz Jurado, “Un caso de profetismo reformista en la Compañía de Jesús. Gandía 1547–1549,” AHSI 43 (1974): 217–66). Borja also counseled Teresa of Ávila in subjects of prayer methods. To General Congregation 1 (which he could not attend) Borja sent a memorial proposing to extend the time allowed for prayer and to impose as mandatory certain penances in the Society. This memorial did not arrive on time, but the newly elected Superior General Laínez refused Borja’s suggestions. Interestingly enough, Palmio accused for the same monastic tendencies the converso novice master in Rome, Alonso Ruiz, who was appointed by Borja. The most famous converso Jesuit representing monastic tendencies in the period of our consideration was Juan Bautista Pacheco (see above). These tendencies were contrasted by a group of French Jesuits known as Confrères de la Voie Candide (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 18).
to Laínez, whom he considered a saint, but—as General Congregation 1 proved—nobody wanted to listen ([11]). This was what led Nicolás Bobadilla to dismantle the New Christian “triumvirate” in Rome, for many resented their rule, which they regarded as despotic—“they proceeded not as fathers but as masters” ([12]). This is why, when he came back to Rome from Milan during his first year of assistancy [1565–6], Palmio found there only quarrels and complaints—“our primeval peace and union, for which the Society had been admired, was now gone” ([12]).

Other causes of the troubles produced by New Christians were, according to Palmio, strictly related to the first: the second and the third “roots” regard “asperity and too much inequality in the Jesuit government,” for “New Christians persuaded themselves that the Society couldn’t be governed except by Spaniards” ([13]). In this section Palmio accuses the Jesuit central government, which was in New Christian hands, of preferring to promote Spaniards [especially those of Jewish origin] to the profession of four vows, and consequently to high administrative offices. Palmio complains that because two

---

84 To my knowledge, Palmio’s memorial is the only document that interprets the crisis after Loyola’s death in terms of the converso conflict. On different interpretations of Bobadilla’s discontent, see DHJC 1:464–5; Scaduto, Governo, pp. 45–7. Ironically enough, Araoz—who is portrayed in Palmio’s memorial as the head of the anti-converso party—claimed that Bobadilla was of Jewish origins (see Miguel Mir, Historia interna documentada de la Compañía de Jesús, vol. 1, p. 332).

85 Interestingly, in Bobadilla’s memorial to Pope Paul IV it was Loyola who was accused of authoritarianism: “Ignatio [...] era Padre et padrone absoluto et faceva quanto voleva” (Mon Nadal 4:733). Note that this accusation is similar to what Palmio wrote about the role of conversos during General Congregation 3: “[Polanco] si vedeva ritirarsi con Madrid, Natale, Ribadenera et altri Spagnuoli, il che ci dava non poco da pensare” ([25]). It is uncertain, thus, about which triumvirate Palmio is speaking here: Polanco-Nadal-Madrid or Polanco-Nadal-Laínez? Given that Palmio writes on Lainez in this document in a very positive way, it is more likely that he had in his mind the former troika. At any rate, Polanco and Nadal are the main actors of these events. Interestingly enough, Palmio does not reveal Nadal’s converso identity directly in his memorial, but he states about the triumvirate that “non si sapendo se non da pochi che erano neofiti.”

86 This accusation suggests why Palmio could ally against the conversos with some Portuguese Jesuits during General Congregation 3 (see below [28]).

87 Miriam Bodian, in her Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation. Conversos and Community in Early Modern Amsterdam (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), described how the converso community of Amsterdam that converted back to Judaism was proud of its Spanish grandeza (p. 86), in spite of the persecutions inflicted on their community in Spain (see the same argument in Gerber, The Jews of Spain, pp. xiv–v). Perhaps the same kind of Spanish national pride assimilated
assistants general, Mercurian and himself (two others, Nadal and Miró, were Spaniards), were often out of Rome, Borja surrounded himself in the curia with members of the New Christian lobby, which had more authority than his assistants. Among these lobbyists were [Juan Alfonso de] Polanco, [Cristóbal Sánchez de] Madrid, Dionisio Vázquez, Alonso Ruiz, [Cristóbal] Rodríguez, [Hernando de] Solier, [Pedro de] Ribadeneyra, and also [Diego de] Ledesma, [Pedro de] Parra, and [Manuel de] Sá. According to Palmio, this group—led by Polanco, Vázquez, and Madrid—pushed to appoint Spaniards even in non-Spanish provinces, such as Portugal, Germany, France, Flanders, and Italy ([13]).

The author provides the details of how Spaniards sought to dominate in this way in Lombardy, where Palmio had been the superior provincial. He accuses Polanco of taking advantage of Borja’s illness to promote Ribadeneyra to the office of provincial there and recounts how he was able successfully to convince Borja that the Italian Leonetto Chiavone88 was a better candidate for that position ([14]). Given that only the Jesuits who were admitted to the profession of four vows had an active voice during general congregations and could hold governmental positions, Palmio argues that Spaniards were particularly eager to be admitted to that profession by meeting its main requirement—the study of theology for four or at least three years ([15]). The author feels offended above all by the admission to this profession of New Christian candidates who were less respected than some Italian

by the Jesuit conversos fueled their pro-Spanish policy. Also Alcalá indicated “an inextinguishable Hispanism” as one of the five reasons why a Jew might convert to Christianity (see Renée Levine Melammed, A Question of Identity. Iberian Conversos in Historical Perspective (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 16). Yet, we have to keep in mind that the preference for Spaniards was an obvious feature of the generals before Borja. Loyola admitted to the profession of four vows thirty-eight Jesuits (minus the first companions), fourteen of whom were Spanish; only eight of whom were Portuguese; nine Flemish, four Italian, and three French. Under Laínez, out of seventy-four admitted thirty-two were Spanish, and only nineteen were Portuguese, eight Italian, six German, five French, and three Flemish (see Mon Nadal 2:502 and Scaduto, Azione, p. 802).

88 Leonetto Chiavone: *1525 Vicenza; SJ 1559; †1572 Milan; priest before 1559; professed in 1568. He was appointed superior provincial of Lombardy in 1570 and died two years later (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 31). His entrance into the Society was strongly opposed by his father, who dubbed the Jesuits as the Society “this new Society founded by the Jews and marranos of Spain” (ARSI, Ital. 116, f. 190).
Jesuits. Such was the case of Luis Mendoza, Gaspar Hernández, and [Antonio] Trancoso vis-à-vis Fulvio Cardulo ([16]).

According to Palmio, the despotic rule of Spaniards was the reason for issuing a document during General Congregation 3 that stipulated that the future superior general be able to govern with a paternal and not a despotic spirit ([17]). To further support his argument, Palmio quotes several examples of the “bad behavior” of Spanish (or New Christian) Jesuits in Italy: the story of Juan Gurrea, whom Palmio as provincial did not allow to “stay out until six or seven o’clock in the morning, going to parties and watching cavaliers and ladies play” ([18]) as he was accustomed to doing, and that of Ribadeneyra’s relative, Juan Hurtado, or Rodrigo Mena, both of whom left the Society in the wake of many scandals. In this paragraph, Palmio depicts himself as a superior who treated his subjects equally, since, as he wrote, the Italians who “did not want to be corrected and accept paternal reprimands” were also dismissed ([18]).

The major source of scandals was Palmio’s main target, Dionisio Vázquez, who—as rector of the Roman College—tried to imprison two Jesuit students, Camillo Carga, a papal prelate’s brother, and a certain

---

89. Luis Mendoza: *1533 Almazán (as Laínez); SJ 1554; †1595 Madrid; priest in 1559; professed 25 March 1568 (see Scaduto, *Catalogo*, p. 97; and Astrain, *Historia*, 3:629, 637–8). He might be Diego Lainez’s nephew—Diego’s sister, María Coronel, who married Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, had two sons who entered the Society, but their names are obscure.

90. Antonio Trancoso: *1534 Moncon (Braga, Portugal); SJ 1550; priest in 1564. He was dismissed in 1568 in Barcelona (see Scaduto, *Catalogo*, p. 147). Contrary to what Palmio may have thought, he was a Portuguese and not Spanish converso.

91. Fulvio Cardulo: *1529 Narni (Terni, Italy); SJ 1546; †1591 Rome; priest in 1555; professed in 1566. For almost his entire Jesuit life he was a professor of rhetoric at the Roman College, where he promoted the reading of Terence and Erasmus. As a renowned Latinist, he helped Polanco correct the latter’s rendition of the Jesuit *Constitutions* into Latin. Polanco described his talents as court orator in a letter from 1556 (*Mon. Ign.*, 12:205–12). Indeed, Cardulo was often called upon by popes to deliver orations in the Sistine Chapel. He also left a number of unedited works on rhetoric (see Scaduto, *Azione*, pp. 295–6). He pronounced his three vows two years before Luis Mendoza (see above). See *DHCJ* 1:658; Scaduto, *Governo*, pp. 107 and 186; and Scaduto, *Catalogo*, p. 27.

92. It was rather a questionnaire that was given to the electors in order to discern who was most apt for the office of superior general: “Is one to believe that […] will govern the Society in a paternal manner, and not in tyrannical one, to use the words of Reverend Father Laínez, of holy memory, so that subjects have easy access to him and that they would happily in the Lord wish to open their hearts to him in confidence” (Padberg, *For Matters of Greater Moment*, p. 136).

93. There is little known about him.

94. Camillo Carga: *S. Daniele del Friuli; SJ 1564. He was dismissed in 1568 in Rome,
Portuguese named Roboredo ([20]–[21]). Palmio describes Vázquez as a “New Christian of ugly appearance, and more importantly, full of duplicity and deceit” ([20]). When asked by Borja why he disliked Vázquez, Palmio replied plainly that he was ambitious, “his face is so ugly that he seems to be a Moor, and he has this fearful leer when you look in his eyes” ([20]). According to Palmio, Borja, in spite of being a very religious and virtuous man, gave Vázquez excessive credit and kept promoting him: removed from Rome, he was appointed as vice-provincial in Naples ([21]).

Palmio, however, wanted to make clear that he made an unambiguous distinction between good Spaniards (Old Christians) and Spanish neophytes: the former “know very well that we love them from the bottom of our heart” ([22]). They came to realize on their own, during General Congregations 2 and 3, that “all their and our evils proceeded from neophytes and especially from those who governed in Rome […]. The neophytes want to dominate everywhere and this is why the Society is agitated by the tempest of discords and acrimonies” ([22]).

The inequality of nations, continues Palmio, was especially evident during General Congregation 3: out of forty-seven electors, twenty-eight were Spaniards. A few weeks before the congregation, Polanco informed the pope that “the only candidate apt to become general could be chosen among Spaniards” ([23]). The pope, advised by some cardinals and the Iberian monarch, expressed his intention to impede the election of any Spanish candidate to generalate ([23]). But some cardinals (one of them consulted Palmio) wanted to investigate further into the proceedings of the congregation and asked the pope to set up for this purpose a committee of two cardinals ([24]). Having gathered from them the information, continues Palmio, the pope summoned Polanco and asked him to make sure that no Spanish candidate be elected general. Polanco’s response did not satisfy the pontiff. As a result, he was instructed by Cardinal Farnese to obey and to not a fact that Palmio omits here. His brother, Giovanni, was a prelate in Pius IV’s and Gregory XIII’s office (segreteria). See Scaduto, Governo, p. 492; and Scaduto, Francesco Borgia, Index.

This portrayal of the converso Vázquez with a dark skin evokes the description of Shylock by Salerio in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice (see Adelman, Blood Relations, pp. 84–5) and represents a diffused iconography of Jews in the period.

According to Fois, the pope suggested during that audience the name of Mercurian for the new general (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 21).
make too many replies. Even then Polanco remained agitated, but he
did not talk about the incident to other assistants general. Instead,
relates Palmio, he was seen talking to Madrid, Nadal, Ribadeneyra,
and other Spaniards. That aroused in Palmio additional suspicions
about Polanco. In order to confirm Polanco’s conspiracy, Palmio lists
a number of compromising episodes ([25]).

Because of the death of the Cardinal of Augusta,97 Palmio (together
with Canisius) happened to be received by the pope in his residence in
Frascati. Throughout the audience, the pope interrogated Palmio about
the general congregation that was planned. When he was told about
the dominance of Spaniards, the pope put his hand on Palmio’s shoul-
der and said, “It is unnecessary that one nation prevail over another”
([26]). Palmio gave Polanco information about this audience with the
pope, to which the latter reacted with embarrassment. After Polanco
and others went to the pope to ask his blessing for the congregation,
the pope affirmed that Polanco wanted to become a general. Once
again Palmio compiles a list of episodes that would prove it, among
them the accusation that Polanco forced Borja, who was dying, to con-
tinue his return trip to Rome, despite his physical state ([27]).98

In the next paragraph ([27]), Palmio returns to the structure of the
seven causes with which he began this memorial. The fourth cause of
troubles that affected the Society was, he claims, the delegation of the
Portuguese fathers who presented to the pope letters from the kings
Sebastian and Philip, and the Cardinal Infant Henry, who strongly
insisted that no New Christian candidate become the general of the
Society, knowing that there was a risk that Polanco could be elected.
This is why the pope sent the Cardinal of Como to the congregation
with the order that no Spanish candidate be elected general.

Before narrating what he labeled the “success” of General Congre-
gation 3, Palmio provides information about its preliminary events
([28]), focusing again on Polanco, who undermined the order of
the pope conveyed by Cardinal of Como by asking the congregation
whether they had to obey. Polanco sent a delegation to the pope to
ask to be free in the election. Among the chosen electors were Leão

97 Otto Truchsess von Waldburg (see above).
98 This accusation, which was also suggested by the Portuguese assistant general,
Manuel Rodrigues, in his De hominibus baptizatis ex progenie jud[a]eorum (ARSI,
Inst. 184/II, f. 365) seems groundless, as we have seen in Chapter Two.
Henriques, who brought the aforementioned letters from Portugal.\footnote{Along with Leão Henriques there were Paul Hoffaeus, Lorenzo Maggio, Oliver Mannaerts, and Peter Canisius, but not Palmio.} The pope, continues Palmio, acceded to the request, but only on condition that, if a Spanish candidate was elected, he would be informed before the candidate’s confirmation, for “to be honest, his intention and that of the kings and the congregation was not to prevent the election of a Spanish candidate, but to prevent the generalate from ending up in hands of a New Christian” ([28]). The day after, the congregation elected the Walloon Everard Mercurian, who had already been assistant general under Borja. Additionally, four assistants general were elected, among them Palmio.

Palmio attributes the fifth cause of the Society’s troubles to Polanco’s claim that the election of Mercurian was orchestrated ([29]). Furthermore, the New Christians promoted a decree that prohibited any future exclusion of a New Christian candidate from the generalate.\footnote{In his autobiography (ARSi, Vitae 164, f. 90’), Palmio argued that to promote this decree would be to “canonizzare i nuovi Cristiani.” From another paragraph (f. 98) it looks like this decree was suggested by Salmerón: “il Padre Salmerón in camera mi fece grande instanza che subito io facessi un decreto per il quale si determinasse che in posterum non si potesse ragionare de genere et che si facesse scommunicare a chi facesse il contrario et che subito l’altro giorno lo publicasse in congregazione sotto l’autorità di Sua Santità.” Palmio opposed the decree, because in his view it was against the pope’s mind. This account fills the gap in the Congregation’s minutes. Only Sacchini’s Historiae Societatis Iesu (written a half-century after General Congregation 3) narrated the discussion on the two anti- and pro-converso bills (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” p. 56).} The Portuguese lobby produced an opposing decree, which would exclude any New Christian from becoming superior general. The New Christian party, continues Palmio, conspired with the help of a cardinal to put pressure on the pope to approve their plan. Moreover, they complained that the elections of Mercurian and of the assistant general for Portugal were suspicious. To inquire into these allegations, Mercurian set up a five-member committee.\footnote{Fois lists only four names: Salmerón, Francesco Adorno, Claude Matthieu, and Miguel de Torres (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 24).} The committee’s investigation confirmed the legitimacy of the elections. The Congregation consequently asked Mercurian to accept neither decree, so that “peace and union be maintained” ([29]). In his failure to obtain the aforementioned decree, Palmio sees the cause of the New Christians’ subsequent opposition to Rome, seeking, with the help of the Spanish king, “the
Mannaerts, and Peter Canisius, but not Palmio.

Miguel de Torres (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 24).

Mercurian set up a five-member committee. The committee’s investigation confirmed the legitimacy of the elections. The Congregation 3) narrated the discussion on the two anti- and pro-converso bills (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” p. 56).

Mansion and union be maintained” (29). In his failure to obtain the aforementioned letters, Palmio opposed the decree, because in his view it would be to “canonizzare i nuovi Cristiani.” From another paragraph it looks like this decree was suggested by Salmerón: “il Padre Salmerón in cam-

Palmio argued that to promote the question about the converso background of the Jesuit candidates. He also opposed the anti-converso lobbying during General Congregation 3.

Alfonso Salmerón from Olías (Toledo) was a close friend of Laínez from adolescence, with whom he studied in Sigüenza, Alcalá, and Paris and participated in the Council of Trent. According to Ribadeneyra, Salmerón would have written against the discrimination of conversos, but no such text has been found. He unsuccessfully suggested that Loyola remove from the Jesuit Constitutions the anti-converso lobbying during General Congregation 3.
separation of Spain from the General’s obedience.” The “main author of this evil enterprise” was Dionisio Vázquez ([30]).

Palmio assigns the penultimate and sixth cause of the Society’s troubles to a “great misdeed” of Mercurian, which included, first, his defense of the insolence of Giulio Mazarino102 towards Cardinal Borromeo; and second, his persecution of two Jesuit fathers who complained to the pope about his demeanor. These acts left Mercurian unable to react against the memorials that were written against him and the Society to the king of Spain ([31]). The final and seventh cause “where our evils were born” was, in Palmio’s view, the wrong way in which the Roman College was subsidized ([30]–[31]).

The unbalanced structure of the memorial, in which five of the seven reasons for the Society’s problems are attributed to conversos, clearly reveals Palmio’s intent to ridicule the converso Jesuits in the eyes of Superior General Acquaviva and to blame them for many of the troubles the Society was experiencing at that time. In blaming the conversos, Palmio employs a brilliantly biased language. New Christians, who to Palmio are still Jews,103 are overly ambitious, insolent, Janus-faced, pretentious, despotic, astute, terrible, greedy for power, and infamous. Some of these features can be seen, according to Palmio, in their ugly physiognomy, as is the case with Dionisio Vázquez ([20]). To describe the converso group, the author often uses the disparaging expression, “this sort of people” ([3]–[5], [8]). Their presence in the Society is a story of conspiracy and deceit. For Palmio, the only good Spaniards are Old Christians ([22]). Employing the rhetoric of *aurea prima aetas*—the Ovidian nostalgia for better old times—Palmio accuses the conversos of banishing the simplicity, peace, and union that characterized early Jesuit life in Italy. To give authority to his argument, Palmio often quotes biblical passages, mostly from the New

---

102 Giulio Mazarino: *1544 Palermo (Italy); SJ 1559; †1621 Bologna; priest in 1572; professed in 1578. Borromeo invited him to preach in the cathedral of Milan (1579), where he scandalized some with his harsh language and criticism of the cardinal that sparked a painful conflict between the two, to which Palmio refers here (see DH CJ 3:2589). For the documentation of his process, see ARSI, Hist. Soc. 164; and Rurale, “Carlo Borromeo,” pp. 559–605.

103 It can be deduced from Palmio’s description of the converso superior general, Lainez: “Erat enim vir iste ex filiis Abraam non secundum carnem, sed secundum spiritum et verus Israelita in quo dolus non erat” ([6]). And the family of Lainez had been Christian already for four generations.
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Testament Epistles of Paul, which is paradoxical, given that the author of these letters was the most influential Jewish convert in the history of Christianity. Ironically enough, Palmio quotes those parts of Paul’s epistolary that declare the unimportance of ethnicity in Christian communities (Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11).

Arguably, the suggestion that Palmio desires to transmit to Acquaviva is as follows: if the conversos are the root of the major troubles that the Society is currently experiencing, the Jesuits must follow the example of the Church of Toledo, the Inquisition, and older religious orders in Spain ([3]) and must introduce purity-of-blood legislation.

Superior General Claudio Acquaviva would respond eagerly to Palmio’s suggestion, instigated by his assistants general.

Acquaviva’s discriminatory measures

After the election of Acquaviva in 1581, the alleged converso character of the memorialistas movement was further accentuated by the anti-converso lobby, which now also included such high-ranking officials in the Jesuit Curia of Rome as Paul Hoffaeus, Lorenzo Maggio, and Manuel Rodrigues.

Paul Hoffaeus was born in 1530 in Münster (Rhineland) and entered the Society in Rome at the age of twenty-five. After his ordination and doctorate in theology (1557), and last vows (1561), he held many important administrative offices in the Society, starting as rector of the Jesuit colleges in Prague and Munich. He was subsequently appointed successor to Peter Canisius as superior of the German Province for a long period of twelve years (1569–81). General Congregation 4 elected him assistant general for German assistance and admonitor to the newly elected Superior General Acquaviva. Hoffaeus held this post for ten years, but Acquaviva eventually fired him due to some disagreements they had on government. Nevertheless, a few years later (1594–7), Acquaviva appointed him as his visitor in the German provinces. Hoffaeus died in 1608 in Ingolstadt.104

As Hoffaeus neared the end of his tenure as assistant general, Acquaviva requested from him (as he did from Palmio, Rodrigues,

---

and Maggio) a memorial on the union of spirits in the Society. 105 Far from focusing exclusively on Jesuits of Jewish ancestry, as did Palmio or Rodrigues, Hoffaeus nevertheless claims that one of the categories of people who compromise the Order’s unity are so-called *confesos*, who are “either suspicious or hateful,” a prejudice that he had already applied in Austria in his dealings with Alfonso de Pisa and Francisco de Toledo, 106 as we shall see below. Given how many troubles they had provoked (*perturbatores*) and surely will provoke, he suggests a remedy: the barring of such subjects from admission and discrimination against those who had been already admitted—they must hold in the Order only “more humble posts,” such as those of teachers, without the possibility of promotion in the government. Although Hoffaeus warns that debarring the noblemen of Jewish stock would produce offense to their families (which Acquaviva would take into consideration in his secret instruction that we shall analyze below), he concludes that other important princes and noblemen might feel offended by the very presence of Jews, so barring them from the Society would be worth the risk. In his letter, Hoffaeus dubbed the Society a “synagogue of the Jews.” 107


106 See ARSI, Germ. 137, f. 63 (123).

107 “Tertia hominum conditio est illorum quos vocant confesos, qui solent passim esse vel suspecti vel etiam odiosi, quique iccirco [sic] difficulter cum veteribus christianis possunt ad unionem coalescere. Remedium esset tales amplius non admittere, admissos vero in humillioribus officiis et in scholarez functionibus tantum continere, ad nulam vero gubernationem promovere. Si serio quaerimus solidam in Societate unionem, certe isti confessi admittendi alisque praeficiendi non sunt, cum nimirum constet, quantopere hecatus Societatem perturbaverint et vix ullo dubio in posterum tanto amplius perturbaturi sint, quanto erunt plures et potentiores quantove magis sensorint se Praeposito Generali esse terrori. Sunt sane multa alia quae nocent nostrae unioni: quid ergo iuvat etiam confessos ad augienda mala nostra adhibere, praesertim cum istis hominibus non indigeamus nec pro Societatis corpore augendo vel conservando, nec pro ullo ufficio gubernationis? Solet obiici nobiles confessos reiici non posse, quod timendum sit ne ipsorum parentes graviter ob inustam infamiam offendantur. At cur non potius tememus, ne universae Societati noceamus et tam multos bonos patres offendamus et contristemur ob pauculum confessorum nobilium cavendam offensionem? Et cur non timemus ne offendamus multo plures nobles, immo etiam principes, qui ob hoc hominum genus nobis non obscure offensi, nostram Societatem cum nota infamia vocant synagogam iudaeorum? Igitur si non est alia ratio quae magis movet, haec sane non est sufficiens? Ego unicum video impedimentum quo solo Vestr Paternitas impeditur, caeteras omnes difficulitates facile superaret, ut mihi certe persuadeo. Hactenus de illis malis quae etiam inter mundanos perturbant unionem nobisque cum ipsis sunt communia” (Schneider, “Denkschrift des Paul Hoffaeus,” p. 93).
Hoffaeus’s colleague in the Roman Jesuit Curia, Assistant General Lorenzo Maggio (or Maggi) wrote in 1586 on Acquaviva’s request the same kind of memorial on how to achieve unity in the Society of Jesus. He entitled it _De unione animorum in Societate: restauranda et servanda_, and it remains unpublished. Maggio was born in Brescia (Italy) in 1531 and entered the Society the same year as Hoffaeus and Rodrigues (1555). A few years after his ordination (1556), Lainéz appointed him rector of the College in Naples and, after his profession in 1563, rector of the College in Vienna (1563–6) and superior of the Austrian Province (1566–78). As such, he laid the foundation for the new Jesuit province in Poland. General Congregation 4 (1581) elected him the successor of Benedetto Palmio as assistant general, an office he held until 1594. Subsequently, he was visitor in Austria (1594–6), provincial of Venice (1596–8), and visitor in France (1599–1604), where he had been a spiritual guide to the future Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle (1575–1629). He died in 1605 in Rome.

In his memorial on unity, he painted Jesuits of Jewish ancestry as troublemakers just as we have seen Hoffaeus do: “Those from the circumcision subverted the entire house of the Society. As sons of this world who are shrewd in dealing with their own [Luke 16:8] and avid of new things, they easily excite disorders and destroy the unity of souls and their bond with the government.”

The third assistant general, whose prejudiced views on conversos created a hostile atmosphere surrounding Jesuits of Jewish ancestry in the 1580s, was Manuel Rodrigues. He was born in 1534 in Monsanto (Castelo Branco, Portugal) and entered the Society in Coimbra. Like Hoffaeus and Maggio, during his entire Jesuit career he held important governmental posts: rector of the College in Oporto (1566–70), vice-rector of the University in Évora (1570–2) and of the Colégio das Artes (1572–4), superior of the Portuguese Province (1574–80), and finally assistant general (1581–94). He died in Évora in 1596.

Rodrigues’s eye-popping bias against those who “by nature are contrary to the true and sincere spirit of religion and thus harmful”

---

110 “[...] natura contraria vero ac syncero spiritui religionis, ideoque ipso ad missionem
echoes Bishop Simancas’s *Defensio* and exceeds even that of Palmio, with whose memorial to Acquaviva he was familiar. The Jesuit Archives in Rome (ARSI) preserve at least four manuscripts by his hand, which are exclusively dedicated to the converso question: *De baptizandis ex progenie Judaeorum* (*Instit. 184 II*, ff. 360–4), *De gente bizcayna* (*Instit. 186e*, ff. 327–351), *De unione animorum* (*Instit. 178*, ff. 162–4), and an untitled postulate to General Congregation 5. This last manuscript recommended that candidates who proceed from “the blood of Jews” be precluded from admission to the Society, for their admission “contradicts the good name of the Society, the reality itself, and the *Constitutions*.” The petition reflected well Rodrigues’s bias, expressed elsewhere:

> Being children of this world, pompous, cunning, fake, self-seeking, etc., it is certain that they fit religious life very badly and that it is impossible to maintain union with them. If those of this blood are made superiors, they employ almost all their government in external things: they promote genuine mortification and solid virtues very little and seem to be merchants, seeking first seats and being called rabbis; they are hardly eager to seek perfection that is described in the parts 5 and 6 of the *Constitutions*; and readily admit others of the same blood who are very unworthy.

The decade-long intense discriminatory campaign of the three assistants general effectively led to gradual restrictions in the admission into the Society of candidates of Jewish ancestry. In April 1590 Acquaviva sent out a secret instruction to Spanish provincials, in which he explained that he had to accede to the will of the influential lay and ecclesiastical officials in Spain, who felt offended by the Society’s openness towards *confesos*:

> maxime Societati nostrae, tum in realitate ipsa, tum in bono nomine plurimum et nocuisset et nocere et nociturum” (ARSI, *Instit. 184 II*, f. 360).

111 “Petitur a Congregatione ut decretum conficiat, quo statuatut ut confessi (id est homines qui ex Iudaeorum sanguine emanant) in Societatem admitti non possint. Quam insta haec petitiu sit, constare ex eo potest quod confessorum admissio pugnat cum bono Societatis nomine, cum realitate ista atque cum Constitutionibus” (ARSI, *Inst. 184/II*, f. 356).

112 “Siendo tan hijos de este siglo, elatos, astutos, fingidos, seipsos quaerentes, etc., cierto es que irá con ellos muy mal la vida religiosa y que no podrá en ella aver unión [...]. Si a los de esta sangre hacen superiores, quasi todo el gobierno emplean en cosas exteriores: promoven poco a la verdadera mortificación y virtudes sólidas, parecen mercantes o tractantes, volunt primas cathedras et vocari Rabi, son poco zelosos de executarse con perfección la 5.ª y 6.ª partes de las Constituciones y admiten fácilmente otros de la misma sangre muy indignos” (ARSI, *Inst. 184/II*, ff. 360–4).
In some provinces at various times, and particularly now, the important people who desire the well-being of the Society very much, have told various [Jesuit] superiors that they felt offended by the fact that many of those who are known to be of the race of confesos are being admitted into the Society and are there visible. This complaint compromises the name of the Society itself and the fruit it would bring, if this situation were more regulated. Therefore, I have decided not to procrastinate anymore and announce what many days ago I had already contemplated to write.

It is to be known that regarding those who had been already received, neither small or big difference should be made between them and others in the Order in what concerns giving grades and other privileges, which should be based on the talents the Lord communicated them and the virtue they have, according to our Constitutions and [papal] bulls. Otherwise, it could produce in them anger and too much of distress and we would fail to give them proof of charity that we owe.

In regards to the offices of government, we should be careful not to give them to these people in certain key places, especially where there is the Inquisition, or in other circumstances that may offend the eyes of those who watch us, in order to avoid offense, particularly to the illustrious inquisitors and ministers of the King [of Spain] who clearly are concerned about this issue.

In what regards the admission of this people in order not to give occasion of bitterness to many in the Society, we have judged to be inappropriate to prohibit universally the admission of those who somehow have this defect. It is necessary to use more selectivity and diligence in the admission, keeping in mind two things. The first is that in no way are to be admitted those who have been clearly suspected [notados] by the Inquisition. As to the people whose suspicion is not so well known or unclear, especially if they come from afar, and if their relatives are noble and employed and honored by the King and his ministers, it would be very hateful and harsh to exclude them, and it would become subject to a number of drawbacks. The second is not to use the same kind of diligence in examining the candidate as in case of somebody destined for an office of the Inquisition in Toledo. Otherwise, this would mean looking for genealogies and collecting information about lineages of noblemen, which would become dangerous. At any rate, this investigation should be done quietly and when somebody has to be excluded, it would be convenient to give some other apparent causes and reasons for his dismissal, so that it could not be understood or affirmed with certainty that a person is barred from admission because of his lineage.

This measure appeared to me necessary, because if we want to look at the edification and authority of our ministries and a good credit that the Society should have, we have to condense to the view of people who are not only principal, but have their hands in the government. Not without reason our Father Ignatius asked to inquire the candidate about his lineage in order to make a good decision for the major greater glory
of God, considered all the circumstances, even though we do know that God does not limit the communication of his grace and virtues to blood or lineages, but gives them abundantly to everybody.\textsuperscript{113}

The documents of Acquaviva and his three assistants general that we have quoted thus far undoubtedly reveal that legislating discrimina-

\textsuperscript{113} “Pax Christi. Porqué en algunas provincias en diversos tiempos, y particularmente en este, personajes muy principales que mucho desean el bien de la Compañía, han dicho a diversos superiores que […] los con confesos, porque se ofenden muchos de que se reciban y se vean en ella tantos que se sabe tienen raza de confesos, lo cual redunda en perjuicio y lengua de la misma Compañía y del fruto que haría si en esto fuese más rectada, me ha parecido no diferir más, avisar lo que muchos días ha estaba determinado se escribiese. Conviene a saber que con los que están recibidos, ni ha de haber, ni mostrarse señal chico, ni grande de diferencia entre ellos, y los demás en cuanto toca a dar los grados y otras prerrogativas en la Religión a cada uno según los talentos que el Señor les ha comunicado, y la virtud que tuvieren, conforme a nuestras bulas y Constituciones, porque lo contrario sería irritarlos y afligirlos \textit{supra modum}, y dejar de darles la muestra de caridad que debemos. Aunque en el darles gobiernos para evitar la ofensión particularmente de los Ilustres Inquisidores y de Ministros del Rey que claramente tratan esto, conviene que tengamos cuidado y miramiento de no darles cargo en ciertos puestos principales, y particularmente donde hay Inquisición o otras circunstancias que pueden ofender los ojos de los que nos están mirando. Mas cuanto al recibir de nuevo semejantes, aunque por no dar ocasión de amargura a muchos de la Compañía non hemos juzgado por cosa conveniente el prohibir universalmente que de cualquier manera que tal defecto les toque no se puedan recibir. Con todo eso es necesario usar mucho delecto y diligencia en el recibirlos, guardando dos cosas. La primera que en ninguna manera se reciban los que tuvieron nota clara y que desconvenga de manera que comúnmente en el concreto de los de fuera sean tenidos y notados portales. Mas cuanto fuesen personas que tuviesen poca nota y de lejos, o no tan clara, y que sus parientes especialmente si son personas nobles, fuesen honrados y empleados por el Rey, y por sus ministros, el excluirlos sería cosa [347\textsuperscript{v}] muy odiosa, dura y sujeta a varios inconvenientes. La segunda es que en recibirlos no se haya la exquisita diligencia que se haría por ventura para una […] de Toledo, o para ocuparlos en el Santo Oficio. Porque esto es de andar buscando genealogías, y haciendo informaciones de linajes de otros especialmente de gente honrada, sería cosa de mucho peligro, mas hágase por los nuestros en los lugares donde esto se puede saber, la moral diligencia que sin ruido basta para tener noticia de la opinión en que están en esta parte en sus tierras; y cuando alguno se hubiese de excluir, se busquen algunas otras causas y razones aparentes para que no se pueda entender, o a lo menos, afirmar con certidumbre que se deja alguno de recibir por esta causa. Esto nos ha parecido ser necesario pues que se ve que a la edificación y autoridad de nuestros ministerios y buen crédito de la Compañía conviene que se condescienda con la opinión de personas que no solo son tan principales, mas juntamente tienen mano en el gobierno, que no sin causa la bendita memoria de N[uestro] P[adre] Ignacio aviso que se les preguntase deste punto, para que entendidas todas las circunstancias, se pudiese hacer la consideración que conviene a mayor gloria Divina. Aunque por otra parte sabemos que Dios N[uestro] S[eño]or no limita la comunicación de sus gracias y virtudes a sangre o linajes, \textit{sed tribuit omnibus abundanter}. En las oraciones y santos sacrificios de V[uestro] R[everencia] mucho me encomiendo. De Roma, 18 de April 1590°” (ARSI, \textit{Inst. 184/II}, ff. 347, 366–7).
tion against Christians of Jewish lineage during General Congregation 5 (1593)—which ironically was forced to convene under pressure from the converso Jesuits José de Acosta and Francisco de Toledo—was orchestrated as a punishment for the alleged participation of conversos in the revolt against the way in which Acquaviva and his assistants general governed the Society. Violating Loyola’s will as expressed in the Jesuit Constitutions, and contradicting the practice of the first three generalates, this new law proclaimed Jewish (and Muslim) ancestry, no matter how distant, an insurmountable impediment for admission to the Society. Moreover, conversos who had not yet made their final vows had to be dismissed. “Suitable to the greater glory of God,” the anti-converso decree was deemed a fait accompli, and even the superior general was forbidden to grant exemptions:

Those, however, who are descendants from parents who are recent Christians, routinely and habitually inflicted a great deal of hindrance and harm on the Society (as has become clear from our daily experience). [...] The entire congregation then decided to decree, as is affirmed by this present decree, that in no case may anyone of this sort, that is to say, one of Hebrew or Saracen stock, be admitted to the Society in the future. And if by error any such person is admitted, he should be dismissed as soon as the impediment is revealed, at whatever time before profession this occurs, after first notifying the superior general and awaiting his reply. [...] It is more suited to the greater glory of God and the more perfect pursuit of the ends it [the Society of Jesus] proposes to itself that it possess workers who are very acceptable to other nations throughout the world and who might more freely and reliably be employed in the Church of God by those people whose good or ill will towards us (as Father Ignatius, of happy memory, says) has much to do with whether they will be open to or close out access to the divine service and the aid of souls.115

The lineage-hunting season began. According to Melchor de Valpedrosa’s Diario, all but two delegates (the converso José de Acosta and Francisco Arias de Párraga) voted for the measure.116 Just as the Sarmiento

---

115 See AHN, Clero-Jesuitas, leg. 252, doc. 192; AHSI, Baet. 3-1, ff. 179, 202, 417; Padberg, For Matters of Greater Moment, p. 204; and Institutum Societatis Iesu (Florence: Ex Typographia a SS. Conceptione, 1892–3), 2:278–9, d. 52.
116 See Astrain, Historia, 3:610. Also, Antonio Possevino confirms this information (see ARSI, Congr. 20b, f. 309r).

Francisco Arias de Párraga: *c. 1534 Seville; SJ 1561; †1605 Seville; priest before 1561; professed 1572 (DHCJ 1:231–2).
legislation of 1449 had been condemned by at least three archbishops of Toledo—Alonso Carrillo de Acuña (1413–82), Pedro González de Mendoza (1428–95), and Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros (1436–1517)—so did Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo and Inquisitor General, Gaspar de Quiroga (1507–94) affirm, against Acquaviva’s decree, that the Society dishonored itself by promulgating such a law. Indeed, Quiroga—who held the reins of the Spanish Inquisition between 1573 and 1594, exactly in the period of the most intense Jesuit anti-converso offensive—restricted the implementation of purity-of-blood laws, a policy that reflected a shift in approach to the converso problem by King Philip II’s Council.

Renée Levine Melammed’s recent description of the consequences of purity-of-blood laws in Spain could be applied very well to the situation in which the Jesuit conversos found themselves the morning after they learned of the decree. They were denied full membership in the Society on the basis of ethnic discrimination. Even the most sincere convert was denied equal rights and opportunities. Only by forging documents or by paying for forgeries could he perhaps manage to circumvent these limitations. Consequently, the purity-of-blood statutes created a culture of opinion rather than law. Some conversos tried by these means or others to be accepted surreptitiously into the Society, but they knew that they would eventually be condemned to second-class citizenship. Conversely, those who desired to get rid of political enemies disseminated rumors or manipulated their opponents’ genealogical documents in order to taint their required “ethnic purity.” The Society of Jesus might teach Gospel-inspired brotherhood and equality, but life had a different lesson in store. A converso who had never experienced a day in his life as a Jew, who even might know absolutely nothing about his converso background, was still refused

---

117 See ARSI, Inst. 186e, f. 358: “En lugar de ganar honra, se ha la Compañía deshonrado con este tal deceto.”


119 Melammed, A Question of Identity, p. 19.

entry into the Society, and little or nothing could be done to alter this situation.

Indeed, as Guzmán pointed out to Ribadeneyra, many influential and valued converso Jesuits left the Society.\footnote{“Después que hay este decreto se han retirado muchos sujetos que tienen partes muy esenciales y de grande estimación y que fueron muy estimados y de gran fruto en la Compañía” (ARSI, Inst. 186e, f. 355’).} The number of admissions in Iberia and the Indies dramatically decreased.\footnote{See Medina, “Los precursores de Vieira,” p. 501.} Despite his safe status as a professed Jesuit, Ribadeneyra never disclosed his converso identity and, to the Jesuit historian Sacchini’s dismay, omitted Lainez’s in his biography of him, as we have seen in the previous chapter. When the Inquisition tried Juan Jerónimo\footnote{Juan Jerónimo: *8 July 1545 Cabra (Cordoba); SJ 1562; priest in 1570; professed in 1578; †1 July 1605 Rome. He was born to the converso Francisco de Méndez and Leonor Arias. Was he, then, related to Francisco Arias de Párraga from Seville? He studied law at Salamanca before joining the Society with the desire to become a missionary in the Indies, but he eventually taught theology in various colleges in Spain and engaged in controversial preaching (see DHCJ 3:2146). See AHN, Inquisición, lib. 581, f. 244’ and lib. 582, ff. 177’, 180’, 203’, 227’, 271’, 295’, 333’.} because, in his popular preaching in Toledo in 1593–4, he supported the so-called confession in absentia (defended by the converso Jesuit jurist, Francisco Suárez), he was reminded by the Toledan inquisitors that the same tribunal had also sentenced his Jewish grandfather and that, thus, “the fire was very close to scorch him.”\footnote{See ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico, NN 10/1368 (envelope 12).}

When Alexandre de Rhodes entered the Society in Rome in 1612, he must have hidden the fact that his grandparents had escaped the Iberian persecutions and, changing their name from Rueda, had settled in Avignon.\footnote{Alexandre de Rhodes: *c. 1583 Avignon; SJ 1612; †1660 Isfahan (Iran); priest in 1618 (see DHCJ 4:3342). In 1487, a priest named Juan Martínez de Rueda, in whose possession anti-Christian books in Hebrew were found, was burned in Saragossa; and in 1492, his relative, the widow of Antonio de Rueda of Catalayud, who had kept the Sabbath and had regularly eaten “hamyn” [ham], was also burned there. Alexandre’s ancestors were probably related to these Iberian conversos.} His surreptitious admission was probably due to the fact that his wealthy family had donated 3,000 librarum to the Jesuit College in Avignon (which was founded by Antonio Possevino, who most likely was also a closet-converso),\footnote{See ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico, NN 10/1368 (envelope 12).} but it was also beneficial to the Society: armed with his exceptional linguistic acumen, Alexandre—after his sojourn in Goa, Macau, and Japan—founded the first Jesuit mission in present-day Vietnam, co-authored the Vietnamese-Portuguese-Latin
dictionary *Dictionarium Annamiticum Lusitanum et Latinum*, and wrote a bi-lingual catechism, *Catechismus pro iis qui volunt suspicere baptismum in octo dies divisus*, both of which works were published in Rome in 1651 by the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.

Andrés Pinto (1595–1654) needed royal support to enable him to remain in the Society, after his Jewish lineage was discovered, even though Superior General Vitelleschi (general 1615–45) requested his dismissal in a letter to the Spanish Superior Provincial Villalba:

I have received information about the lineage of Brother Pinto, signed by [Fernando Martins Mascarenhas] Lord Inquisitor General of Portugal. (Your Reverence should not tell this to anyone.) He says that not only Pinto’s father but also his mother is a descendant of Jews, but after their conversion his parents have never committed a crime, nor have been punished by the Inquisition. And as they were trying to appoint Pinto’s father physician to the king, there was opposition due to his well-known lineage, but since his family was never suspected, they did him a favor and


Figure 14. Map of seventeenth-century Vietnam
This map was printed in the first history of the present-day Vietnam by the Jesuit Alexandre de Rhodes (1583–1660).
appointed him anyway at the request of the king. Yet Brother Pinto cannot remain in the Society and I order Your Reverence to dismiss him immediately. I am sorry about this, but nothing else can be done in this case.  

Upon his request to join the Society in Saragossa, the lineage of Baltasar [Jerónimo] Gracián y Morales (1601–58), from Belmonte (Calatayud) near Saragossa, resulted in suspicion but apparently did not prevent his admission. It seems that the suspicion centered on the name of Gracián and his father’s profession. Indeed, the name (in Hebrew Hen) was associated with the Jewish descendants of Judah ben Barzilai, who had lived in Barcelona in the thirteenth century. One of them, Salomón ben Moses (d. 1307), a renowned Talmudist from Barcelona, sometimes signed himself as Hen, sometimes Gracián. Other notorious members of the Gracián family were Shealtiel Gracián, or Hen, a rabbi of Barcelona and Alcalá, and Zerahiah ben Isaac ben Shealtiel Gracián (Hen), philosopher and translator, both of whom lived in the thirteenth century (The Encyclopedia Judaica has fourteen biographies of family members). There were other well-known Graciáns who lived closer to our Baltasar Gracián’s time: the Carmelite Jerónimo Gracian (1545–1614), son of Diego Gracian de Alderete, who was one of the converso St. Teresa of Ávila’s closest associates; and Juan
Gracián, who was a prominent book publisher in Alcalá de Henares. The relationship of these two men to Baltasar Gracián y Morales still needs to be examined.

The latter was the son of a physician from Sabiñán, Francisco Gracián Garcés (born in 1564 to Antonio Gracián, a descendant of Miguel Gracián de Borja, and Isabel Garcés), and Ángela Morales Torrellas, an illiterate daughter of a tailor from Calatayud (their tomb is located in the chapel San Cosme at San Andrés in Belmonte). He had eight siblings: Manuel, Magdalena, Francisco, Felipe, Pedro, Ángela, Raymundo, and Lorenzo (whose name Gracián used as a pseudonym to publish almost all his books).\(^{131}\)

As in the case of many converso families, those of Laínez, Súarez, and Ribadeneyra included, most of Gracián’s siblings became monks or nuns. He was baptized by Domingo Pascual, and his godfathers were Martín Carrasco and María Fabián. He spent his childhood in Toledo with his uncle, Antonio Gracián, who was a priest at the chapel of San Pedro de los Reyes.

After years of Jesuit formation, Baltasar Gracián taught cases of conscience in Lérida and philosophy and theology in Gandía and Huesca, where he met his future maecenas, Vincencio Juan de Lastanosa (1607–81). Transferred to Saragossa in 1639, he became confessor of the viceroy of Aragón, Francesco Maria Carraffa e Carraffa (r. 1639–40). In 1642 he was appointed vice-rector in Tarragona and later dean of philosophy at the University of Gandía, a post that he lost after the publication of his Criticón (Huesca, 1651; Huesca, 1653; Madrid, 1657). He was then transferred to Graus and ordered to fast on bread and water. Consequently, he asked to be dismissed from the Society, but his request was denied. During Aragon’s war with Catalonia and France, Gracián enrolled as chaplain in the army (1646). After 1649, he taught Scripture in Saragossa, where he befriended the poet Andrés de Uztarroz (1606–53). Gracián is considered one of the major writers of the European Baroque. He was admired by, among others, Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860), who translated his works into German.

\(^{131}\) See Gracián’s El héroe (1637, The Hero); El político Don Fernando el Católico (1640, The Politician); Arte de ingenio (1642) or Agudeza y arte de ingenio (1648); El discreto (1646, The Complete Gentleman); Oráculo manual y arte de prudencia (1647, The Art of Worldly Wisdom); and El Criticón (1651–7, The Critic).
(1861). Some of his books are being still translated, and there are numerous websites dedicated to him.\textsuperscript{132}

It is noteworthy that some other converso Jesuits, who had not yet pronounced their final vows before Acquaviva restricted the admission of converso candidates in the late 1580s, were actually able to do so. That was the story of, for example, the famous biblicist Luis del Alcázar,\textsuperscript{133} whose portrait was made by the celebrated painter, Francisco Pacheco (1564–1644).\textsuperscript{134} As in the case of Alexandre de Rhodes, the authorities perhaps acknowledged that his parents, Melchor del Alcázar and Ana de la Sal Hurtado de Mendoza, contributed financially to the foundation of the Jesuit college San Hermenegildo in Seville, and also that


\textsuperscript{133} Luis del Alcázar: *1554 Seville; SJ 1568; †1613 Rome; priest 1578; professed 1589. His uncle, Baltasar del Alcázar, was a famous poet. He studied at the colleges of Seville, Cordova, and Salamanca. He was erroneously considered the author of the Discurso acerca de los estatutos de limpieza de sangre, which was written by his Dominican friend, Agustín Salucio (AHN, Inquisición, lib. 583, f. 339°; and DHCJ 1:41). See the opposite view in Ruth Pike, Linajudos and Conversos in Seville: Greed and Prejudice in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spain (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), p. 127.

\textsuperscript{134} See Manuela Águeda García Garrido, “La imagen predicada. La virtud como camino hacia la salvación en los retratos de Francisco Pacheco (1564–1644),” Étiopicas 2 (2006): 185; see Alázár’s portrait in Francisco Pacheco, Libro de descripción de verdaderos retratos de illustres y memorables varones (Seville: Imp. de E. Rasco, 1886).
the candidate was a very gifted man. His commentaries on the book of the Apocalypse were so famous that the nineteenth-century theologian Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920) attributed the scientific study of that book to his influence.135

These and other cases deserve more attention, but no in-depth study on this subject has been ever done,136 in spite of the fact that the exceptional role of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry had been constantly underscored in the vanguard Jesuit pro-converso writings of Antonio Possevino, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, Diego de Guzmán, García Girón de Alarcón, and Juan de Mariana.

We turn our attention to these writings in the next chapter, now that we have examined in the present one the shift in the Jesuit approaches to the issue of limpieza de sangre after the death of Superior General Francisco de Borja in 1572. We have seen how and why as a result of the anti-converso policy of his two successors, Mercurian and Acquaviva, the Jesuits of Jewish lineage went, in fewer than fifty years, from having a leading role in the foundation and development of the Society of Jesus to being prohibited from membership in it.
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The candidate was a very gifted man. His commentaries on the book of the Apocalypse were so famous that the nineteenth-century theologian Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920) attributed the scientific study of that book to his influence. These and other cases deserve more attention, but no in-depth study on this subject has been ever done, in spite of the fact that the exceptional role of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry had been constantly underscored in the vanguard Jesuit pro-converso writings of Antonio Possevino, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, Diego de Guzmán, García Girón de Alarcón, and Juan de Mariana.

We turn our attention to these writings in the next chapter, now that we have examined in the present one the shift in the Jesuit approaches to the issue of limpieza de sangre after the death of Superior General Francisco de Borja in 1572. We have seen how and why as a result of the anti-converso policy of his two successors, Mercurian and Acquaviva, the Jesuits of Jewish lineage went, in fewer than fifty years, from having a leading role in the foundation and development of the Society of Jesus to being prohibited from membership in it.


Figure 15. Engravings from the Vestigatio arcani sensus in Apocalypsi (Antwerp, 1614) by Luis del Alcázar (1554–1613).
CHAPTER FOUR

JESUIT OPPOSITION TO THE PURITY-OF-BLOOD DISCRIMINATION (1576–1608)

Thus there is no Poland, no Spain, no Germany, no France, but one Society, one God in all, all in one Lord Jesus Christ, whose members you are.
Everard Mercurian, S.J., 1573

The prior purity-of-blood legislation promulgated in Toledo that we have analyzed in Chapters One and Three—Mayor Sarmiento’s in 1449, Inquisitor Silíceo’s in 1547, and the anti-converso decree of the Jesuit Fifth General Congregation (1593)—provoked a fifteen-year-long storm of opposition that eventually led to the limitation, if only superficial, of the lineage inquiry (up to the fifth generation) by General Congregation Six (1608).¹ Five influential Jesuits, who have frequently appeared on previous pages of this book, constituted the vanguard of this opposition: Antonio Possevino, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, Diego de Guzmán, Juan de Mariana, and García Girón de Alarcón. This chapter examines their pro-converso writings within their historical context.

García Girón de Alarcón is virtually unknown, yet his memorial from 1597 is the most comprehensive critique of the Jesuit purity-of-blood discrimination. This is why we shall dedicate to him and his text much space in this chapter. Juan de Mariana, a member of the memorialistas movement, authored a work entitled De rege et regis institutione, in which he expressed his views on the discrimination against the conversos. It was Antonio Possevino who explicitly mentioned Mariana’s Jewish ancestry.² Diego de Guzmán—whom

¹ Harald E. Braun, in his recent Juan de Mariana and Early Modern Spanish Political Thought (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2007), p. 93, incorrectly stated that General Congregation 6 (1608) revoked the 1593 decree. Juan de Mariana and his friend Pedro de Ribadeneyra did contribute, through their writings, to the defense of the conversos’ status, as we shall see below, but their success was only partial, for General Congregation 6 just limited the genealogical inquiry. The 1593 decree was revoked only in 1946.
² See Possevino’s “Memorial,” ARSI, Congr. 20b, f. 208; see also Mariana’s, “De rege et regis institutione,” in Juan de Mariana, Obras (Madrid: Biblioteca de
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historians consider an Old Christian—may have been motivated to write his pro-converso letter to Superior General Acquaviva by his profound friendship with his converso master, Juan de Ávila, and another of his converso disciples, Gaspar de Loarte, who—as we have seen in Chapter Two—encountered apparently insurmountable obstacles in joining the Society of Jesus due to his Jewish lineage. Obvious also is Guzmán’s affinity for the closet-converso Ribadeneyra, who employed in his anti-discrimination writings his authority as one of only a few surviving disciples of Ignatius of Loyola and as a man of government—he had held important offices in the Jesuit administration for decades until Mercurian’s “house cleansing.” Possevino—the only Italian in this Spanish-dominated quintet—was almost certainly a closet-converso and became one of the earliest and fiercest opponents of purity-of-blood discrimination in the Society. His first memorial was penned as early as 1576,3 i.e., three years after General Congregation 3, during which Possevino personally witnessed the head-on collision between the anti- and pro-converso parties that concluded with the rigged election of Mercurian, as we have seen in the previous chapter. His is the only text of the genre that has been fully studied in the Anglophone historiography on the subject.4 Possevino composed his second memorial on 13 October 1598—already after the promulgation of the anti-converso decree by General Congregation 5.5 The synoptic reading of both memorials that we offer here for the first time allows de-coding of the author’s often secret-style prose. We first turn our attention to his memorial from 1576.

3 See ARSI, Cong. 20b, ff. 206–12.
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Source: Alfred Hamy, Galerie Illustree de la Compagnie de Jesus (Paris, 1893), #37. Courtesy of John J. Burns Library at Boston College.

Figure 16. The Italian Jesuit writer and diplomat Antonio Possevino (1533–1611)

Antonio Possevino (1533–1611) from Mantua in Italy was one of the most adamant and prolific opponents of the purity-of-blood legislation in the Society of Jesus. Under his influence the 1593 anti-converso decree was mitigated, if insignificantly, by the Sixth General Congregation in 1608. Modern scholarship has established Possevino’s Jewish ancestry with quasi-certainty.
Antonio Possevino

Thomas Cohen describes Possevino’s memorial as “a hybrid text: part personal letter, part learned exegesis, part polemic, part exhortation” directed (especially in its opening section) at an unnamed opponent whom Cohen identifies as Benedetto Palmio, Assistant General to Mercurian and the author of the anti-converso memorial that we have studied in Chapter Three. Possevino’s text is set within the context of the Congregation of Procurators that took place in Rome in 1573, during which Mercurian’s secretary had conversations on the subject of converso discrimination with the Spanish representatives—“always very faithful to the Society and its general”—who expressed their concern about the anti-Spanish atmosphere that surrounded the election of Mercurian and that continued to be fed by his assistant Palmio, leading to a potential division among the Jesuits:

It was evident, and known to almost everyone in the Society and to the most important men of this court, that that person [N] was an adversary not of a few men but of an entire nation, and that this opposition needed to be totally uprooted…for if a remedy had not been introduced it could have caused an irremediable schism in the Society.

Possevino’s intention to write the present memorial to Mercurian, petitioning that the latter compose an edification letter on unity in the Society, may have been motivated by the suggestion of the Spanish procurators who had been scandalized by the discrimination against the conversos—regardless of their faithfulness to and love for the Society—that had been instigated by Benedetto Palmio.

---

7 The Congregation of Procurators is an assembly of “persons who should come from the provinces, at least one every three years from each province, having been elected by the votes of the professed and rectors of the province, to inform the general about many things” (Const. [679]).
8 “Prima che si venisse alle particolari risposte si toccò uno presupposto, cioè che era cosa evidente et nota quasi a tutta la Compagnia et fino a più grandi di questa corte che quella persona era stimata avversa non da alcuni solamente ma da una natione intiera, la quale opinione pareva necessario che totalmente si diradicasse: perciocché Vostra Paternità sa che era noto che da N. quel che era stato detto secretamente a bocca a Provinciali quando al tempo della congregazione generale furono mandati in Ispagna, la quale cosa come fu detta senza tener tutta quella luce, la quale si ha tenuto in parte dapoi, potrebbe, se in parte non si fosse cominciato a rimediare, haver cagionato scissure irrimediabili nella Compagnia” (Cong. 20b, f. 206). The translation is by Cohen in his “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” p. 546. In my transcription of the manuscripts I adjusted the orthography, where it helps in reading the text.
during General Congregation [3]. It was also probably motivated by what he observed personally in the General Curia in Rome after the congregation—Mercurian was “cleansing the house” by removing from Rome and possibly from Italy the Spanish subjects, many of whom—as we have seen in the previous chapter—had Jewish origins. In Possevino’s eyes,

> The aforementioned letter will be of universal consolation, that will edify everyone, and that it will show that in the heart of [Mercurian] there is no other spirit than that of Father Ignatius and the other Generals, and it will remove every threatening notion from the World. And so I hope that [the letter] will serve to ensure that the hearts of the Society allow themselves to be governed by the paternal providence of Your Paternity, without seeking evasive human remedies, as some men (driven by their passion) have sought, not without notable damage to fraternal charity.10

The mentioned “damage to fraternal charity” was rooted, claims Possevino, in the idea of purity of blood. Reflecting Alfonso de Cartagena’s *Defensorium unitatis christianae* that we have analyzed in Chapter One, Possevino emphasizes that lineage distinctions are vestiges of paganism and contradict the Jesuit tradition:

> Whether one looks to the *Constitutions*, or to the example of former Fathers General, or to the disposition of Divine Providence manifested in Sacred Scripture, one cannot see how this fear can be born within a Society whose Institute should be distinguished by the blood that is found

---

9 “Aggiungo che questa avversione nel core massime di N. è stata da q[elli] che l’amano con pieno animo e i quali sono stati sempre fedeli alla Compagnia, stimato sempre per il maggiore ostacolo inanti a Dio che la religione nostra potesse havere in questi tempi, essendosi massime dapoi forse troppo indulgenti su […] permesso che se ne scrisse et ragionasse, anzi havendone esso medesimo anco ragionatone in tal modo che si è stimato che non ne seguisse minor ingiuria al prossimo, il quale dobbiamo amar come noi stessi, di quel che seguirebbe se alcuno chiamasse ladro un che si fosse convertito, o heretico un figlio o parente di heretic, ancorché esse fosse fedele et cattolico, ha come veramente sò (et Deus scit quia non mentior) dato occasione di pensare che i giud[izi] fatti in questa materia et le informazioni date anco a tempo della congregazione non erano senza passione” (*Cong. 20b*, f. 206').

10 “Et penso che la detta lettera oltre esser di consolazione universale edificherà ciascuno et dichiarerà che nel petto suo non ha altro spirito che quel del Padre Ignatio et de gli altri Generali. Et si come basterà per lievar ogni sinistro concetto di Mondo, così spero che anco sarà efficace per fare che i cori della Compagnia si lascino governare dalla providentia paterna di Vostra Paternità, senza cercare mezzi umani indiretti, come alcuni per simile passione pigliarono non senza ferita notabile della carità fraternela” (*Cong. 20b*, f. 207'). The translation is by Cohen in his “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” p. 547.
in its freedom, and in the fact that it permits no preference for lineage, or for human concerns, which are vestiges of paganism, or for its own honor, such as not allowing oneself to be touched by others or to greet them, as is the custom of some infidels about whom Father Alessandro Valignano has recently written to Your Paternity.\textsuperscript{11}

Commenting on this passage, Cohen writes that it “constitutes one of the most powerful critiques of the concept of purity of blood to be found in the vast literature—contemporary and modern—on the subject. Moreover, Possevino here for the first time links debates about nation and lineage to debates about the Jesuit missionary enterprise. Illustrious lineage depends on Jesuit ideals, not on blood. Possevino’s argument brings together all the diverse strands of Jesuit opposition to the idea of purity of blood, from Scripture, to the Ignatian tradition, to the ongoing development of Jesuit pastoral ideals, and finally to the common humanity and intelligence of his contemporaries in the Society.”

To make his point, Possevino turns in this part of his memorial to prove what Palmio would deny: the Jesuit tradition from Loyola to Borja indefatigably opposed any lineage discrimination. He begins with a portrayal of Ignatius, a foreigner in Rome:

\begin{quote}
Father Ignatius, [of] holy memory, who was Biscayan, knew the practice and nature of things in Spain. God had elected him, so that he become a model and ideal of all his successors. He knew best of all what he said in his \textit{Constitutions} and thus their understanding must be perceived from his actions and from that prudent fortress, which he planted among humanly insurmountable difficulties [in] this Society. He was really very prudent and saint man, and a foreigner in Rome; he had [also] dealt with the Inquisition of Spain. Even though he ingenuously knew how much storm in those times it would have raised against the Society, he nevertheless felt that the spirit of God does not make favoritisms among people [Romans 2:11] and believed more in Jesus Christ than in earthly prudence. This idea remained carved in the minds of the Society and he shaped the Society in such a way that not even one thing moved him to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} “Si aggiunge che se si deve pigliare la regola della verità di questo fatto o dalle Constitutioni o dall’intelligenza loro o dall’esempio de Padri Generali passati o dalla disposizione della divina Providenza manifestata nella Scrittura santa, non si vede onde possa nascere questo timore in una Compagnia, il cui Instituto deve essere insino col sangue conservato nella sua libertà et che in lui non entrino quelle partialità di carne et bilanci humani, le quali sono propri vestigi di gentilità et di honor proprio, si che non osano toccarsi o salutarsi l’uno l’altro, come di alcuni infideli scrive hora a Vostra Paternità il Padre Alessandro Valignano” (Cong. 20b, f. 207'). The translation is by Cohen in his “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” p. 548.
alter it, knowing that *what God has joined together, let no one separate* [Matthew 19:6]. And the letters he wrote about this are known.12

Not much effort was needed to etch Loyola’s anti-discrimination ideal into the mind of his direct successor, Diego Laínez, for he himself was of Jewish stock—his Castilian ancestors converted after the anti-Jewish *pogroms* of 1391, as we have seen in Chapter Two.13 Possevino reminds that Ignatius employed him in all major enterprises, such as the foundation of many colleges in Sicily, the mission in [North] Africa, the Colloquy of Poissy, and the Council of Trent (which was attended by so many Spanish prelates), without “this vain fear [of people of Jewish lineage]” that characterizes the current Jesuit administration. The election of Laínez to the highest post in the Society that took place in the time of a strong anti-converso tempest in Spain and Rome was, to Possevino, a manifest sign that

God does not make any distinctions of nations, persons, or qualities, as far as his precepts are being observed and one walks rightly in front of his eyes, and that God wants to preserve the primeval status of the Society, to which he gave so many gifts, so that the early Society would serve as a model of the kinds of stones, with which the Society’s construction should be made.14

12 “Il P. Ignatius di santa memoria fu bissaino, sapeva per praxi et natura le cose di Spagna, era stato da Dio eletto perché fosse un modello et idea di tutti gli altri successori suoi, meglio di tutti sapeva quel che volse dire nelle sue Constitutioni et così l’intelligenza loro deve essere presa dalle sue attioni et da quella prudente fortezza, la quale piantò fra difficoltà humanamente insuperabili [in] questa Compagnia. Esso era prudentissimo et veramente santo, era forestiero in Roma, stato nell’Inquisitione di Spagna ancor che innocentemente sapeva quanta tempesta in quei medesimi tempi era stata eccitata contra la Compagnia, non di meno esso il quale sentiva che lo spirito di Dio no era accettatore di persone et che credeva più a Gesù Cristo che alla prudentia terrena, segui quel modo onde et esso resto scolpito negli animi della Compagnia et la ridusse in stato tale che niuna cosa lo mosse ad alterare il suo ordine, sapendo che Dio comanda *quod Deus coniungit homo non separat*. Et le lettere che intorno a questo scrisse sono note” (*Cong. 20b*, f. 207v). See also Cohen, “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” p. 549. The letters mentioned at the end of the quotation are those quoted above in Chapter Two.


14 “Segui al P. Ignatio di santa memoria il P. Laynez, nel cui tempo avvennero quelle terribili tempeste che furono in Ispagna et a Roma mosse per questa materia, ma Dio Signore, il quale voleva che l’opera sua andasse inanti, si come era stata dall’eterna sua sapienza ordita se ne servi tanto, come fece nell’Europa et nell’Africa in fundare collegi di Sicilia et tanti altri, in predicare qui tanti anni dove erano tanti Spagnuoli signori et prelati nell’assemblea di Poyssi et nel Concilio di Trento, dove era, si può dire, tutta Spagna nei suoi prelati, però alcuna nota non gli apportò simile materia,
Francisco de Borja, Mercurian’s direct predecessor, according to Possevino was another model of this kind of stones:

Even though he had much knowledge about lineage issues—he served at the court of Charles V—this servant of God never wanted to make this sort of distinctions, aware that the Society was not governed by other means than its proper spirit of God. And because _where is the Spirit of God, there is liberty_, he employed those means that God our Lord gave him.\(^{15}\)

Just like his predecessors, Cartagena and Oropesa, Possevino could not omit the authority of the Pauline epistology in his argument against the lineage discrimination. He recommends that those who harbor in their hearts such discrimination “should do some spiritual exercises on charity, on loving one’s neighbor as oneself, and on the things that were said by Saint Paul in the First Letter to Corinthians.”\(^{16}\)

Thomas Cohen reads in Possevino’s memorial other echoes of Paul’s influence on his pro-converso approach. It can be seen “in the context

\(^{15}\) “Al P. Borgia che si lungamente era stato in corte di Carlo Quinto, et il quale sapeva che cosa erano questi rumori di simile materia, erano molto noti tutti i motivi, i quali potessero cagionare vera alteratione, ma dall’altra parte come fedele servo di Dio, eletto canonicamente, si come gli altri sono stati al generalato, tanto è lungi che volesse fare queste distinzioni, o che quando volesse fare predicare un Portughese, o altri qui in Roma et a Papi et in Chiese nostre mandasse mai a dimandare come licentia in Portugallo o a giustificarsi o a scisarsi con Ambasciatori o con alt[ri] che sapendo che la Compagnia non si governava per altro che per il proprio spirito di Dio et che _ubi Spiritus Domini, ibi libertas_, liberamente anco usava de i mezzi che Dio Signor Nostro presentato gli haveva” (Cong. 20b, f. 208v–209v).

\(^{16}\) “Coloro i quali hanno in simile materia qualche avversione radicata nel loro core, dovrebbero fare alcuni esercizi spirituali sopra la carità, l’amare il prossimo come se stesso, et sopra le cose dette da san Paolo a Corintii nella prima” (Cong. 20b, f. 208v–209v). Other fragments of Paul’s First Letter to Corinthians that other pro-converso writers utilized, as we have seen in Chapter One, were: Cartagena’s recommendation to give the weak neophytes the milk of love and generous breasts rather than solid food (1 Corinthians 3:2); Nicholas V’s warning of schism born out of favoritism given to Jews over Gentiles (1 Corinthians 3:22); and his reminder of unity of the Christian church, regardless of ethnicity (1 Corinthians 12:12–3). We shall also see below how Alarcón recalls 1 Corinthians 1:24–6 to remind that Christ is God’s wisdom for both Gentiles and Jews.
of Possevino’s insistence on the efficacy of conversion and on the need for self-examination […]]. The memorial’s argument on behalf of the New Christians may be read as a confirmation of Paul’s prophecy, in the lesson on the olive branch, that the Jews will be even more disposed to embrace Christianity than other non-Christians. Beginning with his reference to [Paul’s First Letter to the] Corinthians and continuing throughout the rest of the memorial, Possevino will argue that far from being a hindrance to the Society, Jesuits of Jewish descent are among the Society’s most effective members.”

Indeed, the last statement, as we shall see below, is a sort of refrain in all Jesuit pro-converso texts. Possevino affirms that he could give many examples of the fruitful ministry being performed by Jesuits of Jewish stock, and—unlike Alarcón—he specifically quotes three names of Jesuits of Jewish descent to make his point: Manuel de Sá, Francisco Antonio, and Juan de Maldonado. We have already encountered Manuel de Sá on previous pages of the present book. Whereas Francisco Antonio is little known (Possevino mentions that he was a preacher at an imperial court), Juan de Maldonado played a significant role in the history of the early Society. He was born in 1533 in Casa de Reina (Badajoz, Spain) and entered the Society in 1562. Together with the converso Juan de Mariana, he was instrumental in founding the first Jesuit colleges in France. Maldonado, who authored authoritative commentaries on the four Gospels, was considered the father of modern positive theology. Acquaviva appointed him in 1581 a member of the committee on the Ratio Studiorum, but he died prematurely two years later.18

Further in his memorial, Possevino states that

The greatest fruits that have been gathered in Spain and in parts of the Indies have not been extracted without the work of such men [New Christians], and there are not lacking those [New Christians] in whom today there are found greater learning and virtue than in many others. And the mere hint or suggestion in Spain that such a distinction [between Gentiles and Jews] exists within the Society would be enough to remove the means of gathering fruit in more than half of Spain […], where many


18 “Potrei aggiungere molti altri esempi vivi del frutto che si fa per i ministeri de tali anco al presente nella Compagnia, se Vostra Paternità non sapesse che oltre quei di Spagna, et di Maldonato in Parigi, de Francesco Antonio in predicare tanti anni all’Imperatrice, di Emanuele Saa in Milano, di molti altri lettori et predicatori altrove, et anco di altri di altre nationi che Vostra Paternità forse non conosce” (Cong. 20b, f. 208v).
principal officials at the court are of this [Jewish] stock and, offended by such a distinction, could contribute to the destruction or division of the Society, which, while professing to be holy, and to model itself after Jesus its leader, could ultimately be complicit in harming Jesus, and be society of the world rather than of Jesus.¹⁹

One should conclude, then, utilizing the rules for the discernment of spirits established by Ignatius, that the fear of Jesuits of Jewish ancestry is born out of a different spirit than God’s, for the latter, which is contrary even to a shadow of schism, accompanied—Possevino repeats—the foundation of the Society, and the Jesuits should follow it as exemplary.²⁰

The Jesuits who are driven, in Possevino’s view, by the contrary-to-God spirit, which allegedly is that of the Devil, can be divided in three groups:

(1) The first one is called, after the expression of a Spanish official who paid visit to Mercurian, “villanazzi.” “These were men who were from poor, rural backgrounds, who were often despised by their colleagues from elite families, and who sought to make up through lineage for what they lacked in virtue and talent.” In fingering these men, Possevino calls attention to the sharp socioeconomic divisions that existed within the Society during the first generations. At the same time, he calls into question the claims of the villanazzi to purity of blood. He suggests not that they are of Jewish origin but that if their lineages were to be examined, “there would be found more than four things—and perhaps in their own lifetimes—which would make them turn silent and grow red.”

---

¹⁹ “Come è stato riferito a Vostra Paternità, i maggiori frutti colti in Spagna et in parte nell’Indie si sono cavati non senza l’opera de tali et non mancano di quelli nelli quali hoggi di fra tali si trova, essendo maggiore dottrina et virtù che in molti altri. Et al saperis solamente o l’odorarsi in Ispagna che si havesse tale distin[tio]ne nella Compagnia basterebbe per lievare il modo di fare frutto in più della metà di Spagna. […] Oltre che Vostra Paternità deve ricordarsi di ciò che un[o] di più principali procuratori le ha detto, cioè che in corte del Re molti principali ufficiali et signori de più grandi toccano di questo, i quali se ben tacciono, potrebbono un giorno procurare qualche ruina o divisione alla Compagnia, perciòché non è dubbio che si terrebbono ancorché indirettamente per molto offesi per tal mezzo da una compagnia, la quale facendo tanta professione di santità et di conformarsi con Giesù suo capo, potrebbe al fine averdersi con suo danno che sarebbe societas mundi, non Jesu ben presto” (Cong. 20b, ff. 209r–v). See also Cohen, “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” pp. 553–4.

²⁰ “Tutto questo timore, a chi versa seriamente colla mente le regole del Padre Ignatio, dove trattava de dignoscendis spiritibus, nasce da altro spirito che da quel di Dio benedetto, poiché questo è sempre simile a se stesso et è conforme a quel che da principio fu dato alla Compagnia nascente, dalla cui qualità si ha in si importante negotio a pigliar esempio che altre ombre o spiriti scismatici vestiti di qualsivoglia pelle esteriore o fomentati dallo spirito secolare del mondo cerchino di oscurare la luce della verità, et di Dio” (Cong. 20b, ff. 208”–209”).
The second group is “those men—for the most part Portuguese—who show signs of overweening ambition (because they feel themselves to have been deprived of offices in the Society on which their honor depends), or who reject the ‘eternal wisdom’ of the Society concerning the unity of all men.” Using bold strokes, Possevino declares that those among his colleagues who reject Paul’s affirmation that “there is no distinction between Jew and Greek” are questioning—“perhaps inadvertently”—the efficacy of baptism, and “are creating a new species of Cathars.”

The third group consists of men who simply lack humility. Cohen has observed that “here Possevino singles out the Portuguese and brings his pastoral concerns to bear both on the Portuguese and Mercurian. He believes that the blindness of the Portuguese concerning their pernicious attitude towards New Christians has specific causes.”

---

21 This argument by Possevino is reminiscent of Alonso Cartegena’s Defensorium, where—as we have seen in Chapter One—the Bishop of Burgos accused the authors of the anti-converso legislation in Toledo (1449) of being heretics because they acted against Christian unity and undermined the regenerative character of baptism. Possevino will repeat this argument in another memorial that we shall analyze below.

22 “Faccio quel che a Vostra Paternità è stato dimostrato da procuratori et da alcuno altro venuto ultimamente della corte, cioè che coloro i quali parlano in questa materia, si riducono (parlo di quei della Compagnia) a tre sorti di persone, o a villanazzi, per usare della sua voce, i quali, non havendo altro lustro di virtù, vanno mendicando dalla carne quello che se si andasse un poco esaminando e rivedendo loro i conti adesso, usando di quella fallace ombra di pretesto del ben commune di che si servono nell’esaminar gli avoli et bisavoli, si troverebbono più di quattro cose et forse nella loro stessa vita, le quali gli farebbono et tacer, et arrossire. Gli altri sono quei che ut animalis et nescientes quae sunt spiritus Dei, ancorché essi tocchino di questo, nondimeno ut eluant hanc, qui nati sunt ex sanguinis, non ex Deo, putant maculam, si danno a ragionare contro questo, come et di quei di Portugallo et d’altri potrebbe dirsi: non avendosi fra tanto che mentre pensano che in questo consta l’honore loro o danno segno di ambitione, dubitando di non havere honore come tanto evidentemente l’hanno dato alcuni di qualche Provincia per vedersi privi dell’administratione o finalmente non credono affatto né molto gustano quel che ha detto l’eterna sapienza della cui compagnia si nominano, cioè che iam abluti estis, iam sanctificati estis, et che nova creatura è quella che in conspetto di Dio è considerata et che si vos filius liberaverit, vere liberis eritis, et che appresso Dio non è distintione di Greco, né di Giudeo, la quale definitone introducendosi, oltre il dannarsi latente et forse inavvedutamente l’efficacia del battesimo et farsi una nuova specie di Catari, finalmente può generare radicem amartitudinis quae inquit multos, et una reale divisione et per conseguente diminuzione, se bene l’opinione pregjudicata d’alci fa sentire altrimenti fin tanto che la ruina più evidente non seguà. Et all’hora non so quanto erit bonum dicere non putaram ... I terzi son di quei che comunemente si sa che sono poco addentro dotati di humilità poiché questa virtù se non è nel core et non nasce da carità, può essere spesso velame di malitia, et pelle, o cicatrice che copre la nascosta postema. Il che anco Vostra Paternità può havere molte volte considerato et a me più di una volta ha detto di alcuni i quali hanno mosso o trattengono questo veleno disseminato, de quali si sa in che credito sono o per conto di humilita, o per conto dell’osservazione della disciplina et d’altro” (Cong. 20b, f. 209v). See Cohen, “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” pp. 554–5.
This sort of men offered three reasons to Possevino against his petition that Mercurian compose a letter on unity: (1) impediment to the common good, (2) concern of a few Portuguese, and (3) the desire not to extend the practice of admitting persons who bring dishonor upon the Society. To answer their objections, Mercurian’s secretary boldly reiterates his argument that Jesuits of Jewish ancestry did contribute much to the common good and that Ignatius banned any “defamatory libels, which instead have been permitted to circulate both in writing and in hushed voices throughout the current [Mercurian’s] generalate,” such as that of the future assistant general, Manuel Rodrigues.\textsuperscript{23}

Possevino explicates that the latter is the most notable example of the anti-converso transformation—he was first an ally of the New Christians but became one of their most acerbic opponents within the Society. Possevino states that this transformation was a result of Rodrigues’s decision to accommodate himself to the disposition he had discovered to exist in N [Palmio], even though all the “best Fathers” reject any distinctions based on lineage and understand that those who make such distinctions are driven by “mere passions.”\textsuperscript{24}

To Possevino’s dismay, these passions played a significant role during the Third General Congregation [1573], during which the Portuguese lobby opposed the election of Juan Alfonso de Polanco as the new superior general, as we have seen in the previous chapter. Like Palmio, Possevino in his memorial assigns responsibility for the anti-Polanco conspiracy to the representative of the Portuguese delegation, Leão

\textsuperscript{23} We have seen his anti-converso campaign, which was supported by Hoffaeus and Maggio, in the previous chapter.

\textsuperscript{24} “La seconda causa del timore è per alcuni di Portugallo, il che Vostra Paternità ha alcune volte mostrato o quando predicò qui alcuno Portughese in Roma, […] penso esser bene di farne scusa coll’Ambasciatore et di scriverne fino in Portugallo. Il che fra le altre cose cagiono che da qual tempo in qua il P. Emmanuele Rodriguez il quale sino all’hora le haveva piú volte scritto che non temese niente di questo et che esso si trovava bene con tutti, et del P. Cipriano et di altri che l’amavano si servì molto, cominciassè dapoi ad acomodarsi all’humore che haveva scoperto esser in N. Et così seguendo il commune uso anco esso cominciò mostrare come molti hanno fatto di applaudire a N. in questo, con tutto che migliori Padri della Compagnia et qui sentiunt d[e] Jesu et eius Societate in bonitate, riconoscano et riconobbero fino al tempo della congregazione generale che questo era mera passione. Et so che al P. Antonio Wink è parso nuovo alcuna deliberatione di N. et mi disse che non desiderava visitare al presente et forse Dio Signor Nostro ha così voluto che chi andava nel suo cuore diritto et universale et secondo lo spirito del P. Ignatio, non tirasse sopra l’anima sua alcuna colpa per esser instrumento di quale apertiva o per meglio dire esclusione nella Germania, in qua et multa sunt quae dicantur, se si vuole bilanciare carnalmente il negozio” (Cong. 20b, f. 210r). See also Cohen, “Nation, Lineage, and Jesuit Unity,” p. 556.
Henriques, who carried to Rome some letters from the king of Spain.\textsuperscript{25} Leão utilized those letters in the papal court not only to campaign “with much zeal” against Polanco but also to push for legislation that would prevent any future election of a converso superior general. The Portuguese allied in their efforts, continues Possevino, to undermine the Jesuit \textit{Constitutions}—for which they should be excommunicated—with the Italian Palmio, who pressed on the Italian Possevino “to do battle for his homeland Italy [by voting against a converso Spaniard, i.e., Polanco],” but Possevino, “as a Christian and one faithful to the Society,” refused to do so and reported the intrigue to Polanco [who as vicar general was presiding over the congregation].\textsuperscript{26} Not only Possevino but also the entire congregation was in shock when they learned about the Portuguese conspiracy:

As the whole congregation was astonished and everyone fixed their eyes on the Portuguese as the perpetrators of this deed, the aforementioned Father [Leão Henriques], having now been touched in his conscience, knelt down publicly and asked for pardon, and said, “I am the cause of this.” But both in his own judgment and that of the congregation, he very clearly declared himself condemned. May it please God that he be absolved, and there not follow from the occurrence some sad consequence.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} Palmio, as we have seen, was more precise in describing this episode of General Congregation 3: Leão Henriques brought the letters not only from King Phillip, but first of all from King Sebastian and the Cardinal Infant of Portugal, which actually confirm Possevino’s argument about the anti-converso sentiment of the Portuguese: “Ma venendo più al particolare della cosa di Portugallo. Prima questo è un verissimo presupposto che antiqua inimicitia et disunione d’animi è fra alcuni di essi et Castigliani et che NNN non potevano tollerare, o forse per honore o per altro che alcun governo fosse in mano di detti Spagnuoli, sicome per lettere del P. Valignano, del P. Em[manuel] Rodriguez di molti Portughesi, del P. Alessandro Reggio, del P. Bernardino Ferrari che [. . . ] all’India non può negarsi che hanno anco havuto quei medesimi et hanno contra Vostra Paternità, sicome le lettere soli attestano” (\textit{Cong. 20b}, f. 210\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{26} “Si sa che con quanto buo zelo et intentione potesse haversi, sicome dicevano nondimeno andavano direttamente procurando di far per mezzi humani impedimento che non si eleggessero Generali se non o tali o tali et a me l’hanno detto della quale cosa ciò che determinano i canoni o decreti. Vostra Paternità lo sa. Si sa che il P[almio] a piu persone et particolarmente a me disse, \textit{ut pugnarem pro patria}, mentre si trattava dell’informationi [. . . ]. Il che io come Christiano et fidele alla Compagnia andai come cosa da me né udità né imagintata giamaia a dire a qualche [che] era all’hora superiore. Or da chi venisse quella parola, da chi fosse sostentato il detto huomo, da chi mi fosse mandato anco un altro, lo sa l’eterna verità, la quale non ha paura di temporalí falsità o calunnie” (\textit{Cong. 20b}, f. 210\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{27} “Si sa che il P. Leone avedutosi della piaga da se fatta con suoi complici alla Compagnia, all’hora che fu commandato dal Papa che non si eleggesse alcun Spagnuolo, sicome tutta la congregazione restò attonita et gettò gli occhi sopra Portughesi, come
Contrary to what Palmio argued in his later memorial, Possevino interestingly associates this anti-constitutional attempt with the subsequent movement within the Society aimed to change its Institute. As we have seen in Chapter Three, however, the *memorialistas* movement was mainly composed of Spanish Jesuits, many of whom were undeniably conversos—which Possevino denies—and not Portuguese. Thomas Cohen summarizes this part of Possevino’s memorial as follows:

The pope’s intervention at the Congregation represents a key point in Possevino’s analysis of the stages of development of the New Christian problem within the Society. First, there existed an incipient anti-New Christian movement under Borja, but it was censured by the hierarchy; then came the Portuguese-led intervention in the 1573 election, which will continue to have the potential to create a schism within the Society if Mercurian does not write the letter of unity that Possevino is requesting or take some other comparably decisive action. Central to Possevino’s argument concerning the New Christians is that the Society must not adopt a policy of appeasing the Portuguese either concerning nationality or concerning lineage. Spain brings the same love and obedience to the Society as any other province. As for the New Christians, we have seen that Possevino believes that, in terms of their virtue and dedication, they represent an elite within the Society.  

The last part of Possevino’s 6,500-plus-word memorial is a list of fourteen detailed recommendations that somehow summarize the content of his text to Mercurian. What seems to be Possevino’s primary preoccupation here is the risk that the Spanish Jesuit provinces might secede from the Roman centralized curia with the support of Spanish
lay government, which might result in the creation of a branch of the Society under the supervision of an independent commissary, as had happened many times in the history of other religious orders.29 As we

29 “Cioè che non si scriva o ragioni da particolari in alcuna materia che cagioni dissentione o divisione d’animi già che vede Vostra Paternità quale lettera et per qual via et scritta a suggestione di più principali theologi le è stata ultimamente mandata dall’Andalusia. Che la patienza offesa non si vada assottigliando per tentare altre vie per dividere la Compagnia si come Vostra Paternità sa che avvenne fra minimi a Genova per alcune lettere procurate da alcuni di Spagna da loro Re, et qui in Roma della Religione Premonstranense, il cui eletto generale per essere francese fu dal Re Filippo ricusato. Che non si dia occasione a Spagnuoli di dire al Re et ad altri Principi che la cagione di volere altre nazioni fra loro è perché sono state o heretiche o conversate fra loro, instituite o nate da Parenti heretici. Che un giorno per via del Re o di altri non propongano in una Congregazione Generale che per dett[a] causa non vogliano che si elegga Generale che sia disceso di heretici o sia stato heretico o habbia parenti tali o altra simile nota, delle quali basterà accennarne ogni minima per mettere ombra alla Inquisitione di Spagna. Che non si offerriscano al Re diversi memoriali acioché né Fiamengo per parecchi anni si faccia, allegando o naturale aversione da Spagnuoli o inclinazione a ribellarsi, o vero nota di heresia, o di amicitia et conversazione o parentado de tali. Il che in questi tempi non sarebbe difficile che un solo che fosse in Anversa o altrove facesse credere si come per via di un altro Re si è operato (ancorché con brutti modi) nella passata congregazione. Che non si cominci a fare apertura a fare particolari religioni di una sola la quale adesso abbianno, si come avvenuto di altre Religioni che si trovano, chi osservanti, chi conventuali, chi capucci… sotto pretesto et con qualche colore di volere vivere secondo Instructo della Compagnia interpretato et usato dal P. Ignatio di cui son[o] in questa materia diverse lettere in Ispagna et altrove. Che non si vada cercando le razze antiche di Portughesi, i processi et altre maledini lontane dallo spirito di Dio con vedere se quei che fanno del rigoroso in questa materia sono figlioli di schiave, se hanno havuto altra macchia, o anco peccato carnale. Che il medesimo non si vada vedendo di Siciliani, Sardi, et altri. Che non si alleghi che [es]endo il pubblico usurario se non se pente fra un anno scommuni […] et tenuto per heretico da canoni, non si alleghi che Genovesi et molti altri et altre patrie [es]endo discesi da tali non conviene che siano admessi nella Compagnia o alti gradi in essa. Che non si vadano cercando che sono stati micidiali, bastarà et altre tal cose, [es]endo che tali molte sono nella Compagnia et molti di quei che si stimano legittimi non forse […] per tacere altro. Che non si vada procurando di fare convocare Congregazione Generale come sa Vostra Paternità che pochi giorni son fu scritto da una persona principale ad un’altra principale. Il che era segno che haveva in petto altre cose che non si considerano forse. Che non si proponga un giorno al Re di Spagna che in tutti i suoi stati si pongano diversi di Spagna che almeno in parte amministrino, poiché i collegii sono cose più pubbliche che delle altre Religioni. Che finalmente no si dimandi come hanno altre Religioni di haver una volta un’altro montano, un’altra Italiano, o vero uno commisario perpetuo in Ispagna (il che adesso non sarebbe difficile forse di persuadere a Sua Santità per il […] et signifi di haver […] Compagnia. Che finalmente non si tieni la communicatione dell’aiuto di una nazione all’altra, si come già per opera dei nostri è stato facile di procurare, supposto il timore humano che fin qui N. ha mostrato et il non andare all’incontro a tali inventioni le quali subito furono avisate dal P. Valignano all’arrivo suo in Portugallo et dapoi nell’India ha causato che già i Spagnuoli sono stati rivocati dal Giapone et
have seen in the previous chapter when dealing with the *memorialistas* movement, Possevino’s warnings were fully grounded, but ignored by Mercurian, who soon removed Possevino from his office of secretary of the Society and sent him to remote Sweden. Possevino, however, did not give up his stubborn fight against the discrimination that reached its apex in the legislation of 1593. Five years after the promulgation of the *de genere* decree, he again grabbed his well-worn pen to write another passionate memorial. This time its addressee was Mercurian’s successor, Superior General Claudio Acquaviva.\(^{30}\)

Possevino’s second memorial originated as a reaction to the anti-Jewish and anti-converso atmosphere in the Society of Jesus that was galvanized by the 1593 decree. The text begins with the author’s lamentation about the way some Jesuits had been discussing, during their leisure time, either among themselves or with lay people, the conversion of Jews and their descendants to Christian faith. Possevino bluntly asserts that this kind of discussion is against the spirit of God. But even much more against that spirit is the licentious buzzing about those of Jewish descent who had been called by God to the Society of Jesus.\(^{31}\)

The memorial’s structure is built on these two accusations: (1) the first part is a traditional biblio-historical *excursus* on the place of Jews in the development of the Christian Church from the beginning to the times of Pablo de Santa María, and on the character of baptism that echoes the pro-converso writings we have seen in Chapter One; (2) the second one deals with the role of conversos in the Society of Jesus, upon which the 1593 decree inflicted many wounds. The text concludes with a surprising note on Mercurian’s contribution to unity

\(^{30}\) For a very brief summary of this document, see Donnelly, “Antonio Possevino,” pp. 10–1.

among the Jesuits, which is in stark contrast to what Possevino had written to the latter in his first memorial. This move was probably aimed to make Acquaviva feel guilty for the different way in which he managed the converso problem, compared to his predecessors, Mercurian (unfairly) included.

Possevino’s biblio-historical excursus is unsurprisingly well-developed, for its author was eagerly involved, as we have seen in Chapters Two and Three, in the Jesuit apostolate with Jews in Rome and influenced Pope Gregory XIII’s decision to create a college of neophytes for training preachers to convert Jews in Italy and the Levant.

According to Possevino, nobody can deny that Christ founded the Church by unifying two peoples in one fold: Jews and the Gentiles, both of whom were chosen to guide it. This way no tongue should dare to call those who became Christians by the name of “Jews,” or “Greeks,” or “Scythians,” or “Gentiles,” for all are one in Christ [Colossians 3:11], despite their shared responsibility for the death of Jesus.32

Following the similar ecclesiological premises expressed in Carta-gena’s Defensorium, Possevino draws the Jewish soteriology with large strokes: God could not nullify his faith because of the Jews’ unbelief [Romans 3:3], and instead chose them as apostles and disciplos to “fertilize the world with Christian faith” and preside over the Church of Jerusalem after the city’s destruction in the personae of fifteen archbishops, as Eusebius had narrated.33

32 “Quanto alla Chiesa cristiana, nessuno è il quale possa pretendere ignorarla che Christo nel congregarla di ogni nazione quae sub coelo est et che essendo egli pietra angolare fece utraque unum; la onde prese poi de Giudei et de Gentili facendo degli uni et degli altri non solo un ovile ma etiam di ciò i pastori et dottori di lei, volendo insieme che poi che erano fatti sue membra, nil iis damnationis esset quoniam erant in Christo Jesu, ne fosse lingua si, o incrédula o temeraria insieme, la quale osasse nominar i già fatti cristiani, o Giudei, o Greci, o Schiti, o Gentili, ma omnes unum in Cristo. Pero quel infinita carità di Christo con tutto che i Giudei et Gentili havessero chi col procurarlo, chi con aconsentirvi, imbrattare di fresco le mani del suo innocen-tissimo sangue” (Inst. 184/II, f. 349v). 33 “Non però volle che incredulitas eorum fidem suam evacuaret. Anzi, perché le sue strade sono lontanissime da quelle del mondo, fece con fatti che superabundaret gratia, ubi abundasset delictum et che la sua chiesa insino alla consummatione del mondo ricevessi da quattro venti ognuno che a lei venisse. Così eleggendo fra gli stessi Giudei dodici apostoli et, doppo il tradimento di Giuda, un altro apostolo pur stato Giudeo et, poi che ascese in cielo, S. Paolo oltre i settanta discepoli et alla voce di s. Pietro convertendosene molte migliaia dentro di Gerusalemm et fuori et crescendone per mezzo et degli altri apostoli et discepoli et di questi altri già convertiti il numero grandissimamente, Christo raccolse tanto seme che può spargersi per fecondar il
Naturally, the Jewish soteriology cannot be construed without exemplifying St. Paul’s thought, to which Possevino dedicates the next paragraph. Despite Paul’s assertions, like the one that Jews still had a veil set over their hearts [2 Corinthians 3:15], Paul in his choices of building the Christian Church could not contradict the voice of God who was calling other Jews, as he had called Paul himself to become “a vase of election” and apostle [Acts of the Apostles 9:15],

For one is the God who justifies circumcision by faith and foreskin through faith [Romans 3:30]. Therefore, just as through the offense of one, all men fell under condemnation, so also through the justice of one, all men fall under justification unto life [Romans 5:18]. Who will make an accusation against the elect of God? God is the One who justifies. Who is the one who condemns? [Romans 8:33–4].

Like for Bishop Cartagena in his Defensorium, the most evocative example of God’s justification of the Gentiles for Possevino is the episode from the Acts of the Apostles 10 that narrates how Peter’s vision about the irrelevance of the Jewish dietary restrictions for his faith in Christ made him reveal God’s election of Cornelius.

---


35 "Chi parimente avesse detto a s. Pietro che cosa vuoi far di questi gentili faccia del mondo, idolatri, pieni d’iniquità. Avrebbe da lui avuto per risposta ciò che egli udi da Cristo. Quod Deus sanctificavit, tu immundum ne dixeris, surge et tu, occide et manduca" [Inst. 184/II, f. 350r].
Bypassing briefly the examples of ancient martyred popes of Jewish ancestry, such as Linus and Evarist, Possevino highlights the contributions of the Iberian Christians of Jewish stock “to the penetration of the New World by the Christian faith and to the reparation of the Old World” in the period closer to his own life, such as Julian, Archbishop of Toledo, and Pablo [de Santa María] of Burgos, Bishop of Cartagena and Burgos as well as chancellor at the court of King León. Thanks to the latter’s preaching many Jews spontaneously converted to Christianity, as Doctor Navarrus [Martín de Azpilcueta, 1491–1586] had testified. It is true, affirms Possevino, that many Jews from Spain and Portugal “went back to their vomit,” for they had falsely converted in order to maintain their property and avoid abandoning their homeland and relatives. Yet he is hopeful that many of these can still become saints, “converting from the fear of slave to that of son and from the fear of death to religion,” as [John] Cassian [c. 360–435] had noted. Their relapse cannot justify the prohibition against admitting other conversos to the Christian faith. Otherwise, we should also give up every effort to convert pagans, since many of those who had converted in Asia, America, or Europe later abandoned Christianity and killed those who had converted them. The relapse of the latter is even graver, for they received grace, sacraments, and bigger gifts than the Jews did.

36 St. Linus is traditionally considered the successor of St. Peter as the bishop of Rome (r. 64/67–76/79).
37 Evarist, as an example of a Jewish Christian, was mentioned by Cartagena in his Defensorium that we have seen in Chapter One.
38 “Ma furono poi da Dio chiamati dal giudaismo et assenti al pontificato et oltre altri martiri, al martirio, Lino, Evarist et se altri tali furono. Ma lasciando a parte ciò che potrebbe dirsi di quei dei seguenti secoli, vediamo se come anticamente Iddio volle che si procedesse con quello spirito così vicino alla presente età, ha voluto usarne, servendosi poi dalla Spagna et di Portogallo per far penetrar la fede cristiana nel mondo nuovo et per ripararvi in qualche parte il vecchio. Et prima chiara cosa è che s. Giuliano, archivescovo di Toledo et molti dotti rabbini in lei si convertissero talmente alla fede che poi ridussero molti alla Christiana religione. Et Paolo borghese, il quale di giudeo divenne per gratia di Dio Christiano et il quale fu prima il vescovo di Cartagena et dapo di Burgos et supremo cancelliere di Castiglia et del re don Leone, convertì alla predicazione quasi tutta la città di Burgos dal giudaismo in manera che sicome nel libro 5 di suoi consigli scrisse il dottor Navarro, sponte omnino sua bap-
39 “Che se altri poi sono ritornati al vomito, o piuttosto nascostamente sono stati pertinaci nella loro perfidia, quali sono stati molti fra coloro i quali in Portogallo o in Spagna in alcuni luochi furono per forza costretti a ricevere exteriormente la
The second part of Possevino’s memorial challenges another reason cited by some Jesuits for banning Jews from the apostolate and their descendants from the Society of Jesus: these men have forgotten with what kind of spirit God had wanted to found the Jesuits, who in their service to the New and Old World played a role analogous to the primitive Church. To found the Society, God chose ten people, most of them Spaniards: some of them were Old Christians, some New; some noble, some ignoble, for God does not make favoritisms of persons [Romans 2:11]. Thus, the first superior general was an Old Christian, and his immediate successor a New Christian. Indeed, Diego Lainez—as Possevino had already abundantly written in his first memorial—was employed in many important missions by his predecessor, Ignatius of Loyola. Loyola, illuminated by God’s light, followed God’s will rather than human respect, for the Society was a universal body to serve the entire world and did not have some particular interests of a local religious order. Ignatius’s spirit was reflected in the choice of General Congregation 1 to elect Lainez the new superior general, in spite of his own caveat that he might not qualify for the position due to his Jewish lineage.\footnote{As we have seen in Chapter Two, Lainez and Bobadilla were conversos, but so also perhaps was Rodrigues. Unfortunately, Possevino is here quite oblique, except for about Lainez.}

\footnote{“Della Compagnia poi conviene dire che ella è stata da Dio secondo l’esempio della primitiva chiesa, dovendo ella servire per aiuto del vecchio et nuovo mondo. Perciò la divina sapienza di primi 10 eleggendo alquanti Spagnuoli i quali furono poi principali instrumenti di lei, volle che questi furono parte dei vecchi, parte de nuovi cristiani, sicome anco parte nobili, parte ignobili, non essendo Dio accettator di persona. Et fatto il primo generale dei vecchi cristiani, subito volle che si facesse il

religione Christiana. Et questo fecero per conservare la roba o per non abbandonar la patria e i parenti loro, questi non hanno luoco fra i veri convertiti; non più di quei che fintamente o si confessano o abirano le heresie o per qualche falso rispetto entrano in famiglie religiose, coi quali la ragione vuole che molto circospettamente si proceda et che ci siano canoni et leggi, le quali prescrivano il modo o di tenergli lunghi da noi o di dispensargli ex causa massime che anco di questi si trovano molti, che dal timor servile possono convertirsi in filiale e i convertiti per la paura della morte alla religione possano diventare santi, sicome mostra Cassiano. Ma si la ricaduta poi dovesse farli astener di procurare la salute o l’admissione degli altri, bisognerebbe senza dubbio per simile ragione lasciar tutta la cura della conversione della gentilitia, poiché tanti popoli et regni già convertiti dagli istessi apostoli dell’Asia et conseguentemente da altri in Africa e nell’Europa ritornando indietro, uccisero che convertiti gli aveva. Bisognerebbe dico abbandonare ogni impresa di ridurre gli eretici, il peccato et l’offendicolo dei quali è più grieve (sicome disse s. Tomaso) di quel dei giudei, in quanto hanno ricevuto la gratia, i sacramenti et maggiori doni di loro” (Inst. 184/II, f. 350r–v). On Azpilcueta’s relation to the Jesuits, see Maryks, \textit{Saint Cicero and the Jesuits}, pp. 51–2, 58, 59, 66, 70, 82, 111–2, 145.}
God was not indignant, continues Possevino, seeing the work of other New Christians in the Society, such as that of Alfonso de Polanco of Burgos (which is a city that Loyola must have known well, being close to his native Guipúzcoa).\textsuperscript{42} He was secretary of the entire Society during the tenures of the first three superiors general [and Possevino’s direct predecessor] and was the second most important person in the Order. Possevino had already dedicated much space in the 1576 memorial to Polanco, when dealing with the conspiracy against him during General Congregation 3. In Possevino’s view, the Society’s openness to admit and help every person whom God called was the reason why the Jesuit Order was so popular and requested by so many lay rulers. Possevino repeats again that the Iberian Jesuits of Jewish ancestry excelled in their learning as major teachers in Italy, France, Germany, and elsewhere. Their books had been and will be of great help, especially against the heretics. God called others for martyrdom, such as the Portuguese Pedro Ramón,\textsuperscript{43} who joined in heaven other
martyrs, among them Rodolfo Acquaviva, a nephew of the addressee of the present memorial.

Possevino concludes this part of his memorial by stating that if a man knows the [indiscriminatory] spirit with which God founded the Church and instituted the Society of Jesus—which he has described so far—it is easy to conclude that the reasoning of those Jesuits whom Possevino criticized as jeopardizing their unity at the beginning of his text would never have been accepted by Father Ignatius because of its harmfulness to the body of the Society and to the salvation of the neighbor. 44

The inability to foresee how grave and incurable this harmful discriminatory reasoning is for the Society’s body, writes Possevino, explains finally why some Jesuits are engaged in prejudiced and mocking anti-converso conversations. There are four more precise aspects of the mentioned harm resulting from such behavior: (1) sedition and arguments among confreres caused by the mean fingering of some respected and beloved Jesuits as Jews, which is against the Jesuit Constitutions that punish as plague those who engage in such acerbic reciprocal biting in the Society; 45 (2) the profound anger inflamed by lineage hunting characterized by endless genealogical digging in search of heretics, which makes “the Society divided into Jerusalem and Samaria” and to which the Spaniards object, saying, for example, that the French Albigensian heresy is 300 years old and has been not

---

He translated into Japanese the converso Luis de Granada’s *El Compendio de la Guía de la Fe* (Amakusa, 1592) and *Introducción al Símbolo de la Fe* (Nagasaki, 1611). He died in Nagasaki (not as a martyr, though) in 1611 (see Fejér, *Defuncti*, 2:190; DHCJ 4:3289; and Donnelly, “Antonio Possevino,” pp. 10–1).

44 “Dalle quali cose tutte conoscendosi con quale spirito habbia Dio proceduto nel fondare la sua chiesa et nell’instituire la nostra Compagnia, sarà facile il giudicare se alcuni procedendo con contrari concetti et ragionando in modo che giammai non sarebbe stato permesso da N[ostro] P[adre] Ignatio, giovino o noccano all’edificio nostro et alla salute dei prossimi. Che le tante lacrime et penitenze contro ogni minima regola al P. nostro Ignatio, quante pensiam che costasse quella in che consiste l’unione e il nervo principale della Compagnia” (*Inst. 184/II*, f. 351’).

45 “La prima ferita è quella che nasce da chi semina seditione et risse *inter fratres*, la quale è tanto più grande quanto s’infamano le centinaia per non dire le migliaia di uomini chiamati da Dio a questa vocazione, computandosi quei che sono andati al cielo. Che si ingiuria e il porre sospetto che uno non sia Christiano, quanta sarà in una religione tali il nominar i Christiani religiosi con dispregio et acerbità giudei. Et qual rispetto o pace interna potrà esser giamai mentre si mostrano a dito coloro i quali dallo spirito vero della Compagnia erano rispettati, amati et impiegati debitamente. Le *Constitutioni* poi castigando giustamente et dovendo *tanquam pestos arcer talos a societate*. Chi di questa maniera ragiona o chi dia occasione perché se ragioni in tanto pregiudizio altrui, come si esseguiranno […] ma senza dubbio *si ivicem mordimus, ab invicem consumemur et omne regnum in se divisum disolabitur*” (*Inst. 184/II*, f. 351’).
eradicated yet; (3) the offense to the many New Christian founders and financial supporters of Jesuit colleges in Spain and Portugal, which testify to their infamy; and (4) the depreciation of the Society by lay and ecclesiastical rulers because of this bitterness reigning among the Jesuits, which results from considering New Christians to be profane.

Antonio Possevino concludes his memorial to Acquaviva by repeating his thesis from the previous memorial, that the wounds he has just mentioned already could be foreseen during General Congregation 3, which elected Mercurian as the new superior general. Mercurian was expected to affirm that the variety among the Jesuits was the foundation not only of the Society’s conservation and vigor but also of its promotion. Indeed, after his election Mercurian beseeched the Jesuits to embrace each other by saying, “You all are brethren and sons of the same vocation. Thus there is no Poland, no Spain, no Germany, no France, but one Society, one God in all, all in one Lord Jesus Christ, whose members you are.” Possevino proved, however, in his first memorial,
how Mercurian’s actual policy contradicted his desire, expressed in the quoted speech, for the union of hearts in the Society of Jesus.

During the twenty-year period that separates the two memorials of Possevino, two other condemnations of the 1593 decree were composed: one by Diego de Guzmán, another by Pedro de Ribadeneyra.

**Diego de Guzmán**

We have already told the story of Guzmán’s vocation in Chapter Two, when discussing his relation to the converso Gaspar de Loarte. There we also brought up his testimonies about Ignatius of Loyola’s and his envoy Jerónimo Nadal’s adamant non-discrimination policy in admitting candidates of Jewish stock, whose most illustrious example was Giovanni Battista Eliano.

Guzmán’s 2,300-word letter was apparently sent to Pedro de Ribadeneyra, but its style suggests that it was a proposal of a memorial to be forwarded to Superior General Acquaviva: it requested the abrogation of the *de genere* decree. The text has the same structure as Alarcón’s: it is divided in two parts, the first of which lists six ways in which the spirit of the 1593 decree differed from the early Jesuit practice and the *Constitutions*. In addition to the first reason we have already seen in Chapter Two, Loarte’s closest friend cites the obvious unpopularity of the decree among the Jesuits, many of whom are very important and known for their virtues, learning, and wisdom. The daily experience shows how the implementation of this decree creates in the Society an occasion for many ills, such as jealousies and discords, contentions and alterations, which eventually lead to the loss of peace, unity, and true love that Jesus Christ left as precept to his Apostles during the Last Supper.

---


51 Acquaviva was strongly convinced of the opposite, as we have seen in Chapter Three.

52 “Y se ve cada día que todos comúnmente bien de este decreto, diciendo que se tiene experiencia cierta que dondequiera que hay este tal decreto, se ha visto y se ve
The third and fourth reasons echo again Alarcón’s memorial: after the promulgation of the decree, many influential and valued Jesuits, whose work brought many fruits in the Society, left the Order. Some of them left even though they were not required to do so by the decree; but they were afraid that the gathering of information about their background would jeopardize their honor. Others, who were forced to leave because of their lineage, which had never bothered anybody before, did so in spite of their notoriety as very gifted persons both in virtues and learning, through whom the Lord brought much fruit among both the faithful and heretics.53

Guzmán’s fifth reason is a warning about enmities and other inconveniences that will result from lineage investigations that could produce false testimonies. It had already happened in some military orders and university colleges and certainly will happen in the Society, which was founded to remedy all sins and every occasion that would lead to them. How can the Jesuits help and console many persons who are affected by this situation, if persons know that the Society itself has produced such a decree?—asks Diego de Guzmán rhetorically.54

The last reason articulated in the first part points out that in order to pursue its mission of helping people in many parts of the world, the Society needs many good subjects. Thus, Father Ignatius wrote down

una grande ocasión de muchos males como son discordias y envidias, contenciones y mutaciones, y finalmente perderse la paz y unidad verdadera et caridad que Jesús Cristo nuestro Señor nos dejo por único precepto suyo, como lo dejo a sus santos apóstoles la noche del jueves santo, cuando se despidió de ellos” (Instit. 186e, f. 355v).

53 “La tercera razón es ver que después que hay este decreto se han retirado muchos sujetos que tienen partes muy señaladas y de grande estimación y que fueran muy estimados y de gran fruto en la Compañía; y aunque no les tocó a algunos de ellos ser excluidos por este decreto, mas por no poner su honra en peligro, que con las informaciones suele acontecer a muchas personas, por esto se retiran afuera. La cuarta saber que hemos tenido en la Compañía algunas personas muy señaladas en muchos dones de nuestro Señor así de virtudes como de letras y dignidad en la misma Compañía; y que han sido muy estimados, dondequiera que estuvieron, por el gran fruto que por medio suyo hizo nuestro Señor entre fieles y herejes; y se sabe que les tocaba tener parte de este linaje, lo cual nunca dio a nadie ocasión de ningún escándalo” (Instit. 186e, ff. 355v–356v).

54 “La quinta es saber que en las informaciones que se hacen para los que pretenden las encomiendas de religiones militares y también para los colegios que hay en las universidades suelen suceder de ellas muy graves escándalos y falsos testimonios y enemistades y otras muchas inconvenientes que abrazan gran multitud de gente; cuanto más podemos tener por cierto que sucederá esto en la Compañía y con más razón, pues la ha fundado nuestro Señor para quitar y remediar todos los pecados y ocasiones de donde ellos proceden; y como podrán los nuestros ayudar y consolar a muchas personas a quienes sucede algún escándalo acerca de esta materia, si se sabe que tenemos en la Compañía este mismo decreto” (Instit. 186e, f. 356v).
what good characteristics the candidates should have. Now, many people meet these requirements but fail the lineage background check. Consequently, the Society loses many subjects of this kind, while just one of them could gain many others. Thus, “by losing one grain, we lose a great harvest,” Guzmán observes.\textsuperscript{55} To illustrate his point, Guzmán interestingly brings here an example of a Jesuit not of Jewish but Morisco lineage, by whom “nobody was offended.” His name is [Juan de] Albotodo,\textsuperscript{56} and he is presented as an indefatigable worker for the people of Granada, who were “edified by seeing that our Lord had taken such a rose amid the thorns” and who supported him with thousands of ducats that he distributed among the poor of the city. So, when he died, everybody felt as if his or her own father had died.\textsuperscript{57} Diego de Guzmán concludes this part by praying that these and many other reasons will persuade the superior general to abrogate, or at least mitigate, the decree, which could be done, he suggests, by the pope, without the burden of convoking a general congregation.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} “La sexta, hay necesidad en la Compañía de buenos y muchos sujetos para proveer a tantos y diversos asuntos que abraza para ayudar las ánimas en tantas partes del mundo y para esto ordena nuestro Señor por medio del nuestro bendito padre Ignacio las partes que han de tener los que se han de admitir en la Compañía. Ahora se ve claramente que hay muchos que tienen todas las partes que son menester, mas les faltará sola aquella; y así se priva de los tales sujetos que uno solo de ellos pudiera ganar a muchos, y perdiéndose un grano se pierde una gran mies” (Instit. 186e, f. 356r).

\textsuperscript{56} Juan de Albotodo (1527–78) was born into a Morisco family from Granada. He worked among the Moriscos of his native city, using Arabic. His success convinced his superiors to establish a Jesuit house and school in the Morisco quarter of Albaicín, where he operated with other Jesuits for a decade until the Morisco rebellion in 1568–70. Subsequently he worked in Seville, where he died. His funeral testified to the great esteem that the citizens had for his work (see \textit{DHCJ} 1:38–9). Guzmán himself was from Seville and moved back there nine years after Albotodo’s death (1587), which explains why he would choose the latter as an example here. On Albotodo’s work in Granada, see Coleman, \textit{Creating Christian Granada}, pp. 156–7.

\textsuperscript{57} “Tengamos en la memoria el gran fruto que hizo el Padre Albotodo que era del linaje de los moriscos de Granada el cual hizo maravillas, dondequiera que estuvo, en ayudar las ánimas y socorrer infinitas necesidades espirituales y corporales especialmente en […] y la tenía toda en su mano. Y aunque todos sabían que él era de aquel linaje, ninguno se ofendía por ello, antes se edificaban viendo que nuestro Señor había sacado una tal rosa de medio de las espinas y le daban muchos millares de ducados que distribuyese entre muchos pobres y obras pías de la ciudad. Y así cuando nuestro Señor se lo llevó, fue tanto el sentimiento de todos, como si cada uno perdiera su propio padre” (Instit. 186e, ff. 356r–v).

\textsuperscript{58} “Y si por estas razones y por otras muchas que hay muy eficaces fuese persuadido nuestro Padre General que este decreto se abrogase, o a los menos se moderase, no excluyendo a otros que los que el decreto común excluye para ser sacerdotes, mas para coadjutores se puedan recibir, esto podría Su Paternidad concluir tratándolo con Su
The second part of Guzmán’s letter-memorial takes the form of an appendix that contains a list of ten brief points. They present inconveniences that the de genere decree creates in the Society. The first one, which would be picked up also by Alarcón, points out a big risk of using lineage as a hidden excuse to dismiss someone from the Order. Guzmán seems to be surprised by the fact that the decree must be observed outside Spain, even though elsewhere the issue of lineage is nonexistent—for example, in Rome, where a famous Dominican preacher, known as “the Jew,” is much esteemed for his doctrine and grace of preaching. (This preacher had been baptized along with his father after he had been catechized in a Jesuit house in the time of Ignatius.) Besides, even in Spain, other religious orders do not have such a decree, and the Dominicans observe it only in some convents and with limitations.

Repeating what he had already written in the first part, Guzmán calls the witness of many grave people “of lineage” who are scandalized by the promulgation of such a decree in the Society, blaming its [general] congregation for having been presided by the demon. Another scandalous and divisive inconvenience can be created during the examination for admission, if a superior is “of lineage” and has to bar a candidate.

Santidad del papa. Y así no sería menester que hubiese congregación general por los muchos inconvenientes que hay en venir a Roma de tantas provincias, mayormente en estos tiempos todos puestos en tantas guerras y temores de haber las mayores en todas partes. Ordene nuestro Señor lo que el sabe que mas conviene para mayor gloria suya y bien de esta mínima Compañía. Amen” (Instit. 186e, f. 356r).

“Sucece muchas veces ser menester despedir algunos de la Compañía según lo mandan las Constituciones por diversos casos y defectos que tienen o han tenido. Y habiendo ahora este decreto, hay gran peligro de escándalo que se diga que por el linaje se despiden; y así se impida el […] por mucho que convenga para el bien de la Compañía que se vaya” (Instit. 186e, ff. 356’–357’).

“Porque este decreto no solo toca a España, mas a las otras naciones donde no se suele hacer caso del linaje, sino que los reciben muy fácilmente, si tienen las otras buenas partes, como por ejemplo en Roma hay un predicador de santo Domingo que llamen el hebreo y que se bautizó junto con su padre y se categózio en nuestra casa profesóa en tiempo de nuestro Padre Ignacio, el cual es muy estimado en todas las ciudades de Italia por su doctrina y gracia de predicar. Pues si por allá y en otras partes ha de ser guardado este decreto, necesariamente ha de suceder escándalo notable pues las otras religiones no lo tienen en España. Lo tienen los padres de s. Domingo en algunos conventos, mas con mucha limitación, como es que si uno es caballero aunque le toque por otra parte ser del otro linaje no le impide nada” (Instit. 186e, f. 357’).

“Que se sabe que personas muy graves en dignidad y letras y linaje se hayan escandalizado por este decreto y dicho abominaciones de la Compañía, como que el demonio presidía en aquella Congregación y cosas semejantes” (Instit. 186e, f. 357’).
because of his lineage.\textsuperscript{62} That is why Spanish families do not want to send their sons to Jesuit colleges, being afraid that, should they discover vocation and want to enter the Order, they would expose themselves to embarrassment, as is already happening.\textsuperscript{63} Sometimes, though, such families insist that the Society admit their sons, as in the grotesque case Guzmán quotes: “We have heard that somewhere, because the Jesuits did not receive somebody of this lineage, the relatives arrived masked in the night and threatened to kill the Jesuits if they did not admit their son, and the Jesuits were forced to do so for the fear of death.”\textsuperscript{64}

Conversely, there will be people without vocation to the Society who will want to enter only because they want to be considered of pure lineage.\textsuperscript{65} Thus, the Society becomes unavoidably abhorred not only by “the people of lineage” but also by many who are not but who are often bound to them by ties of friendship or blood. Consequently, the Society is seen as adverse, for it was founded to embrace and console all kinds of people.\textsuperscript{66} Guzmán again regrets, then, that the Society closes its doors to the people who are most excellent in virtues and letters but cannot be admitted to the Order solely because of their lineage, even though they have vocation. Vice versa, the Society opens the door to less capable people just because they possess one thing that the others do not have.\textsuperscript{67}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} “Que hay ocasión grande dentro la Compañía de haber escándalos y cizaña. Como será, si hubiese de los superiores que les tocase algo de aquel linaje y fuese menester hacer examen de algunos que pretenden entrar, puede decir, ‘Eres tu superior y tienes parte de este linaje y buscas me a mí si tengo algo’” (\textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 357r).
\item \textsuperscript{63} “Nuestros no querían enviar sus hijos a nuestros colegios por miedo que si tuviiesen vocación y queriendo entrar, no los reciban y quedan afrentados, como ya se ha sabido que acontece esto” (\textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 357v).
\item \textsuperscript{64} “Ya se ha sabido que en algunas partes por no haber recibido alguno que le tocaba algo de este linaje, han venido de noche sus parientes enmascarados y han amenazado de matar a los nuestros, si no lo reciben, y ha sido menester recibirlo por miedo de la muerte” (\textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 357v).
\item \textsuperscript{65} “Sucederá que algunos que aunque no tengan vocación a la Compañía cual sea verdadera, sino por ser tenidos por limpios de linaje quieran entrar” (\textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 357v).
\item \textsuperscript{66} “Necesariamente se hace la Compañía odiosa a gran multitud de gente no solo a los que toca de aquel linaje, mas también a otros muchos aunque no les toque nada, porque siempre hay de los que tienen amigos muy íntimos que les toca y también a otros que tienen parientes y muy cercanos que les toca, de manera que abraca esta ocasión de odio y de aversión una gran multitud de universidades y calidad de gentes, lo que es escándalo que todos podemos ver, habiendo nuestro Señor fundado la Compañía para abrazar y consolar a toda suerte y calidad de personas” (\textit{Instit. 186e}, f. 357v).
\item \textsuperscript{67} “Se cierra la puerta a personas muy señaladas en mucha virtud y letras y autoridad y dignidad que, aunque tengan vocación de entrar en la Compañía, si […] les
Guzmán concludes his draft of the memorial by saying that even Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo and Inquisitor General Gaspar de Quiroga considered the Society dishonored by promulgating a law that bars from the Society not only priests of lineage but also lay brothers of the kind.  

Diego de Guzmán must have written his memorial from Seville sometime between the promulgation of the 1593 decree and his death in 1606, just two years before the decree’s limitation that he fought for. He wrote it to Pedro de Ribadeneyra not only because of the bond of friendship that tied them but also because the latter was known to have good connections at the court in Madrid, through which he might have been able to pressure Acquaviva. At any rate, Ribadeneyra himself engaged in a campaign that targeted the 1593 decree, employing some of the arguments offered by Guzmán.  

**Pedro de Ribadeneyra**

The most cohesive reaction of Pedro de Ribadeneyra to the purity-of-blood discrimination in the Society of Jesus is contained in his memorial under the title, *Las razones que se me ofrecen para no hacer novedad en el admitir gente en la Compañía* [The reasons that I think of for not making any change regarding the admission to the Society], which is the only text of the kind that was published in its entirety. We have already seen parts of this text in Chapter Two, when quoting the instances of Loyola’s desire to be a Jew by blood and instances of the adamant condemnation by early Jesuits (Laínez and Nadal) of such a discriminatory policy as “opposite to the spirit of God.”

---

65 “Se sabe muy cierto lo que sintió en esto el Cardinal Arzobispo de Toledo, Inquisidor General don Gaspar de Quiroga, que fue que en lugar de ganar honra se ha la Compañía deshonrado con este tal decreto, cerrando la puerta no solo a los sacerdotes, mas también a los coadjutores, lo cual apenas se puede guardar en los colegios de las universidades, cuanto menos en una religión como esta. Y lo mismo sintió el obispo santo desear, don Francisco Sarmiento de buena memoria” (*Instit. 186e*, f. 358).

66 “Necesariamente se hace la Compañía odiosa a gran multitud de gente no solo por las razones de purificación que se han de exigir, sino porque siempre hay de los que tienen amigos muy íntimos que les toca y que, no habiendo sido recibido, han sido amenazados de matar a los nuestros, si no lo reciben, y ha sido menester recibirlo por miedo de la muerte” (*Instit. 186e*, f. 357r).

67 “Ya se ha sabido que en algunas partes por no haber recibido alguno que le tocaba algo de este linaje, han venido de noche sus parientes enmascarados y han toca alguna cosa de tal linaje y se le abre esta puerta a otros que sean muy menos que los otros en todas estas partes por no tener algo de lo que tienen los otros” (*Instit. 186e*, f. 358).

68 “Los hermanos de la Compañía prevarican por no tener autoritativeness within the Society.

69 ARSI, *Instit. 184 I*, ff. 292r–295r; and *Mon Rib.* 2:374–84. The particularity of this text comes not from the author’s advanced age, as Anna Foà has suggested in her “Limpieza y Mission” (p. 306), but from the author’s converso background and from authoritativeness within the Society.
Ribadeneyra begins his memorial by bluntly affirming that the lineage discrimination constitutes a substantial change in the Jesuit Constitutions, which do not exclude those of Jewish stock; even Loyola’s anti-converso relative, Antonio de Araoz, had to succumb willy-nilly to their authority. Yet, Araoz must have been quite stubborn in his prejudice, for Ribadeneyra quotes two letters that Loyola’s successor, Diego Laínez, wrote to him in this regard. The first one was composed in November 1560 and the second in November 1564. Both letters strongly opposed “the national humor” in Spain against the conversos—“as if they were made of other metal”—as destructive to the unity of the Society. Ribadeneyra employed the traditional argumentation for Christian unity used in Pauline epistolography and the Acts of the Apostles that we already have seen abundantly in other pro-converso writings.

Like Possevino, Ribadeneyra highlights the stark contrast between the pro-converso attitude during the governments of the first three superiors general—especially during the generalate of Francisco de Borja, who “was still easier in accepting this kind of people than Fathers Master Ignatius and Master Laínez”\(^{70}\)—and the novelty introduced by the 1593 decree. To a Jesuit objecting to this openness, Borja would reply that he was pursuing the same kind of policy that the Spanish monarch was, in whose service many conversos were employed. Additionally, Borja would point out that he could not restrict the admission to the service in the house of that Lord, who “makes no favoritism \([\textit{acceptatio personarum}: \text{Romans 2:11}]\) neither between Jew and Greek \([\text{Romans 10:12}]\), nor between Barbarian and Scythian \([\text{Colossians 3:11}]\).” Curiously, Ribadeneyra also adds that the discriminatory practice was alien to the current Superior General Acquaviva, but this statement was probably a kind of \textit{captatio benevolentiae} trick, aimed—as we have seen it already in the first memorial by Possevino in respect to Mercurian—at persuading the addressee to change the policy, so that his authority be not jeopardized.\(^{71}\)

Ribadeneyra also refutes the accusation that the \textit{memorialistas} movement was composed of Jesuits of Jewish origin, for which they would have been punished by the 1593 decree. To the contrary, he

\(^{70}\) See Mon Rib. 2:377.
\(^{71}\) See Mon Rib. 2:377–8.
stresses, the leader of this group of perturbatores, [Francisco] Abreo, was considered pure, and many converso Jesuits, at any rate, showed that “they were very faithful and true sons of our Father [Ignatius] and of the Society.” The people who initiated major turmoil in the Society—continues Ribadeneyra—were not of Jewish stock; and even if they were, it would not suffice to punish them with this kind of decree, for we have to remember that among those people in the Society we find the most excellent men in sainthood, letters, prudence and of rare gifts, like Giovanni Battista Romano. Like Guzmán, Ribadeneyra is surprised by the lineage obsession in Spain, while elsewhere this issue is nonexistent—for example in Rome, where a great Dominican preacher, Father Alexander, who converted from Judaism, operates with no obstacle.

Consequently, the honor of the Society and of Spain is compromised, for the Italians consider it entirely Jewish or crypto-Jewish. This bias undermines the Society’s union, for its members look at one another as enemies who belong to a different caste or sect. The atmosphere of suspicion and division that seems to be a civil war is viewed by Ribadeneyra as “vinegar added to the fire that will consume the entire Society.” This concern for the Society’s future was expressed—Ribadeneyra reminds—by many holy and illustrious friends of the Society, Master [Juan de] Ávila included, who predicted that the Society would be destroyed if it introduced distinctions of lineage and blood.

Acquaviva’s special envoy to investigate the consequences of these distinctions, García Girón de Alarcón, wrote in response to the superior general the most comprehensive and systematic critique of the Jesuit purity-of-blood legislation.

---

72 Francisco Abreo was born in 1528 in Fuente Guinaldo (Ciudad Rodrigo, Salamanca) and entered the Society in 1569 in Salamanca. His Sephardic name, birthplace, and intellectual interests, however, suggest converso origin. Before he became a Jesuit, he studied law in Salamanca and consequently taught there and in Oviedo with much success. Mercurian refused to admit him to the profession of solemn vows, and Acquaviva dismissed him in 1588 due to his alleged (financial) independence, but he left the Society only in 1592 and moved to his birthplace. See Información en derecho. En defensa de la Bula conservatoria, dada por los Pontífices Pío V y Gregorio XIII a la Compañía de Jesús, Casas, Colegios y Religiosos dellos (s.l., c. 1575); “Contra Institutum S.I.,” in ARSI, Hist. Soc. 163; DHCJ 1:7; Astrain, Historia, 3:354–7, 413, 418sq, 490–3, 537sq; and García Casar, Fontes iudaeorum regni castellae, vol. VI: “El pasado judío de Ciudad Rodrigo” (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1992).

73 See Mon Rib. 2:379–80. This part would suggest that Ribadeneyra used Guzmán’s text to write the present memorial.

74 See Mon Rib. 2:380–3.
García Girón de Alarcón was born in 1534 in Albaladejo (Cuenca) to Alonso Girón de Alarcón and Juana Pacheco. As the oldest son he inherited the mayorazgo of his father in Albaladejo and Piqueras, and that of his maternal uncle, Juan de Silva y Pacheco, in Villarejo. Most likely he was also related to doña Juana de Alarcón of Villa de Minaya (Cuenca), who was married to don Juan de Pacheco, whose son, Alonso, also entered the Society. After his six-month experience with the Jeronymites, which constituted for him a legal impediment to join the Jesuits, he nevertheless entered the Society in 1555, supported by a request directed to Francisco de Borja by the converso Juan de Ávila, with whom Alarcón had been acquainted in Granada. After his studies in Alcalá he was ordained priest in 1567 and celebrated his first mass in a church of the Jesuit novitiate that he had founded in Villarejo. Among many other administrative duties he was superior provincial of Andalusia. As such, he participated in General Congregation 4 (1581), which elected him assistant general for Spain, and he was thus a colleague of Hoffaeus, Maggio, and Rodrigues, whose anti-converso campaign we have studied in the previous chapter. Alarcón kept his office until General Congregation 5 (1593), which promulgated the de genere decree. The Jesuit Superior General Acquaviva appointed him (1595–7) visitor in the provinces of Castile and Toledo, both of which expressed their opposition to that decree. At the end of his visit to these provinces and close to death, García de Alarcón commissioned Juan de Montemayor to write a memorial on his behalf. The latter was elected in 1597 to participate in the Congregation of Procurators in Rome, and the next year he would

75 See ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 1652, N. 263. There was another Jesuit named Pacheco who was mentioned in the previous chapter. His first name was Juan Bautista, and he was born most likely to a converso family in Uclés, in the same province of Cuenca. Alarcón might be also related to the famous playwright Juan Ruiz de Alarcón, whose father, Pedro, immigrated from Albaladejo in Cuenca (where García was born) to Taxco in Mexico. In 1572 Pedro married a descendant of the Cazalla merchant converso family from Seville, Leonor de Mendoza. See Willard F. King, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón, letrado y dramaturgo: su mundo mexicano y español (Mexico: Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios, 1989), Chapter 1 and the genealogical tree of the House of Albaladejo (Appendix B).

76 Kamen in his Crisis and Change (p. 14) mentions an anti-limpieza memorandum from 1613 by Juan de Montemayor, though without providing enough details about it, so I could not establish whether it is the same text we are discussing here.
become superior provincial of Castile. The document was dated 16 December 1597 and was carried to Rome,\textsuperscript{77} where it has survived in the Jesuit Archives until today but has been virtually unnoticed.

The purpose of this text addressed to Acquaviva is to advise the superior general about the suggestion made to him by “many eminent men from the Society, either in doctrine, piety, religion, or government, who are known for their love and faithfulness to the Society and its superior general” to obtain from the pope some limitation to the third canon of General Congregation 5, which prohibits the admission of candidates of Jewish lineage and orders the dismissal of those subjects who anytime before their religious profession would be discovered to have such ancestry, without giving to the general the power to grant exemptions.\textsuperscript{78}

Alarcón’s text has a twofold structure: the first part reflects the author’s training in law and presents a set of papal and conciliar documents refuting the discrimination of Jewish Christians based on their lineage alone; the second offers fifteen reasons whereby the 1593 decree was harmful to the Society of Jesus itself. Despite the initial suggestion of the decree’s mitigation, Alarcón’s argumentation makes this decree \textit{wholly} unacceptable, for he quotes the documents that call not just for the alleviation of discriminatory legislation but, further, prove its unlawfulness \textit{tout court}.

The most important papal document of this kind that the Castilian Jesuit cites almost entirely—as did his former Jeronymite confrere, Oropesa, in his \textit{Lumen}—is Nicholas V’s bull \textit{Humani generis inimicus} (1449),\textsuperscript{79} which we have already seen in Chapter One as a reaction to


\textsuperscript{78} “Pater Garcia de Alarcon Visitator Castellae et Toleti mihi Romam profiscerenti valde commendavit simul etiam inunxit ut ipsius nomine Patri nostro generali defer rant, quae ei multi viri e Societate, in doctrina e pietate, in religione et gubernatione praecipui, et in amore et fidelitate in Societatem, necnon ad Patrem nostrum generalem valde praecrari proposuerunt circa canonem tertium Quintae Congregationis generalis (quo cavetur ne in Societatem admissantur, qui ex Hebraeorum genere originem trahunt: quod si errore aliquo quispiam admissis fuerit, quocumque tempore ante professionem detegatur, dimittatur, quin generalis super hoc dispensare possit) haec autem deferenda censuit non ut canon derogatur, aut penitus deleatur, sed ut ei aliqua declaratiorne Summi Pontificis nonnulla limitatio adhibeatur” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, f. 297). Note that Alarcón does not mention the debarment of Moriscos in this summary of the 1593 decree.

\textsuperscript{79} Anna Foa has noted in her “\textit{Limpieza and Mission}” (pp. 302–3) the similarity of the title of this encyclical with the never-promulgated anti-racist \textit{Humani generis unitas} of Pope Pius XI, which was co-written by three Jesuits: the American John LaFarge...
Sarmiento’s first purity-of-blood legislation and whose very existence Bishop Simancas undermined in his *Defensio Toletani Statuti* (1573). The jurist Alarcón highlights its eight points:

1. Three major monarchs of Castile and León “established under severe penalty that there be no preference between the new converts to the faith, especially from the Jewish people, and the Old Christians in keeping or receiving honors, offices and dignities, both ecclesiastical and civil.”

2. The pope had seen these royal sanctions supplied with their authentic seals, which he sufficiently discussed and—after mature deliberation—approved with apostolic authority on his own initiative, fully certain that they complied with the sacred canons and law.

3. Nicholas declared the contrary judgment as erroneous, therefore those who follow it are dubbed “new sowers of zizania” (“*novos seminatores zizaniae*”), “contemptuous of the documents of our faith and unity” (“*contemptores documenti salutaris fidei nostrae et unitatis*”), “those who renew dissent that had been extirpated by the Apostle Paul” (“*renovatores dissidii, quod ab apostolo Paulo extirpatum*”), “totally alien to our Lord Christ” (“*alienos ab infinitis Christi Domini nostri*”), “deviators from the truth of the Catholic faith” (“*aberrantes ab veritate fidei catholicae*”), “opponents of the authority not only of the Sacred Scripture, but also of the sanctions of the most illustrious lay princes” (“*contradictores non solum authoritatis Sacrae Scripturae, verum etiam sanctionum illius trium Principum saecularum, quae visae sunt et discussae, approbatae et roboratae a Sede Apostolica*”), “sowers of falseness against the norm of Christian religion and what is contrary to peace and unity” (“*seminatores falsitatum contra Christianae religionis normam [et] quae contraria sunt paci et unitati*”), and “scandalous to the neighbor” (“*scandalizatores proximorum*”).

4. The pope’s *motu proprio* orders all Catholics, whether ecclesiastic or lay, of any status, rank or condition, under penalty of excommunication, to admit all the converts to the faith of the Gospel and those who will convert in the future, and their descendants of both

---

(1880–1963); the German Gustav Gundlach (1892–1963), and the French Gustave Desbuquois (1869–1946) (see Archiv der Deutschen Provinz der Jesuiten, 252 C 377).

80 “Sanxerunt sub gravibus poenis, ut inter noviter conversos ad fidem, maxime de populo israelitico et antiquos christianos nulla fiat discretio in honoribus, dignitatibus, officiis tam ecclesiasticis quam saecularibus susciendi et habendi” (*Inst. 184–I*, f. 299v).

81 “Ipsummet Pontificem vidisse praedictas sanctiones authenticas eorum sigillo munitas eas quae sufficienter et mature discussisse et post maturam discussionem eas approbase, apostolica quae authoritate roborasse, non ad petitionem partis, sed ex proprio motu, et ex certa scientia, ut iuri et sacris canonibus conformes” (*Inst. 184–I*, f. 299v).

the clergy and laity, as long as they live as good Christians, to all dignities and offices, and everything else, i.e., communities of men religious, to which all other old Christians are universally admitted, and that there be no discrimination between the latter and other Christians because of their recent acceptance of the faith.\(^{83}\)

5. Under penalty of excommunication, Old Christians should not disgrace the New Christians by word or deed, nor should they let others do such things, but rather they should contradict and oppose it with all their might; and with all their charity they should accompany them and honor without favoritism of persons.\(^{84}\)

6. Nicholas ordered bishops to punish those who teach the opposite in words or deeds and those who inflect injuries by means of various penalties from imprisonment to pecuniary ones.\(^{85}\)

7. Apostates from the faith ought to be punished according to common law.\(^{86}\)

8. The Apostle Paul at the beginning of the Church extirpated an acrimony that was born between Jews and Gentiles, to which he abundantly related through almost entire Letter to the Romans.\(^{87}\)

The second most authoritative papal document that the Salmantican alumnus cites in his letter to Acquaviva is Paul III’s bull *Cupientes Iudaeos* (1542), a papal document that was issued under the sway of the founder of the Order of Jesuits, Ignatius of Loyola, a fact that Alarcón may have not known. The fragment in which Alarcón is especially interested was inserted into a collection of decrees commissioned by Pope Gregory XIII; it is actually a quotation of the decree *De his qui volunt ad fidel converti* of the Council of Basel (1431–7). Alonso de

---

\(^{83}\) “Praecipitur sub excommunicationis poena omnibus catolicis ecclesiasticis et seacularibus, cuissuumque status et conditionis sint, ut omnes ad fidel evangelli conversos et in posterum convertendos et eorum posteros tam ecclesiasticos quam saeculares catholice et secundum quod decet Christianum viventes admittant ad omnes dignitates et officia et universaliter, ait, ad omnia alia, communitates scilicet religiosorum et similia adque alii Christiani quantumcumque antiqui admissi solent, nec propter fidei novae receptionem interos et alios Christianos discretiones fiant” (Inst. 184–I, f. 300').

\(^{84}\) “Praecipit sub eadem poena excommunicationis ne quis eos verbis aut factis contumeliis afficiat, neve ab [301'] alii affici permissat imo ut pro viribus contradicat et se opponat iniuria afficere volentibus, et tandem ut sine acceptione personarum eos charitate prosequantur” (see Inst. 184–I, ff. 300''–301').

\(^{85}\) “Praecipit Episcopis, ut docentes contrarium aut eos verbo vel facto, aut qu quo modo iniuria afficientes puingat captura, privatione, inhabitatione, poenis pecuniaris et alii huius modi, omissa omni iuris solemnitate, sola facti veritate inspecta” (see Inst. 184–I, f. 301').

\(^{86}\) “Apostantes a fide iubet puniri iuxta ius commune” (see Inst. 184–I, f. 301').

\(^{87}\) “Apostolum Paulum extirpasse con simile dissidium antelationis exhortum initio nascentis Ecclesiae inter Iudeos et gentiles quod Apostolus late prosequitur epistolae ad Romanos fere per totam” (see Inst. 184–I, f. 301').
Cartagena hammered it out there and included in his *Defensorium*, as we have seen in Chapter One: “Those recently converted to the faith must enjoy the same privileges, exemptions, and liberties that the Old Christians do, ‘for the members of the family of God and the saints become citizens by the grace of baptism and it is much more worthy to be regenerated in the spirit than to be born in the flesh’.”

The spirit of this decree, continues Alarcón, was reflected in a document by Pope Alexander III, who reprimanded a bishop for being unwilling to admit to his Church and give an ecclesiastical benefice to a convert from Judaism; Alexander argued that the bishop should not dishonor the man because of his Jewish origin.

Additionally, Alarcón cites the names of other popes who, albeit not directly, were driven by the same kind of spirit that Nicholas’s bull contained, among them Pius V, Gregory XIII, Innocent III, and Gregory IX. The latter underlined that what makes someone a good servant in God’s eyes is not his provenience but the nobility of his virtues and the honesty of his life, words that echo St. Paul’s First Letter to Corinthians (1:24–6): “To those who have been called, Jews as well as Greeks, the Christ is the virtue of God and the wisdom of God […], for not many are wise according to the flesh, not many are powerful, not many are noble.”

For the sake of fairness, Alarcón admits that there are some statutes approved by the Apostolic See, whereby “those who are from the circumcision” are rejected in some Churches, but he explains that those papal documents do not have universal value, for they were proposed in specific circumstances, where their confirmation seemed to be a prudent solution. Yet, those churches, which adopted such restrictions,
soon realized how harmful and inconvenient they were and, consequently, petitioned from popes or monarchs their abrogation. An example of this practice was the Church of Burgos, which saw in the observation of this discriminatory law many inconveniences, likewise the Church of Toledo itself, under the rule of Archbishop Alonso Carrillo de Acuña (to whom Oropesa dedicated his *Lumen*, as we have seen above), issued a decree that Alarcón himself consulted in the archives of the Santa María Church in Alcalá de Henares. In it, the irritated Carrillo complains that in Toledo, as well as in other cities and towns of his archdiocese, many confraternities, chapters, and colleges do not admit New Christians, falsely justifying it with piety. In such places, the candidates are scrutinized with regard to their origin, which produces many scandals and undermines peace and unity. In reaction to this division of “nations and origins,” which he considers to be contrary to law and charity, Carrillo prohibited under penalty of excommunication the observance of such statutes. Carrillo’s decree

---

condita sunt illa statuta Pontifici fuisset propositas occasiones et circumstantias, quibus prudenter impulsus est ad illa confirmanda” (*Inst. 184–I*, ff. 301r–v).

92 “Addo etiam nonullas ecclesias, in quibus haec statuta confirmata sunt, videntes damna et inconveniencia maxima quae ex illis emanabant a summo Pontifice petisse ut illa abrogaret, qua etiam rationem nonnullae religiones habentes consimilia statuta a fede Apostolica approbata, ne scilicet ad sui habitus susceptionem, qui sunt ex circumcisione admitterentur, ab eodem Pontifice eorum abrogationem petiverunt, et eadem ratione licet aliquae Ecclesiae in Hispania denuo curaverint condere similia statuta a Rege nostro eiusque regii consiliis reiecti sunt: imo et Ecclesia Toletana Burgensi consuluit ne tale statutum conderet propter quotidiana damna et incommoda quae ipsa in observatione sui statuti experita est” (*Inst. 184–I*, f. 301v).

93 “Quia, iuxta Apostoli sententiam ab omni specie mali nos decet abstinere et... in infra percepimus (quod dolendum est) quod in civitate Toletana et in aliis civitatibus, oppidis et villis nostri Archiepiscopatus reperiruunt multae confraternitates, capitula et collegia, quae sub fuco pietatis non recipiunt ad suam societatem noviter conversos ad fidem, aliis non recipiunt eos, qui ab antiquo ad fidem conversi sunt, hoc in sui erroris praesidium assumentes, quod ad id teneantur adstricti statutis et ordinationibus pactis, iuramento et aliis poenis, ac vinculis roboratis. Et si quis ad eorum societatem recipiendus est, prieri inquiri facient de qua progenie ortus sit, ex quo sequuntur gravia scandalata inter Chistianos, quae nos attendentes et ex intimis visceribus pacem et tranquillum statum nobis subditorum affectantes, sancta synoda approbante omnia et singula statuta huius modi consuetudine, iuramento et aliis poenis roboratae, irritatus, et nullius roboris et valoris esse decernimus et contraria iuris et charitati declaramus et relaxamus quae cumque iuramenta hac occasione edita et reprobasmus et anathematizamus omnes confraternitates, collegia, capitula, et coetus, in quibus in posterum tales divisiones nationum et generum fieri contigerit publice vel occulte sub quocumque colore; et iubemus quod si qui aliquod statutum circa hoc fecerunt et congregationes, ubi tales divisiones observantur quamdiu in talibus schismatibus perseraverint et infra. Prohibemus etiam omnibus personis ecclesiasticis sub excommunicationis maioris poena ne praedictas personas convenire permettant
was confirmed in 1483—reminds Alarcón—by his successor, Cardinal Pedro González de Mendoza (1428–95). Also, Cardinal Francisco Jiménez [de Cisneros] (1436–1517) followed the policy of these two archbishops of Toledo: he advised his Franciscan confreres not to refuse the candidates “who had origin from Hebrews.”

To finish his list of highest Church authorities who disapproved lineage discrimination, Alarcón—following perhaps a similar treatise by the Franciscan Gaspar de Uceda—adds that of the Dominican Cardinal Cajetan (Tommaso de Vio, 1468–1534), who was consulted in 1514 (when the conversion of Jews was quite recent and, hence, when their “return to the vomit” more frequent) by the academics from Salamanca about whether it was licit to refuse the admission of those who converted. He replied that refusing only for the reason of their Jewish origin seemed to him irrational, “for our salvation comes from Jews, from whom Christ, the Apostles and many fathers of the faith were born according to the flesh. This refusal would generate in Jews an excuse not to convert to Christianity, knowing that their children would be rejected forever.”

in suis ecclesiis vel paroecis nec eis celebrent missam vel divina officia, quandiu in praedicto schismate perduraverint. Haec ibi concilium ubi tales institutiones quibus ratione generis repelluntur noviter conversi ex communitatibus [...] scandalosas, schismaticas, et contrarias iuris et charitatis” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 302r–v).

94 “Quam constitutionem deinde illustrissimus cardinalis Petrus Gonzalez a Mendoza Archiepiscopus etiam Toletanus approbavit et confirmavit anno 1483 in quadam provisione data Victoriae, fuit enim gubernator horum regnorum. Reverendissimus etiam cardinalis Frater Franciscus Jimenez Archiepiscopus Toletanus ordinis Divi Francisci consulti suae religioni ut trahentes originem ab Hebraeis non repellerent quin potius admittentur ad sui habitus susceptionem” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 302v). Cardinal Cisneros kept a converso physician, whose nephew, Alfonso de Pisa (1528–98), also a physician, entered the Society in 1552 in Alcalá, as we have seen in the previous chapter.

95 Gaspar de Uceda, a theologian from Salamanca, wrote a treatise against the purity-of-blood statutes in his Franciscan Order in 1586. See Elvira Pérez Ferreiro, ed., El Tratado de Uceda contra los Estatutos de Limpieza de Sangre: una reacción ante el establecimiento del Estatuto de Limpieza en la Orden Franciscana (Madrid: Aben Ezra Ediciones, 2000).

96 “Et Cardinalis Caetanust consultus a doctoribus academiae Salmanticensis anno Domini 1514 quando erat satis recens conversio iudaeorum ad fidem, an esset licitum eos repellere a religioni respondet tomo I opuscolorum tractatu 3 [...] qui continet 17 responsiones, responsione 6 in eius fine his verbis: “Irrationabile mihi videtur perpetuum statutum aut opus huius modi refutationis respectu illorum qui nulla alia suspicionis nota sunt affecti nisi quod originem ex iudaicis traxerunt, tum quia salus nostra ex iudaicis est, ex quibus natus est Christus secundum carmem et Apostoli et plurimi patres fidei, et ignari inveniur su generis filios repellendo: tum quia occasio daretur iudaicis, ut ad fidem non convertantur dum intelligunt conversorum filios in generatione et generationem repulsos a religione, tum quia religio status est talis, ubi
The second part of Alarcón’s letter deals with the unconstitutionality of the 1593 decree and highlights the harm it had brought to the Society of Jesus. The decree alters the Jesuit Institute substantially, for the Jesuits accepted the Institute from Father Ignatius, who was believed to have received at least its substance directly from God. To add or delete something that Ignatius wrote in the Constitutions regarding impediments to a man’s joining the Society means altering the Institute substantially. Even though General Congregation 5 itself (which approved the de genere decree) declared that the essential impediments for admission to the Society belong to the substance of the Jesuit Institute, it added the impediment of lineage as essential. But, Alarcón argues, when Ignatius made a distinction in the Constitutions between the primary and secondary impediments for the admission, he did not include lineage in either of the two.97

97 “Prima, quia statuto alteratur et mutatur eius institutum in re satis substantiale, quod nos a Patre nostro Ignatius accepimus eumque probabiliter credimus illud a Deo immediate recepisse quod omnia substantialia. Probatur quia addere vel adimere aliquid circa ea, quae Pater noster Ignatius in Constitutionibus reliquit circa impedimenta substantialia excludentia aliquem a Societate est alterare institutum in rebus substantialibus. Nam ut recte vidit congregatio 5.a generalis, canone 17 impedimenta essentialia, quae aliquem an ingressi Societatis impedienti, res est ad substantiam institutum spectans, at hoc statutum circa huius modi impedimenta unum addit substantiales” (Inst. 184–I, f. 304).
Indeed, Loyola established in the *Constitutions* (165–176) five essential impediments that bar a candidate absolutely from being accepted into the Society:

1. “To have separated oneself for a time from the bosom of the Holy Church, by denying the faith in the midst of infidels, or by falling into errors against the faith and having been condemned because of them by a public sentence or by withdrawing as a schismatic from the unity of the Church.”

2. “To have been a homicide or infamous because of enormous sins.”

3. “To have received the habit of a religious institute, or to have been a hermit with the garb of a monk.”

4. “To be bound by the bond of matrimony or of legal servitude.”

5. “To be mentally ill, with the result that the judgment becomes obscured and unsound, or to have a notable disposition toward such illness.”

Additionally, there are nine secondary impediments (177–189), “none of which by itself bars admission to the Society, but which nevertheless renders the applicant less suitable”:

---

98 The *Constitutions* explain the character of these impediments as follows: “In regard of all these impediments it is expedient that neither the superior general nor the whole Society should be able to dispense, since it is universally good that no dispensation be granted from them. However, should one of these impediments be found in a person who has such other qualifications as to give certitude that the Society could be much helped by him in the service of God our Lord, and should the person himself petition the supreme pontiff or his nuncio or chief penitentiary for permission, notwithstanding the Constitutions, to be received into the Society, its superior general not being opposed, then the superior general may give his consent, so long as the door would not be opened to large numbers or to anyone, as has been stated, without exceptional qualities” [176].

99 The *Constitutions* commented on this impediment as follows: “[166] Even though one has not been condemned by a public sentence, if his error has been public and he has been highly suspect and there is fear that proceedings may be instituted against him, he ought not to be admitted. But this judgment will be left to the superior general. [167] With respect to schism, if someone was born in a schismatic region, so that the schism was not simply an individual sin committed by the person himself but a general sin, he would not be understood to be excluded from the Society for this cause (and the same holds true of one born in a heretical region). Rather, what is envisaged is a person who is under infamy and excommunication after having contemned the authority and vigilance of our holy mother the Church, so that the heresy or schism is the person’s individual sin, not the general sin of the nation or country.”

100 See Inst. 184–1, ff. 304r–v.

101 The *Constitutions* explain this kind of impediments as follows: “[178] Each of the impediments of this second category could itself suffice to bar admission. But since there might be other compensating excellent qualities such that it would appear in our Lord that one of these defects ought to be tolerated, the discernment of this case...
(1) “In regard to the interior, passions, which seem uncontrollable, or sinful habits of which there is no hope of much emendation.”
(2) “An intention that is not as right as it ought to be for entrance into a religious institute but is mixed with human designs.”
(3) “Inconstancy or notable listlessness, so that the applicant seems unlikely to amount to much.”
(4) “Indiscreet devotions that lead some to fall into illusions and errors of importance.”
(5) “A lack of learning or of intellectual ability or of memory to acquire it, or of facility in speech to explain it, in candidates who manifest an intention or desire to progress farther than temporal coadjutors customarily do.”
(6) “A lack of judgment or a notable obstinacy in one’s personal opinions, which is very troublesome in any congregation.”
(7) “In regard to the exterior, a lack of bodily integrity, illness and weakness, or notable ugliness.”
(8) “Age too tender, or too advanced.”
(9) “Debts or civil obligations.”

As both lists clearly show—confirms Alarcón—the impediment of lineage that was established in the 1593 statute is not extant here. It is true that Loyola mentioned the question of ancestry in the section “General Exam” of the Constitutions, but not as an impediment—the text simply asks the candidates’ examiner to ask whether his family comes from old or modern Christians. The purpose of this question is just to gather more information about the subject. Alarcón repeats again that adding this substantial impediment means altering the Institute substantially and that it opens a precedent to add other substantial changes in the future, which would result in the creation of a new Institute and a different religious order than the one Ignatius founded. The Society has always desired with all its might to avoid any such substantial alteration.102

---

102 “Huic autem impedimento quod habetur in statuto nullam fecit mentionem, nam licet in examine [...] § 2 moneat, ut interrogetur recipiendus, an sit ex progenitioribus iam olim christianis, an modernis, hoc non est, quia impedimentum esse censeat talis propagatio, sed ut maior notitia recipiendi habeatur, cuius signum apertum est. Nam eodem § 2 eodem tenere ait. Interrogetur an sit ex legitimo matrimonio et tamen non esse legitum constat nullum esse impedimentum. Igitur denuo addere hoc impedimentum substantiale est alterare institutum in re substantiali, quo aditus
It has to be remembered—continues the Jesuit jurist—that Ignatius, even though he was originally from Guipúzcoa (whose people used to persecute with hatred those who are from the circumcision), nursed conversos with special love, inspired by God’s spirit during his long prayers, penances, and sacrifices, and he did not reject them from his community. Rather, he admitted into the Society men of Jewish lineage, for they rendered the Society famous by their doctrine, sanctity, and erudition and conserved its integrity and indemnity during the Council of Trent. Although some in the Society during Ignatius’s lifetime did try to introduce such an impediment, he dismissed them as alien to the Society’s spirit and would do so now, if he found such people.\(^\text{103}\)

Alarcón could still comprehend the need to introduce the Toledan statutes [1449], understanding that the conversion of Jews in Spain was then quite recent and that many of them were still being daily caught practicing “their perfidy,” but he underscores that such a motivation to hound converts was not unnecessary in Spain, for many conversos are truly faithful and only a few of them relapse—their infamy and obstinacy have been eliminated and purified by the durability of their faith.\(^\text{104}\)

If Ignatius had objected to the lineage statutes, Alarcón continues, it is necessary to refuse them also now. A similar issue had been
raised during the generalate of Father Francisco [de Borja], who knew well Spanish affairs, but even though he was pressured to go in that direction, he refused it with all his strength. Moreover, argues Alarcón, the proper purpose of the Society, according to the *Constitutions* and papal bulls, is to bring all men to the faith, even infidels, whatever nation they come from, and help them attain salvation and perfection. So that the Jesuit ministers may be pleased by all nations, it is necessary that no decree be offensive to any nation, making these ministers unwanted by such a nation.\(^{105}\)

It is demonstrated, writes García de Alarcón without hesitation in a form of a syllogism (a reasoning dear to Cartagena), that if the *Constitutions* established that the Society must admit those who are considered apt and useful and if somebody “from the circumcision” is judged to be apt and useful for the Society’s goal (which happens often), *ergo* it is against these *Constitutions* not to admit such a subject. The lineage decree stated, he reminds, that those who are offensive to the people to whom the Society directs its ministries should not be admitted, but this offense is not being experienced in Spain, especially in Castile, Toledo, and in the Bética Province [where Alarcón was sent as general’s special envoy]. Furthermore, the evidence shows that not only in the Society but also in other provinces of the mendicant orders (where this kind of statutes were not legislated), their members exercise without offense all kinds of ministries, especially that of confessor to important ecclesiastics and noblemen. They are canons, bishops, and cardinals as well, and even the Holy See does not consider them unfit or inept to exercise their religious ministries.\(^{106}\)

---

105 “Quare si tunc pater noster Ignatius obstitit huic statuto videtur necessario nunc repugnaturus fuisse. Similis quaestio excitata est tempore patris nostri Francisci, qui res Hispanicæ bene comprehendebat; neque tamen ullus eum in hanc partem inclinari voluit, sed totis viribus reclamavit. Confirmatur secundo, quia secundum Constitutiones et bullas summorum pontificum, proprium munus Societatis est omnes homines, etiam infideles cuiuscumque nationis sint, ad fidem reducere, reductus quæ ad assequendum suam salutem et perfectionem iuvare, ergo ut ministri Societatis grati sint omnibus nationibus oportet non esse decretum quod aliqui earum offendicularum sit, eos qui invisos tali nationi faciat” (*Inst.* 184–1, f. 305\(^*\)).

106 “Confirmatur tertio, quia Constitutio p. 1 c. 1 § 1 ait admittendos esse qui ad finem Societatis apti et utiles esse iudicabantur, ergo quando aliquis ex circumcisione aptus et utilis ad Societatis finem iudicatur, quod frequenter contigit, contra Constitutionem est eum in Societatem non admittere. Verum ait decretum hos ad Societatem esse ineptos quod cum offensione populi eius ministeria exercerant, hanc tamen offensionem in Hispania, saltem in regnis Castellae, Toleti et Beticae non experimur, quin imo quotidie videmus non solum in Societate, verum in omnibus
Against the common accusation that those of Jewish ancestry are ambitious and that they have disturbed tranquility in the Society by writing memorials and asking lay princes for help by other illicit means, Alarcón admits that some of them are ambitious, yet many more are humble, tranquil, lovers of evangelical peace, and imitators of the Crucified. Those who are ambitious and charged with exciting uproars must be punished not by a lineage decree but by exclusion from the Society, just like the Society would exclude any other Jesuit caught in infidelity to their religious Order and its superior. The reason for this [as Alonso de Cartagena had pointed out] is that these vices are characteristic not of a race but of an individual; they originate not from lineage but from free will. Representatives of other races have the same kind of vices, yet we do not assume that they characterize an entire race.

Another argument against the lineage decree is that it has diminished the good reputation of Society’s piety and sanctity, which has

---

107 Alarcón refers here to the movement of memorialistas that we have studied in the previous chapter.

108 “Aliter dicitur eos esse ambitiosos et tranquillitatem Societatis perturbasse monumentis seu memorialibus, et aliis illicitis mediis, auxilium postulantes a principibus saecularibus verum contra hoc est, quod licet aliqui sint ambitiosi, aliis et multo plures inveniuntur eiusdem generis humiles, tranquilli, pacis evangeli amatores, imitatores Crucis Christo, quare quorundam malitia omnibus nocere non debet, sed puniendi illi essent si de ambitione et perturbatione convicti sunt, non quidem hoc decreto, sed eos a Societate excluding simul cum aliis nobilibus, qui cum eiusdem in eadem infidelitate cum sua religione et capite deprehensi sunt. Nec huius modi vitia sunt pròria generis sed personae, quae quidem non ex genere, sed ex libero arbitrio originem trahunt, nunc autem ex culpa quorundam non debent omnes tales praesumi, sicut ex hoc quod in multis alterius generis similia vitia reperiantur, non ideo omnes tales praesumuntur” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 306r–v).
been so renowned among the Jesuits themselves and other important men, inquisitors included. Such men have suggested that this decree was made without prior prayer and deliberation in front of God, which is opposite to what Ignatius used to do. Consequently, respect and obedience, which are required for the superior general’s directives, will be diminished.109

The third argument against the decree is that for members of the Society to become examiners of genealogies seems alien to the Society’s Institute. Following the view expressed by Cardinal Francisco Mendoza de Bobadilla (1508–66) in his Tizón de la nobleza (1560), Alarcón highlights how very annoying and burdensome it is to inquire and investigate the ancestors, grandparents, and great-grandparents of candidates: Spanish Jews, especially in the provinces of Castile, Toledo, and Bética, have made great efforts to obfuscate their origins by contracting matrimones with the noble families of Old Christians.110 Ironically, this blood mixture can be found in those who are said by their relatives to be free of it. Thus, the examination of genealogies of candidates can bring offense to many nobles, especially if they are already unaware of their forgotten and buried genealogical past. Some candidates would be discouraged from entering the Society, paralyzed

109 “Secunda sit quia bona existimatio et opinio sanctitatis et pietatis quam Societas apud omnes habet, tam apud suos, quam apud exeros hoc decretum valde diminuta videtur, nam plurimi tam de Societate, quam saeculares nobiles et graviorum viri et ex tribunalibus suprimis inquisitorum censent illud conditum esse non praemissa tanta oratione et consultatione divina, ac edita est constitutio de opposito a patre nostro Ignatio, sed in quibusdam aliquod humani intervenisse in eo stabilendo, et cum omnia Societas decreta, quae hucusque edita sunt, huiusmodi sint, ut non solum bona et iusta censeantur, verum etiam optima reputentur, non tantum sancta iudicentur, verum etiam supremam evangelii perfectionem redoleant et continant, hoc unum, quod a plurimis non ita perfectum iudicatur aliorum omnium minueunt opinionem et authoritatem, iamque in posterum congregationis generalis decreta attendi incipiet animis, quibus aliae communitates et confraternitates quae aliquando ducuntur passionibus. Atque hac via obedientia cultus et veneratio, quae decretis omnibus habebatur valde diminuta invenitur, nec non bona existimatio quam tota Societas erga viros spiritualles habebat, eam fundatum esse in spiritu et in omnibus suis decretis et decisionibus spiritu tantum agi divino. Veneratio etiam et obedientia, quae mandatis nostri Patris generalis debetur, valde repescet et debilitata manebit” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 306r–307r).

110 Fernán Díaz, the Realtor of Juan II, noted that there was barely a noble house in Spain that had no converso in its family tree. If Jewishness was attached to blood, genealogy would become a weapon of the weak, and the nobility of Iberia would be destroyed. See Nirenberg, “Mass Conversion,” p. 35.
by fear of compromising the social status of their relatives, many of whom come from very illustrious families.¹¹¹

Fourth, this decree in Spain will exclude from the Society those men who would sufficiently and aptly perform the Society’s minis-
tries, which require a great number of talented people. At the same
time, there is a risk that the Society will accept pure-blooded people of mediocre talents, which is an aberration of the rules established in the “[General] Exam” of the Constitutions.¹¹²

¹¹¹ “Tertia, quia alienum esse videtur ob instituto Societatis, eius religiosos exami-
natores fieri generum et genealogiarum et valde molestum et grave inquirere et inves-
tigare progenitores, avos et proavos omnium admittendorum, quod finem ultorum
offensione fieri minime potest. Cuius aperta ratio est quoniam eius gens Hebraeorum
in Hispania, praesertim in provinciis Castellae, Toleti et Vetricae, summo conatu
curet suam nativitatem occultare, totis viribus conatur cognitiones inire cum chris-
tianis veteribus et nobilibus, et idcirco perpauci sunt, qui si divitiis affluant connu-
bia contrahant cum hominibus eiusdem generis, sed haec in parte consilium Pauli 3
sequenda quae ruruntur Christianos veteres et generos nobiles et [. . .] illustres, ex quo
sit domus etiam illustrissima Hispaniae, maximam quae partem populum sanguini
eorum iam esse permixtam. Unusquie horum brevi tempore solet familias totius
civitatis praecipuas suo sanguine commiscere. Unde iam ita valde extensa est evolutio
sanguinum horum duorum populum in his provinciis, ut collega fide dignus mihi
dixerit ex oppositioribus collegiorum, etiam si hi tales sint, ut in sua opinione securi
sint a tali missione, nihilominus dum informationes exacte summuntur, maior pars
eorum reperitur admissa; et hac causa reiciuntur. Si ergo haec mixtio reperitur etiam
in his qui iuxta suam et cognatorum sententiam ab ea liberi sunt, quid erit de reliquo
populo? Praetera sibi qui in Hispania vulgo dicuntur libertados discendentes ex unica
illa muliere dicta, Antona Garcia, brevi tempore ita aucti sunt, quia aliarum famil-
iarum connubii se miscuerunt, ut in tribunalibus regis delimitando illorum privile-
giis tractetur, ne pra illor multitudine tributare regia minuantur. Quae commistio
sanguinum erit iam ex tot millibus Hebraeorum qui in Hispania remanserunt? Erit
igitur molestissimos nostros examinatores fieri harum genealogiarum et cum offen-
sione multorum etiam nobilium. Nam dum informatio aliius summitur in aliius
oppido, palam fiet mixtiones aliorum etiam nobilium, quae iam oblibioni [sic] erant
inaditae et penitus occultae” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 307v–308r).

¹¹² “Quartum quia hoc statutum in Hispania in causa erit ne admittentur homi-
nes qui suicientem et apte ministeria Societatis exequuntur. Nam cum omnia eius
ministeria sint proximos iuvare lectionibus humanitatis, philosophiae, theologiae
scholasticae et positivae, concionibus, et confessionibus desitque chorus, quo religiosi
mediocris ingenii sollet occupari, ad quae omnia exiguntur homines non solum vir-
tute verum etiam ingenio, eruditione, et iudicio polletent conici potest, ad haec omnia,
quae magnam insignium hominum copiam requirunt, de futuros homines, qui his
omnibus idonee satis faciant, in religione ita extensa et dilatata quod quidem ex parte
iam coepimus experiri in tyrocinii. Ab illo enim tempore, quo statutum conditum est,
vix aliius magnae expectationis receptus est. Licet enim sint plurimi omnino liberi
ab isto sanguine, caeterum nollunt sui et cognatorum honoris pericum facere. Et
ideo homines prorectaeae aetatis aliiquas insigni qualitate praediti paucissime erunt, qui
Societatem ingredi tentent, et consentur. Qua forte ratione in quadam religione mona-
chali, ubi hoc statutum servatum esse hoc videmus, quantumque sit a principibus
divitiis et honoribus aucta et locupletata, non tamen in ea reperiri homines qui etiam
suos proprios monachos in paucissimis collegiis docere valeant, sed opus est praemis
The fifth argument against the decree comes from Alarcón’s preoccupation with the weak economic situation of the Society, whose wealth depended much on the support of the affluent converso nobility that sent their sons to the Order, as Possevino also pointed out in his second memorial. The decree could make them change their previously written wills by which they had donated their assets to the Society; the families could choose to allocate their assets to other pious works.113

Moreover, the converso families—which usually come from urban environments—will lose their devotion and piety towards the Society, knowing that their relatives are being thrown away because they are considered dishonorable. Consequently, they will turn towards those congregations that welcome their sons, threatened furthermore by their fear that the lineage inquiries could compromise their social status. As a result—complains Alarcón—“many people of great expectations will escape from us and the Society will feel poor and deficient without them, as the experience has already shown.”114

113 “Quinta, quia Societas non solum detrimentum patietur in reputatione spiritus, et in hominibus aptis ad institutum, verum etiam in facultatibus et in rebus temporibus, quorum inopia valde premitur tota societas. Est quidem certum ex experientia iam comprobatum factum aliorum omnium qui societatem ingentiuntur aut nullas esse aut valde tenues. Qui enim nobilis in Hispania religionem ingentiuntur, commune aut eam non habent, aut si habent, eas cognatis relinquunt, existimantes ad eorum statum, ut pote nobilium, omnia esse illis necessaria. Quia vero nec nobiles sunt nec ex Hebraeorum genere oriuntur, agricolae sunt, ita pauperes, ut commune tam ipsi quam eorum parentes ex proprio labore vivant. Quia propter excludendo a Societate eos qui communiter abundant opibus aditus intere luditur quo Societas in temporibus sublevari posset. His accedit quod multi huius generis saeculares, qui suas facultates iam testamento nostris donaverant, cum se a Societate contemni videant mandata abrogabant et ad alia pia opera se convertent” (Inst. 184–I, ff. 308v–309v).

114 “Sexta, erit occasio, ut plurimi externi nos in domibus nostris relinquant et alias religiones adeant: pietatemque et devotionem erga Societatem eiusque ministeria intermittant. Cum enim sinto plurimi in civitatibus ex hoc genere trahentes originem, cum videant universis sui generis ab hominibus huius religionis contemni et repelli ut indignos sua societate, cum videant item saepe suos filios aut cognatos studio ingrediendi Societatem teneri eosque repell, qui eorum filii sunt aut cognati quam devotionem erga societatem poterunt conservare? Ad alias potius religiones suum affectum convertent et cum religiosis illis potius fabulari et tractare curabunt, qui nec
The seventh disadvantage of the *de genere* decree (which labels the converso Jesuits as inept to hold governmental offices) diminishes the conversos’ love towards their superior general. The latter’s refusal to promote such subjects based on their origin and regardless of their merits produces in them hatred and not love towards the Society, by which—if they are ambitious—they will negatively influence other people of the same origin and many other noblemen, with whom they exercise much authority. That will force them to threaten to request the appointment of an external visitor for the Spanish provinces, which would result in their separation from the administration of the general. As Possevino did already twenty-five years earlier, Alarcón predicts that this will happen if the Institute of the Society changes its substantial features, turning itself into another religious order.115

The decree makes maintaining Society’s purity very difficult for the way the order would dismiss those who “do not walk in the spirit,” because the dismissed and their relatives—who could feel disgraced—might ascribe their removal to the problem of their origin and not to

eos nec eorum filios et cognatos a suis congregationibus reiciant. Atque haec offensio maiori erit, si post factam informationem intelligant ob illius defectum non suos filios vel cognatos admitti. Est igitur occasio magnum populi partem a nostris ministris avertendi et ut plurimi singularis expectationis adolescentes non audeant ingressum Societatis tentare, ne se periculo suum inominandi genus exponant, atque ita ad alias religiones confugiant; cum illud in primitis animadvertant, in aliis scilicet religioinibus ad honores episcopatus et aliarum dignitatum petendas, non esse aditum interclusum. Qua propter aliae religiones hominibus maxime expectationis illustrabuntur, nostra autem Societas eorum paupertatem et inopiam persentiet, prout iam coepimus experiiri” (*Inst. 184–1*, ff. 309r–v).

115 “Septima, qui etiam in Societate huius generis reperientur, aliquis de amore Societatis et patris nostri generalis amittent, cum haec de causa se ab officiiis honorificis excludi putent. Existimabant namque se iici qui huius generis sunt ut ad tyrocinium admittantur, inepti censentur, etiam iam admissos ad rectoratus et alia honorifica munera ineptos iudicandos esse. Et quidem plures eorum prudentiae, lenitatis et aliarum qualitatum defectu ad regimi mis minus ineptissimos esse continget; et tamen si ad haec non promoverunt, non meritorem defectui sed ortus rationi tribuent. Qua propter, licet in iustae Societas amorem in odium commutabunt et (quod dolendum est) si Dei amore priventur et in spiritu ambitionis tangantur, per se atque eos qui sui generis sunt, imo et per multos alios nobiles eiusdem Societatis apud quos non parum dignitatis habent, visitatorem externum petere conabuntur, assignantes (ut dicunt) non causam pro causa. Non enim suae petitionis causam quae eos precipue impellit et movet assignabunt ne se ipsos prodant huiusce generis es, sed alias causas reddent, quae vim maiorem apud externos habent. Atque ita ne harum provinciarum gubernatio ad patre nostro generali pendeat, funditus tollere conabuntur. Quo fiet ut in rebus valde substantialibus alteretur institutum atque mutetur et alia religio fiat. Et quamvis vivente patre nostro generali propter ipsius animi constantiam, et invictum brachium non illis praevalituros probabile sit. Tamen cum nunc plures huius generali adolescents sint, illo defectuente forte praevalebunt” (*Inst. 184–1*, ff. 309v–310r).
the lack of virtue. This situation could generate enmity, especially if dismissals were public. Eventually, the Society would be either compelled to either not dismiss or be risk being accused of injustice.\textsuperscript{116}

Another problem that the \textit{de genere} decree produces is the required dismissal of those converso Jesuits who are not yet admitted to their solemn profession, but whose lineage impediment was discovered after their admission to the Society, where—unlike in other orders such as the Jeronymites—the period between the entrance and final vows is much longer (fifteen years or even more, if someone was not admitted to the profession for his entire life). It could happen, then, that a subject must be dismissed after many years of being a Jesuit, even though his qualities would make him eligible to the profession. Lineage—claims Alarcón—could become a weapon in the competition among men religious, especially confessors of influential women who could become involved in fabricating rumors about the lineage of their confessor’s enemy. No wonder that many grave men from other religious orders affirmed that this decree was going to destroy the Society.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{116} “Octava, quia medium dimittendi eos qui in spiritu non procedunt, quod potissimum est, ad Societatem in sua puritate conservandam, hoc decreto reddetur valde difficile. Nam saepe eveniet aliquos ob morum defectus dimittere; et tamen eorum cognati et qui cum eisdem inimicitias gerunt, defectui generis exclusionem adscribent; praecipue quando publica contentio est, an illius cognati huic sanguini admissi sint; quo Societatis omnibus illius cognatis reddentur invisa, imo cum videant se ipsos exclusione infamari, nostros cogent, vimque inherent ut dimensionis causas publice patefaciunt, quae saepe in re et apud nos sufficientes erunt apud externos tamen leves, et insufficientes judicabuntur. Quia propter vel non excludere compellemur vel inustitiae arguemet” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, ff. 310r–v).

\textsuperscript{117} “Nona, cum iam lex spiritus valde in Societate tepescat et vetus homo praevaleat, erunt in posterum contentiones et aemulationes inter nossos, tam inter subditos et superiores quam inter magistros concionatores et operarios. Atque res saepe eos quos deveniet ut unus alteri opponat, eum essentiale ad Societatem impedimentum habere, eo quod in informatione generis quando admissus est, manifestus defectus fuerit. Et cum hoc impedimentum obici possit usque ad professionem, quae post longum tempus in Societate sit, hoc decretem innumeralrum vitium et perturbationum seminarium erit quas quia experti sunt religiosi timorati ordinis Divini Hieronymi decretum suum (ut fertur) limitarunt, ut post tyrocinii annum, cum primum quis ad professionem admissit, his obiectionibus locus non detur. In nostra autem Societate hunc defectum obiciendi occasio inter eos qui qualitates ad professionem habent, durat per quindicem annos et amplius inter eos vero qui ad professionem non sunt admitendi per totae vitae cursum. Et cum frequenter inter confessores esse solent aemulationes et invidiae circa confessiones praesertim mulierum, si vestigium aliquod inveniatur ad opponendum hoc impedimentum, illud obiciens: auxilium quandoque apibus met mulieribus petendo, ut testes sint vel testes quaerant qui hunc defectum superiori vel alteri confessori suas confabulationes prohibenti adscribant, quae omnia fient magno cum scandalo populorum. Propter quae plures eiam religiosi graves aliorum ordinum hoc decreto destruendum esse Societatem dixerunt” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, ff. 310v–311r).
The tenth disadvantage of the decree that Alarcón underscores in concert with Possevino is the possibility of creating in the Society divisions between the Spaniards and other nations, for the decree debars the descendants of Jews and Muslims, who come mostly from Spain, but not descendants of heretics and apostates, who troubled different nations much more than those Jews who—helped by God’s grace—converted. Thus, the decree contradicts common law and the papal decisions that do exclude from civil and ecclesiastical offices the sons and nephews of the heretics and apostates in paternal line, but not the sons of Jews who converted and not even the Jews themselves who converted. Therefore, right reason dictates that conversos be admitted rather than refused.\textsuperscript{118}

Additionally, the decree debars those whose number in the Society is not small and who excel in letters, preaching, government, and sainthood, even though their names have to be silenced here for the sake of not exciting controversies. A Dominican noted the same sort of presence in his order—he made a catalogue of learned and holy people who excelled in these virtues: most of them were those of Jewish ancestry.\textsuperscript{119}

The twelfth argument against the decree is that it does not follow the legal maxim that “in doubt a safer solution has to be chosen.” Thus, it is safer and more secure to admit than to exclude, given that nobody ever condemned the former, but pontiffs and many very learned men

\textsuperscript{118} “Decima, occasio erit divisionis inter Hispanorum nationem et alias Sociatatis, cum enim in decreto a Mauris et Haebreis descendentes excludantur, quod Hispanos plurimum tangit, non vero descendentes ab haereticis quod nationes ad venas multo plus inficit, occasio erit decisionis indicandique rem plus multitudine suffragiorum quam rationum pondere definitam esse, nam secundum ius commune et omnium pontificum decisiones, qui Christi ecclesiam gubernarunt, quaurum aliquae in principio sunt adductae, deterioris multo conditionis sunt descendentes ab haereticis et apostatis, quam ab Haebreis et aliis infidelibus, qui Dei adiuti gratia se ad fidelem converterunt. Cum illos et eorum filios atque nepotes per linearum virilem ius commune ab honoribus et dignitatis ecclesiasticis et saecularibus exclusit (c. Statutum 2 de haereticis in 6) non vero filios Haebreorum, qui se ad fidelem redegerunt, imo nec ipsosmet Hebraeos aut infideles qui ad fideum sunt reduci, repellit […] eam re de prescriptis. Illos ergo admittere, hos reicere contra rectam rationem esse videtur” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, f. 311\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{119} “Undecima. Quia si occulos convertamus ad eos qui in Societate litteris, con-cionibus, gubernatione, et sanctitate floruerunt non exigam partem huius nationis suisse inveniemus; quos sine uilla controversia possem, sed eos honoris causa silentio permitto. Quod ergo hoc usque factum est, idem etiam in posterum sperari poterit. Maxime cum quotidian a suis progenitoribus, qui denuo sunt conversi magis ac magis recedant. Hunc accedit quo frate Dominicus Baltbanas ordinis Divi Dominici cathalogum fecit, quo ostendit ex hominibus doctis et sanctis, qui in sua religione doctrina et sanctitate floruerunt, maiorem partem ex Hebraeorum genere suisse” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, ff. 311\textsuperscript{r}–v).
did condemn the latter even in older times, when the risk of re-
conversion of Jews was much more real. Cajetan, as was mentioned,
considered such a debarment in the Dominican Order unreasonable.
Perhaps there are some reasons, continues Alarcón, for such
discrimination in the Portuguese provinces, where—as one says—the
New Christians do not want to intermarry with the Old Christians
and they used to have a different kind of education. Moreover, it is
said that the Spanish Jews who fled to Portugal were from more villain
families. Yet, this judgment must be left to those who know these
things better.\footnote{120}

In Spain, no mendicant order has such statutes, even though some
of them did have them when the Jewish conversion was still recent.
Now, however—realizing the huge inconveniences of such laws—they
have abrogated them. So, those orders will consider the Society odd
and longing for vain fame if it now issues such statutes itself.\footnote{121}

The penultimate argument against the exclusion of those who
have Jewish ancestry is, according to Alarcón, that it will become a
source of many crimes and the occasion for numerous sins, which
is incompatible with the mission of the Society as described in the
papal bulls of Gregory XIII. Thus the Society, which was sent by God

\footnote{120} “Duodecima, quia in dubiis tutor pars est eligenda, c. invenis de sponsalibus,
maxime inter viros qui de spiritu et perfectione evanglica assequenda pertractant.
Tutius autem est et securius hos admittere quam repellere: quia hoc nullus unquam
condemnavit; imo Pontifices in principio adducti et viri doctrina, religione, et nobili-
tate pollentes probant illud autem, loquendo iam his temporibus in Hispania et de
religione ita extensa ac est societas, multi viri doctissimi condemnant et Caietanus
locus supra allegato dixit etiam priscis temporibus, quando erat recens conversio
Iudaeorum in Hispania, et frequens eorum relapsus, esse irrationali eos a religione
praedicatorum excludere. Signumque a Sede Apostolica confirmatum reperitur, id est
quia tunc praecipitaciones fuerunt quae huius modi statutum honestunt. Sicut forte
nunc in Lusitaniae provincia esse possent rationes tale statutum honestantes, in qua
(ut fertur) qui ex circuncisione sunt cum christianis veteribus connubia non contra-
hunt educationemque ab aliis christianis antiquis satis diversam habent. Et ex Iudaes
qui in Hispania remanserunt, quando ab his provinciis reiecri sunt, familiae viiores ad
regnun illum confugerunt. Verum suius rei iudicium iis qui haec proximiur norunt,
relinquendum est” (\textit{Inst.} 184–I, ff. 311r–312r).

\footnote{121} “Decima tertia, quia in Hispania nulla religio mendicantium tale statutum habet,
imo eti alicue earum in principio quando Iudaesorum conversio recens erat, et relap-
sus continuus illus rationabiliter condiderunt. Deinde postquam maxima sunt incon-
veniencia experti, illud tandem abrogarunt. Qua propter Societas, cum eam omnes
illud denuo edidisse videant, singularitatis et insanis gloriae cupida existimabitur”
(\textit{Inst.} 184–I, f. 312v).
to eradicate sins in his Church, should make every effort to eliminate such statutes.\textsuperscript{122}

Finally, since the Society—unlike other communities—is supposed to be governed paternally, its every member, regardless of his nationality, is expected to respect, love, and esteem his superior, and especially the father general as his natural father. With this decree, however, many subjects who are not of his nationality [i.e., non-Italians], will perceive the father general not as a father but as a judge. So that everybody will consider him a father, it seems to many of his faithful sons that, using his power and authority, he should seek from the pontiff some kind of declaration that would alleviate the decree’s rigor.\textsuperscript{123}

On a much lesser scale, Alarcón’s claim of the harm inflicted on society in general by discrimination against conversos was further supported by one the most influential writers of the Spanish \textit{Siglo de Oro}, Juan de Mariana, known as the Spanish avatar of Titus Livius.

\textsuperscript{122} “Decima quarta. Quia Societas potissimum Deus in suam ecclesiam misit (ut testatur Gregorius 13 in bullis eidem Societati concessis) ad populorum peccata eradicanda, et funditus autem confraternitatum et aliarum commun imitatione eorum qui ex circumcisione sunt, intrumentaque plurimorum delictorum et innumerabilium peccatorum occasiones ut supra Toletenum concilium testatur. Societas vero, quae totis viribus conari debuisse set ut talia statuta delerentur, ut eis abrogatis, infinita etiam peccata cessarent, hoc statuto, eum aedem communitates illud a viris prudentia, doctrina et sanctitate emansasse intelligant, id quo post diuturnas orationes et sacrificia Deo oblata, sine ulna animi perturbatione neque passione, omnes denique in suis statutis antiquis roborabuntur, imo et confraternitates quae e o carent nunc primum sufficient. Quare Societas hoc statuto radices peccatorum originesque fovebit” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, ff. 312r–v).

\textsuperscript{123} “Decimquinta. Quia Societas gubernatio non est ad aliarum communimationi gubernatio similis, sed qualis est in privata quaedam familia, inter patres naturales et filios eorum nativos. Quare quotquot sunt in Societate, unecumque et ex quacumque natione sint, superiores, praesertim Patrem nostrum generalem, ut proprium parentem respicerire, amare et venerari debent; et contra superiores eodem usque filios nativos debent intueri, eorumque honoris et solatio consulare. At stante hoc decreto, subditi, qui e sumi sunt huius nationis, praesertim ii, apud quos non multum spiritus orationis viget, nonnullam occasionem habebunt patrem nostrum generalem non ut patrem, sed ut iudicem respiciendi. Ut igitur ab omnibus habeatur ut pater, prout revera est, semperque fuit; visum est multis eius fideliissimis filiis expedire, ut eius industria et auctoritate a summo pontifice aliqua illius statuti declaratio exigeretur, quo rigor eius temperetur” (\textit{Inst. 184–I}, f. 312v).
auctoritate a summo pontifici aliqua illius statuti declaratio exigeretur, quo rigor eius semperque fuit; visum est multis eius fidelissimis filiis expedire, ut eius industria et sed ut iudicem respiciendi. Ut igitur ab omnibus habeatur ut pater, prout revera est, nonnullam occasionem habebunt patrem nostrum generalem non ut patrem, qui nunc sunt huius nationis, praesertim ii, apud quos non multum spiritus orationis debent intueri, eorumque honori et solatio consulere. At stante hoc decretum, subditi, filios eorum nativos. Quare quotquot sunt in Societate, undecumque et ex quacumque gubernationi similis, sed qualis est in privata quadam familia, inter patres naturales et

122 "Decima quarta. Quia Societas potissimum Deus in suam ecclesiam misit (ut

123 "Decimquinta. Quia Societas gubernatio non est ad aliarum communitatum

On a much lesser scale, Alarcón’s claim of the harm inflicted on society in general by discrimination against conversos was further supported by his assertion that, using his power and authority, he should seek from the pontiff some kind of declaration that would alleviate the decree’s rigor. 123

Finally, since the Society—unlike other communities—is supposed to eradicate sins in his Church, should make every effort to eliminate such statutes. 122

Figure 17. Juan de Mariana (1536–1624)—the Spanish avatar of Titus Livius
Juan de Mariana

We have already mentioned Mariana in Chapter Two, when pointing out his blood ties to the converso clan of Suárez de Toledo, and in Chapter Three, when dealing with the memorialistas movement, to which he belonged. Illegitimate son of a priest, Juan de Mariana was born in 1536 in Talavera de la Reina (Toledo). He entered the Society of Jesus in Alcalá in 1554; was ordained priest in Rome in 1562; and professed his final vows there in 1564. After eight years in Italy, with Juan de Maldonado he laid foundations of the first Jesuit College in France, Clermont de París. Together with Francisco Suárez and Baltasar Gracián, he is considered one of the major thinkers of the Spanish Golden Age. In addition to his learned biblical commentaries, he authored a history of Spain, Historiae de rebus Hispaniae libri XX (Toledo, 1592), which also investigated the Jewish settlement in pre-Visigothic Iberia; a treatise on economy (De monetae mutatione, 1609), for which he had been under house arrest for fifteen months; a comparative study of the Arab and Christian calendar (De annis arabum cum nostris comparatis, 1609); and a work on government in the Jesuit Order (De reformatione Societatis [Discurso de las cosas de la Compañía], 1625). He died in 1624 in Toledo.

In more generic terms than Alarcón, Juan de Mariana expressed the desire to limit the purity-of-blood statutes in his (in)famous treatise that included the approval of a collective tyrannicide, De rege et regis institutione (Toledo, 1599):

The virtuous person must never find the door shut to any honour or reward, however elevated these may be, and it should matter little that he is Spanish or Italian, Sicilian or Belgian…. The prince must decide firmly not to allow whole families to be disgraced because of vague rumours among the populace. The marks of infamy should not be eternal, and it is necessary to fix a limit beyond which descendants must not pay for

---

124 For Astrain’s interpretation of Mariana’s engagement in the movement, see his Historia, 3:574–7.
125 The Spanish revised and updated version appeared under the title Historia general de España in Toledo in 1601.
126 For his Jewish ancestry, see Antonio Possevino, Memorial, f. 208v. See also Kamen, “Limpieza and the Ghost of Américo Castro,” p. 23. On the role of Mariana as a book censor of the Spanish Inquisition, see AHN, Inquisición, lib. 580, ff. 27r, 147r, 164v.
127 The work only added oil to the fire of anti-Jesuitism in France, where Mariana was charged with inspiring the assassination of Henry IV by a would-be Jesuit student, François Ravillac.
the faults of their predecessors, carrying on their brows always the stain that marked these… Can one believe that it does no harm for the state to be split into factions, always harassed by the unbelievable hatred of the majority of its citizens, hatred from which at the very first opportunity civil war and discord must arise? One could possibly run no risk in depriving of all honours those who bear this stain, if they were few in number. But today, when the blood of all degrees in the state is confused and mixed, it would be highly dangerous, since we have in our country as enemies all those who are excluded from public affairs, not for their own fault but for that of their forefathers. It is the nature only of tyrants to sow discord among their subjects… Lawful kings always direct their principal care to seeing that all classes in the realm are united in love.128

In conclusion, the outspoken Jesuits Antonio Possevino, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, Diego de Guzmán, García Girón de Alarcón, and Juan de Mariana strongly opposed in their writings the Jesuit anti-converso legislation, employing the old arguments of the pro-converso literature that we have presented in Chapter One, but also bringing some new points of view related to the specific circumstances of the early Jesuits. Even though the 1593 decree was actually moderated, if only superficially, by the Sixth General Congregation in 1608,129 it was not abrogated until more than three hundred years later, in a decision of General Congregation 29 (1946),130 which considered the impediment of ancestry unconstitutional, even though it did not condemn the racial discrimination practiced by the Society in the previous centuries. The legislation of 1593 was abrogated almost certainly under the sway of the Shoah.131 This story, however, is the material for another book.

128 See Juan de Mariana, Obras (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 1950), vol. 31, pp. 540–2. The translation is by Henry Kamen (see his Crisis and Change, p. 10). Another similar document addressing the purity-of-blood statutes in Spain was Memorial para quitar o limitar los estatutos de limpieza (1632) by Fernando de Valdés (d. 1642), rector of the Jesuit Imperial College in Madrid, censor of the Suprema and superior provincial of Toledo (1637–40). See Kamen, Crisis and Change, pp. 20–1; and Ronald W. Truman, Spanish Treatises on Government, Society and Religion in the Time of Philip II. The ‘De Regimine Principum’ and Associated Traditions (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 333–5.

129 For more details about this process, see Medina, “Ignacio de Loyola,” p. 608.

130 For a different chronology of this process, see Baron, Social and Religious History of the Jews, pp. 15–6; and Pike, Aristocrats and Traders, p. 68.

CONCLUSION

Just as I was concluding writing this book in December 2008, The American Society of Human Genetics published an important article entitled “The Genetic Legacy of Religious Diversity and Intolerance: Paternal Lineages of Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula.” It presented a study by a group of international geneticists that analyzed Y chromosome haplotypes in 1,140 males from the Iberian Peninsula and Balearic Islands. Their admixture analysis indicated a high mean proportion of ancestry from North African (10.6%) and Sephardic Jewish (19.8%) sources. “Despite alternative possible sources for lineages ascribed a Sephardic Jewish origin, these proportions attest to a high level of religious conversion (whether voluntary or enforced), driven by historical episodes of social and religious intolerance, that ultimately led to the integration of descendants. In agreement with the historical record, analysis of haplotype sharing and diversity within specific haplogroups suggests that the Sephardic Jewish component is more ancient” (p. 725).

These scientific results should not be surprising to the reader of this book. It has testified to the significant presence of a minority of Jewish people on the Iberian Peninsula and Balearic Islands before 711 CE (estimated in the article at 100,000, which constituted about 1.25% of the projected Iberian population of 7–8 million) and to the creation of a no less considerable new social group of their descendants (conversos), especially after the massive conversions of 1391, which did not diminish the presence of Jews themselves (who are estimated in the article at 400,000 by the time of the 1492 Expulsion). When Ignatius of Loyola and many of the first Jesuits were born between the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, approximately 240,000 Jews decided to stay in Iberia (and therefore convert to Christianity). If we add the latter number to the number of conversos who multiplied in the one hundred years between 1391 and 1492, it is not unexpected to find that the converso

---

1 Susan M. Adams et al., The American Journal of Human Genetics 83 (December 12, 2008): 725–36.

This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.
group was highly influential in both civic and ecclesiastical society, especially if we consider the mostly urban middle-class provenience of the Jewish converts.

Given the surprisingly high values in the proportions of Sephardic Jewish ancestry that the quoted genetic study has established, historians studying almost any aspect of the early modern Iberian world cannot neglect the role of conversos. If the Jesuits were founded by a group whose majority descended from Iberia, it is absolutely logical that they had to face the problem of converso presence in their ranks, as Chapter Two has shown. The first Jesuits brought to their Order the multifaceted experience of Spanish, Portuguese, and Balearic conversos.

As we have observed, the second superior general of the Society of Jesus, Diego Laínez, was a descendant of Castilian Jews who had converted to Christianity in the wake of the 1391 pogroms. The participation of Diego’s family in the Catholic life was astonishing—his numerous relatives who entered the religious orders included his two brothers and two nephews who entered the Society of Jesus itself. Converso siblings joining the Jesuits can be seen as a pattern. Baltasar Loarte followed his older brother Gaspar; Baltasar Suárez entered after his older brother Francisco; and José de Acosta’s other four siblings, Jerónimo, Diego, Bernardino, and Cristóbal, became Jesuits. The Acosta and Loarte families came from the same Castilian town of Medina del Campo, where other converso Jesuits—Baltasar de Torres and José de San Julián, as well as Pedro Cuadrado, who financially supported Loyola during his studies in Paris—were also born.

The financial aid that many converso families who offered their sons to the Jesuit Order gave to the order reflects their social and economic status in society. Melchor del Alcázar and Ana de la Sal Hurtado de Mendoza, parents of the famous Jesuit Luis del Alcázar, contributed financially to the foundation of the Jesuit San Hermenegildo College in Seville; the family of the Jesuit Alexandre de Rhodes donated 3,000 librarum to the Jesuit College in Avignon; and the list continues.

The influential position of the Jesuit converso families can be also seen in their high governmental posts. Hernando Ortiz de Cisneros, the great grandfather of Pedro de Ribadeneyra, was Queen Isabella’s page and later governor of Toledo. Gregorio de Polanco, the father of the long-time secretary of the Society, Juan Alfonso de Polanco, was the regidor of the city of Burgos. Alonso de Toledo, the grandfather of Francisco Suárez, was the majordomo of the Catholic kings, with whom he moved to the re-conquered Granada from his native Toledo. The Toledan con-
Converso family of Suárez de Toledo was related to Álvarez de Toledo, the Archbishop-Cardinal of Burgos; don Francisco de Toledo, Viceroy of Peru; and the prominent Jesuits Cipriano Sóarez and Juan de Mariana. The latter was born as an illegitimate son of a priest, as was the Jesuit martyr Ignacio de Azevedo, grandchild of the converso João Gomes de Abreu, famous Portuguese poet and navigator.

Suffice the reiterated invocation of these few names to confirm the magnitude of the role that Christians of Jewish ancestry played in the foundation and development of the Society of Jesus—from their initial influence to eventual debarment from membership—that this book has sought to explain. The relevance of the subject matter of this work lies in analyzing the correlation of two important historical topics that hopefully will continue to attract considerable scholarly attention: the origins and the adoption of the Iberian laws of limpieza; and the foundation of one of the most influential Catholic movements, the Society of Jesus, whose founder and most of its members came from Iberia, where the limpieza mania originated a century before the Order was founded.
The untitled and unsigned manuscript is bound in the codex ARSI, Institutum 106, ff. 92r–132v, adjacent to another manuscript by the same hand, “De gubernatione Societatis.” A sixteenth-century amanuensis wrote it in a neat hand, but it has corrections and interpolations by another hand. Along with my amendments the latter are noted in the apparatus criticus to the present critical edition of the manuscript. I have reorganized the text, numbered by folio, into paragraphs, to which I have assigned numbers between square brackets ([ ]). I refer to these numbers in citations to the manuscript throughout this book.

[f. 92]

[1] Descritione delle cause dalle quali sono procedute le discor-die con molti mali et inconvenientii che tuttavia ci affliggono nella Compagnia, acciò essendo intese, si preghi Iddio che c’illumini per rimediare come conviene et è necessario per servitio e gloria sua.

[2] Meritamente vi contristate et vi affliggete per la turbazione grande e divisione che in questi nostri tempi vedete essere scoperta nella Compagnia nostra che dal principio suo visse insino adesso in somma pace et unione, almeno in queste nostre bande.\textsuperscript{1} Et vi maravigliate d’onde sia proceduta et entrata fra noi questa peste, ma conviene raccordarsi di quella parabola del Signore: E havendo seminato nelle campagne sui bellissimi semi, \textit{cum dormirent homines}, \textit{venit inimicus homo et superseminavit zizania},\textsuperscript{2} che hora apertamente si vedono essere nati tra il frumento. Et se desiderate saper [92v] le cause et le occasioni delle quali s’è servito il demone per suscitare la tempesta della divisione fra noi et incendio delle discordie che ci affliggono, vi dico che sono state molte, ma per adesso vi manifesterò [solo] alcune

\textsuperscript{1} That is in the Assistancy of Italy, for which Palmio was superior general’s assistant.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Mathe}w 13:25.
che sono state le principali et la vera origine dei mali che patiamo. Et tra questi la prima è stata la multitudine dei neofi
ti di Spagna. Et per intendere questo havete a sapere che sono due sorti di huomini nella Spagna: alcuni che si chiamano Christiani vecchi et altri Christiani nuovi che hanno la discendenza loro dai Giudei et dai Mori che si convertirono in Spagna al Christianesimo per gli editti che fece il Re cattolico contra di essi. Et perché da quel tempo insino adesso si sono tra questi huomini scoperti, et tuttavia si scuoprono, persone di pessimi costumi, così huomini come donne che sotto nome di Christiani vivono alla Giudaica et alla Moresca, per raffrenar questa diabolica impietà fu introdotta nella Spagna l’Inquisizione così severa; ma, benché quasi ogni anno et di tempo in tempo di costoro si vedono essere abbrigliati e condannati molti, non resta però levato lo scandolo di così grande impietà, perché sempre se ne vedono pullulare in diverse città di Spagna. Di qui è proceduto che è questa sorte di huomini in tanto odio et abominatione nella Spagna, trovandosi le chiese piene di habitelli di costoro che sono stati condannati dall’Inquisitione. Per questa causa si dice che quasi tutte le religioni in Spagna (dopo d’havere esperimentato che dove era alcuno

3 This main argument of Palmio’s memorial is repeated below ([22]).
4 Read: Per intendere questo dovete sapere che...
5 An old Italian form for convertirano.
6 It is an allusion to the 1492 decree of the Reyes Católicos, Ferdinand and Isabella, which expelled from Spain all Jews who refused to accept Christianity. Palmio seems not to know that Jewish conversions to Catholicism took place already in late fourteenth (1391) and through the fift eenth century, or even earlier. Indeed, many converso Jesuits were descendants of Jews who already had converted before the expulsion.
7 Read: che vivono alla giudaica o alla morisca.
8 Read: bruciati.
9 Read: perché di loro se ne vedono ancora pullulare molti...
10 By habitelli Palmio means here san-benitos, penitential garments of yellow cloth, resembling a Benedictine scapular in shape, whence the name. They bore a red St. Andrew’s cross before and behind. See Lea, History, vol. 3, p. 172: “The custom of suspending in the churches the habitelli or sanbenitos of the reconciled and relaxed seems to have been borrowed by Italy from Spain, at least in some places. It is to the credit of the Roman Inquisition that it disapproved this barbarous practice, as appears from a decree of 1627 ordering them to be removed from the cathedral of Faenza and to be secretly burnt.” In his autobiography, Palmio mentions the habitelli of the Jesuit Francisco de Toledo’s grandparents hung in a church of Cordova: “L’Ambasciatore di Spagna sentendo questi ragionamenti sparsi per la corte disse al Papa che quest’huomo era novissimo cristiano et che erano in Cordova abitelli dell’avo et altri suoi parenti” (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 24’).
11 “Religione” means here religious order, such as Jeronymites, Dominicans, Franciscans, and other.
di costoro, non si poteva vivere in pace, oltra i scandali\textsuperscript{12} che da essi procedevano et le infamie che per conto loro pativano) hanno determinato di non accettar persona alcuna che si possa sapere che habbia discendenza da costoro. Per questa istessa causa alcuni anni sono che furono esclusi dalla chiesa Toletana che determinò con gravissimi decreti che in quella non potessero haver dignità alcuna.\textsuperscript{13}

[4] Per la nota che patisce questa sorte di gente nella Spagna la felice memoria di Nostro Padre Ignatio nel 3\textsuperscript{e} capo dell’Essame generale volse che all’Spagnuoli che entravano nella Compagnia particolarmente si domandasse se erano nuovi Christiani, pretendendo egli che da questa sorte di gente se ne ricevessero molto pochi et che fossero nella [94] Compagnia sempre conosciuti. Et quelli che furono ricevuti allhora sempre li tenne fuori di Spagna. Et di qui nacque che dovendo mandare alcuni nella Spagna et altri al Re Giovannì di Portogallo per le Indie, non volse mandar se non Christiani vecchi. Et così in Spagna mandò il Padre Antonio Araoz,\textsuperscript{14} Biscaino,\textsuperscript{15} huomo di gran giudizio et di singolar virtù, come dicono tutti quelli che l’hanno praticato e conosciuto; al Re Giovanni di Portogallo mandò Maestro Simón Rodríghez, Porthoghese, che piantò con la bontà et virtù sua la Compagnia in Portogallo, et il Padre Francesco Saverio in luogo del Padre Bobadilla\textsuperscript{16} (che trovandosi ammalato gravamente, non poté, come era designato, andare in quella missione). Et giunto [94v] che fu in Portogallo, se ne andò alle Indie, dove da Dio era destinato.\textit{Et huius memoria erit

\textsuperscript{12} Significantly, the term \textit{scandali o scandalizzare} is employed by Palmio ten times in this memorial.

\textsuperscript{13} Palmio refers here to the \textit{limpieza de sangre} statutes.

\textsuperscript{14} Compare with Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 17 and 109v).

\textsuperscript{15} It seems that by indicating Araoz’s Basque origins Palmio tried to underscore his blood purity since the Basques were known to be proud of not having any Jewish antecedents. The \textit{ordenanzas} of Guipúzcoa promulgated in 1527 prohibited the residence of conversos in their province as well as marrying them (see Sicwoff, \textit{Los estatutos}, p. 117, who observes that to say “vizcayno” was an indirect way to say “Old Christian”). Telling is Loyola’s answer during the Inquisition’s trial in Alcalá: “Otras observancias del sábado las ignoro, ni en mi tierra suele haber judíos” (\textit{Fontes narr.} 2:548). However, the absence of Jews and conversos from the province of Guipúzcoa was a myth as José Luis Orella Unzué has demonstrated in “La Provincia de Guipúzcoa y el tema de Judíos en tiempos del joven Iñigo de Loyola” (1492–1528),” in Plazaola, ed., \textit{Ignacio de Loyola y su tiempo}, pp. 847–68. See Chapter Two for the details.

\textsuperscript{16} Palmio mentions Bobadilla one more time in this memorial ([12]) as the main opponent of the converso role in the central government of the Jesuits after Loyola’s death (1556).
semper in benedictione sanctorum\(^{17}\) per la gran santità sua. Et fu egli il Padre che condusse il Giapone alla luce dell’Evangelo.

[5] Hora, se questa gente si fosse tenuta bassa, come si era cominciato, et non si havesse lasciato crescere tanto nella Compagnia, com’è cresciuta, sarebbe senza dubbio libera da tanti mali che in questi nostri tempi l’affliggono et la travagliano. Come adunque questo è avvenuto? Fatto che fu il Padre Francesco Borgia di buona memoria Commissario in Spagna\(^{18}\) (cosa procurata troppo astutamente dai nuovi Christiani che pensorno,\(^{19}\) con l’autorità di questo padre et con favore che speravano\(^{1}\) da [95] lui, [di] dover prevalere a Christiani vecchi et a tanta presuntione non si sarebbono\(^{20}\) mai alzati, perseverando il P. Antonio Araoz nell’officio del Commissariato che gli era stato dato dalla buona memoria del P. Ignatio, et l’haveva tenuto insino all’hora), fece, specie recti ingannato, come fermamente crediamo, due cose totalmente contrarie a quello che sempre haveva fatto con gran giudizio et prudentiala il P. Araoz. La prima fu che si dette supra modo a moltiplicar collegiati\(^{ii}\) degli alcuni che erano di gran disturbo alla Compagnia [e che] già si sono lasciati. La 2\(^{a}\) fu che aperse talmente la porta a questa sorte di gente che quasi non si riceveva allhora altre persone in Spagna, perché Christiani vecchi, vedendo tal cosa, fuggivano [dal]la [95’] Compagnia. Et per la multitudine dei neofiti che in quella si ricevevano la chiamava il Re “sinagoga de gli Hebrei,” come da persone d’autorità è stato detto et affermato. Et perché le altre religioni\(^{21}\) non li volevano, per la facilità grande del P. Borgia\(^{22}\) [di ammetterli], cor

---

1. correctum ex c’ebbero
2. correctum ex quelli dieci

---

17 A paraphrase of Ecclesiastes 45:1.
18 Commissary’s job was to supervise the superiors provincial of a region; in this case Borja supervised the three provincials of Spain and that of Portugal, among them Araoz. He was appointed for this office by Loyola in 1554 and relinquished it under Láinez in 1559. During his trip to Iberia as commissary, Borja was accompanied by Dionisio Vázquez (see below [8]).
19 Pensorno is an old–Italian passato remoto form for pensarono.
20 Sarrebbe is an old-Italian conditional form for sarebbero.
21 Meaning: religious orders. See above [3].
22 See the meaningful title of the chapter dedicated to this issue in Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 13\(^{3}\)): “Dell’inganno del Demonio col quale procurò sotto pretesto di santità introdurre uno spirito nella Compagnia molto diverso da quello che per mezzo d’Ignatio gli aveva comunicato Dio N[ostro] S[ignore].” Palmio attributes this infidelity to the influence exercised over Borja and other Jesuits by a certain converso frate from Andalusia called Giovanni [Juan de Tejeda]: “che era tenuto
revano a lui. D’onde è avvenuto che la Compagnia in ogni banda si trova piena di questa gente. Et benché il P. Antonio Araoz, considerando il danno che di qui ne riceveva a la Compagnia gagliardamente, s’opponesse et contradicesse, nientedimeno non poté mai fare cosa alcuna et impedir che le cose cominciate dal P. Borgia non andassero tuttavia avanti, perché quelli che governavano in Roma erano quasi tutti neofiti.

[6] Il buon Padre Lainez che veramente era un [96] santo, pieno di singular virtù et d’eccellentissima dottrina, ancora che havesse descendenza da costoro, come egli stesso disse, assignando questa causa quando lo volsero far Generale per liberarsi da questo carico (erat enim vir iste ex filiis Abraam non secundum carnem, sed secundum spiritum: et verus Israelita in quo dolus non erat), vedendo i mali che cominciavano a pullulare nella Compagnia et troppo apertamente manifestare, desiderò provvedere, acciò non andassero avanti et non facessero maggiori radici, massime quando si accorse che quelli che gli stavano appresso non camminavano bene, ma prevenuto dalla morte non vi poté far altro. Nel principio però del suo generalato, perché [e]gli credeva [ciò che] [96¹] gli persuasero: che era bene quello che faceva il P. Borgia, procurando parimente alienarlo da P. Antonio Araoz. Et perché quando buon Padre attendeva molto alli studi et si trovò occupato e nella Francia e nel Concilio di Trento, et in altre

__

**antes** Prima però che morisse gli pers _deletum_

___

huomo di grandissimo spirito et estimato da Francesco de Borgia, che entrasse nella Compagnia et per l’affettione che li portava procurò con ogni diligentia di farlo fare sacerdote et perché ciò non si poteva ottenere in Spagna, lo mandò a Roma da Ignatio” (ARSI, _Vitae_ 164, ff. 13r-v).

Laínez is the only converso whom Palmio portrays benevolently. Most likely it is due to the fact that the former was instrumental in the latter’s vocation to the Society—Palmio decided to make Spiritual Exercises after hearing Lainez preach in his native Parma.

This information is also attributed to Possevino (see _Mon Lainez_ 8:837).


Lainez was sent by the pope to participate in the colloquy of Poissy (1561), from where he headed to Trent. Palmio seems to forget here that Lainez was accompanied there by Polanco. Both would be back in Rome only in December 1564. During these three years of absence, Polanco was replaced by Cristóbal de Madrid who sometimes was assisted by Ribadeneyra. Both were accused by Palmio of being part of the converso conspiracy. On this trip, see Scaduto, _Azione_, pp. 113–35.
cose di grandissima importanza,\textsuperscript{27} non fu [a] questi huomini molto difficile mandare avanti sotto di lui i loro disegni.\textsuperscript{28}

[7] Questi mali ancora ebbero accrescimento per la diversità dello spirito in che fu il P. Francesco Borgia instruito da certi frati prima che entrasse nella Compagnia. Et in lui si videro sempre molte cose assai lontane dall’instituto della Compagnia et da quel modo che pretendeva la santa memoria di Nostro P. Ignatio che s’osservasse et si tenesse in essa. Et in effetto, la gente allevata [97] dal P. Borgia nella comparation sua a comparation di quelli che furono instituti dal P. Ignatio parevano veramente huomini d’altra religione,\textsuperscript{29} dati a cerimonie et apparenze. Et più s’accostavano al vivere monastico et Carthesiano che all’instituto della Compagnia. Et di qui nacque che nel tempo del generalato del P. Borgia\textsuperscript{30} [la Compagnia] s’è vista molto alterata. Et assai maggiore alteratione si sarebbe fatta se gli Assistenti\textsuperscript{31} unicamente non havessero havuto l’occhio a conservar la purità dell’instituto et la disciplina che lasciò la buona memoria del Nostro P. Ignatio. Et bencché potrei qui narrar molte cose che da alcuni, ai quali dava gran credito, gli erano proposte, acciò le introducesse sotto pretesto di conservare i novitii che entravano [97v] nella Compagnia et promovere altri a maggiore perfetione, mi contentarò [di] scrivere una [cosa] sola, d’onde il resto si potrà intendere.


\textsuperscript{28} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 19).

\textsuperscript{29} Read: di un altro ordine religioso.

\textsuperscript{30} Between the years 1565 and 1572.

\textsuperscript{31} The four assistants general elected by GC 2 in 1565 were: Araoz (for Spain), Mercurian (for France and Germany), Palmio (for Italy), and Diego Miró (for Portugal, India, and Brazil). See below [13]. For their profiles as assistants, see Scaduto, Francesco Borgia, pp. 67–75.
[8] Dionisio adunque Vaschez\textsuperscript{32} che fu la rovina della Compagnia Romana et autore di tutti i mali che sono venuti di Spagna, Rodriguez che era Provinciale, Ruiz Maestro di novizii,\textsuperscript{33} Ledesma che leggeva teologia in Collegio [Romano] con altri di questa sorte d’huomini, sotto certo pretesto di maggior bene gli\textsuperscript{34} avevano dato ad intendere che bisognava dividere il Collegio Romano in quattro parti,\textsuperscript{35} mettendo in una novizii del 2\textsuperscript{a} anno, nella 2\textsuperscript{a} quelli che finivano il noviziato, nella terza quelli che si mostravano più desiderosi della perfezione religiosa [e] nella 4\textsuperscript{a} quelli che erano inquieti,\textsuperscript{36} assegnando a ciascuna di queste classi un capo che havesse a [98] reggere et a governare. Essendo deliberato di eseguir questo disegno, [Vázquez] se ne andò al Collegio, conducendome solo seco,\textsuperscript{36} senza però dirmi che cosa volesse fare. Così, essendosi riposato dopo desinare\textsuperscript{37} et havendo chiamati i sodetti padri, in presenza loro mi disse che haveva animo di far tal cosa, giudicando che sarebbe di grandissimo aiuto al Collegio et levarrebbe diversi disordini che intendeva essere in quello, ma che disiderava sapere, prima che eseguisse cosa alcuna, il parer mio. Et perch\textsuperscript{v} la cosa mi parve molto nuova, periculosa et piena di grandissimi inconvenienti che sarebbono successi, quando si fosse posta in esecuzione, gli risposi che il negotio mi pareva degno di gran consideratione et che prima di rispondere [98°] desideravo saper le cause per le quali s’erano mossi i Padri che si trovavano presenti a persuadergli tal cosa. Così havendo inteso i motivi loro, nell’ultimo luogo parlando io dissi che

\textsuperscript{32} Palmio dedicates to Vázquez more paragraphs below ([13], [20–1] and [30]).

\textsuperscript{33} See Chapter 18 (“Della turbatione causata per il Provincialato di Ruiz e de tanti assistenti che haveva introdotto il Borgia tutti Spagnoli”) of Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 33–33\textsuperscript{3}): “homo di bona mente et da bene, ma alevato e nutrito in quella novita di spirito di quel frate Giovanni, di che si è detto di sopra, per il che P. Borgia il [sic] fece Maestro de Noviti in Santo Andrea. [Egli] comenziò a introdurre una certa forma di novitato molto diversa da quella che si servò nel tempo di Ignatio, massimamente in Messina, dove si dette principio alla prima casa de noviti; […] era più presto conforme al monachismo.” One wonders, though, why Ruiz was appointed to redact the rules for the Jesuit novitiate during GC 3, if he was such a bad novice master.

\textsuperscript{34} That is to Borja.

\textsuperscript{35} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 34‘–35‘ and 151–151\textsuperscript{1}). As a scholastic, Palmio himself studied at the Roman College 1553–6.

\textsuperscript{36} Meaning: bringing me alone with him.

\textsuperscript{37} desinare: to eat the main meal of the day, usually lunch.
mi maravigliavo che tal cosa si proponesse, che era non per giovare ma per rovinare il Collegio et empirlo di odii, di dissensioni, di discordie, di divisioni et d’ogni sorte di male, rompendo e dissipando la carità, la pace et l’unione che era il fondamento di quel Collegio et di tutta la Compagnia, la quale necessariamente [si] corromperebbe ogni volta che il Collegio Romano [fosse] corrotto et depravato, trovandosi pieno di tante nationi, alle quali era necessaria non la divisione, ma l’unione. Et soggiunsi che quando si fosse [99] desiderata la ruina del Collegio et della Compagnia, non si sarebbe potuto trovare il miglior mezzo di questo. Dissi di più: che desideravo sapere i disordini, i scandali et li mali che erano nel Collegio, perché con la proposta che havevano fatto mi davano ad intendere che c’era gran pravità et corruttela et che quando così fosse, non giovarebbe la distintione che s’era pensato di fare, ma già presto condurrebbe il Collegio in una estrema ruina et che molto meglio sarebbe licentiar dalla Compagnia tutti quelli che la turbavano con i pessimi costumi loro, ancorché fossero cinquanta, o sessanta, non essendovi speranza di poterlo aiutare con il mezzo che s’era proposto. Et perché allora rispondendo il P. Generale [Borgia], mi disse che per gratia di Dio [99v] non c’erano tanti mali et che il tutto si riduceva a certe imperfetioni di alcuni pochi, allhora dissi io, allegrandomi che così fosse et rendendone le debite gratie a Dio, che non conveniva per tali rispetti introdurre tante distintioni et parti nel Collegio che non gli poteva essere se non di estremo danno, estinguendo la pace fra i collegiali, perché questo modo non serviva ad altro che separar gli animi et introdurre nel Collegio diversi modi di vivere, et che alcuni si sarebbono nominati gli osservanti, altri conventuali; questi Capuzzini et quelli Carthesiani. Dipoi mi voltai al P. Ledesma, che era stato il principale autore di questa bella inventione, et gli dissi che se fosse vivo il P. Ignatio di santa memoria, non lo haverebbe tenuto un’hora nella Compagnia, giudicando quasi huomo nemico di quella et esterminatore della pace et della unione, onde dipende tutto il bene della Compagnia. Et per ragioni che io

---

vi ante si desid deletum
vii ante che deletum
viii ante che deletum

38 Read: riempirlo.
39 See the paragraph on Ledesma in Chapter Two, from which one learns that his role in building the foundations of the Jesuit pedagogical system was pivotal (see his various texts in MHSI, Mon. paed.). Apparently Palmio did not think so.
dissi il buon P. Borgia lasciò in tutto e per tutto quei pensieri et non si fece altro, perché conobbe che il mezzo che gli era stato proposto sarebbe stato perniciosissimo.

[9] Dal modo adunque di procedere del buon P. Borgia in tutto e per tutto diverso da quello che teneva il P. Araoz\textsuperscript{ix} nacque tanta divisione tra i nostri di Spagna che tutta la Compagnia l’ha sentita non senza grave danno et disturbo suo. Et questo particolarmente in Roma, dove essendo[si] congregati huomini di diverse nationi, mai per i tempi passati si era udito una minima parola [100\textsuperscript{v}] di tal divisione, anzi si viveva con tanta semplicità, unionne e pace che fra noi si vedeva adempiuto per gratia di Dio quello che si legge negli Atti degli Apostoli, \textit{erat illis anima una et cor unum.}\textsuperscript{40} Né si fece mai una minima differentia fra nationi, \textit{nec erat inter eos neque Scyta, neque Barbarus, neque Iudaeeus, neque Gentilis, sed Christus erat omnia in omnibus et omnis eramus unum in illo.}\textsuperscript{41} Crebbe talmente questa divisione fra Christiani vecchi et nuovi che prima che si cominciasse a celebrar la 2\textsuperscript{a} Congregatio\textsuperscript{e} [Generale]\textsuperscript{42} fu presentato a Pio 4\textsuperscript{3} di felice memoria un libello pieno di querele. Et in quello era descritta molto alla lunga questa divisione che era nella nostra Compagnia in Spagna per conto dei Christiani vecchi e nuovi\textsuperscript{44} [101] et che si trovavano fra loro due fattioni: una dei Christiani vecchi cui capo era Antonio Araoz,\textsuperscript{x} l’atra dei Christiani nuovi che seguitavano come capo loro Francesco Borgia. Et in quella scritta, dopo un lungo catalogo che si faceva dei nuovi Christiani et particolarmente di quelli che allhora

\textsuperscript{ix} ex Araoza correx\textsuperscript{i}
\textsuperscript{x} ex Araoza correx\textsuperscript{i}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Acts of the Apostles} 4:32.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} This is a paraphrase of \textit{Galatians} 3:28 ("Non est Iudaeus neque Graecus non est servus neque liber non est masculus neque femina omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo Isu") and \textit{Colossians} 3:11 ("Ubi non est masculus et femina, Graecus et Iudaecus, circumcisio et praeputium, barbarus et Scyta, servus et liber: sed omnia et in omnibus Christus").
  \item \textsuperscript{42} The Second General Congregation was convoked by Vicar General Borja in 1565. It elected him general.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Pope Pius IV (Giovanni Angelo Medici) was born in 1499. He was elected pope by acclamation in 1560. Pius IV created cardinal his nephew Carlo Borromeo, to whom he assigned the task of inquiring about the Jesuit conflict mentioned in the next paragraph [10]. Pius IV appointed Claudio Acquaviva as papal chamberlain before the latter’s entrance to the Society of Jesus. Pius IV died the same year as Laínez (1565).
  \item \textsuperscript{44} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae} 164, ff. 150–151).
\end{itemize}
governavano la Compagnia col P. Borgia, che era Vicario Generale, con grandissima instanza si supplicava Sua Santità che si degnasse proveder quanto prima, acciò che questa fattione dei nuovi Christiani non andasse avanti, perché crescendo sarebbe divenuta a perdere et a dissipar la Compagnia et ad impedir il bene grande che Iddio per essa misericordiosamente si degnava operare.

[10] Havendo havuto il Papa questa informatione, commise all’Illustissimo Cardinal Borromeo che considerasse con altri quattro cardinali ciò che si doveva fare per rimediare a questi disordini. Il Cardinale Borromeo, perché amava molto la Compagnia, prima che trattasse niente di questo con altri Cardinali, perché molto si fidava di me, mi comunicò questo negotio et mi disse che l’animo di Sua Santità era di provvedere per ogni modo, ma che prima di movere cosa alcuna in questa materia voleva saper da me, se giudicavo che tal cosa si trattasse in Roma. Et mi disse che havrebbe fatto l’offitio col Papa che havessi giudicato doversi fare per maggior servitio di Dio et maggior bene della Compagnia. Così havendo io pensato et raccomandato questo negotio a Dio Nosto Signore, stando noi allhora congregati per fare il Generale et pensando firmamente che quello che fosse stato eletto havrebbe proveduto con il consiglio degli Assistenti che la Congregatione gli havesse dato senza pubblicar queste magagne della nostra religione, persuasi all’Illustissimo Borromeo che facesse offitio con Sua Santità che si contentasse che la Compagnia istessa da

---

\textsuperscript{xix} *ex dati correxii* 

\textsuperscript{45} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSi, *Vitae* 164, f. 19v): “Un lungo catalogo de questi nuovi Christiani tra i quali ancora erano numerati alcuni che governavano a Roma la Compagnia et non si sapeva che havessero questa nota […]. Et se è licito a indovinare pare che tutto questo fusse presentato al Papa per impedire che Francesco Borgia non fosse Generale, come si temeva certo dovesse essere, massime vedendosi che era stato fatto vicario.”

\textsuperscript{46} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSi, *Vitae* 164, f. 106v–107r).

\textsuperscript{47} Palmio was the head of the first Jesuit community established in Milan in 1563. He later became Borromeo’s personal secretary. In spite of Palmio’s job in Rome as assistant general, Borromeo insisted on having him in Milan for much time. That provoked a tension between the Jesuit curia in Rome and the cardinal (see *Mon Borgia* 4:250–1 and 264, and ARSi, *Ital.* 139, f. 283). For the epistolary between the two preserved at the Ambrosiana of Milan, see http://epistolariosancarlo.ambrosiana.it/lettere.asp?idutente=3219.

\textsuperscript{48} read: si avessi giudicato che questo si doveva fare…

\textsuperscript{49} *magagna*: flaw, imperfection, deformation.
se medesima provedesse, poiché si trovava in procinto per eleggere il nuovo Generale et per provedere a molte cose che havevano bisogno di provizione con l’autorità della Congregazione Generale. Così, perché io affermai all’Illustrißimo Borromeo che la Compagnia haverebbe provveduto, come io credevo di certo dovesse provedere, accettò il consiglio e parer mio, giudicando [102°] che questo fosse il meglio. Ma in effetto non successe quello che mi era [stato] dato ad intendere [di] dover succedere, perseverando il P. Borgia nell’amore et nel credito che dava a questi nuovi Christiani. Però ancora che dalle intenzione di voler provedere, facendo io più volte grande instanza sopra di questo, sentendome essere obligato per l’officio che havevo fatto con l’Illustrißimo Borromeo.⁵⁰ Nientedimeno non solamente non si pose rimedio alcuno, ma crescendo il numero et l’autorità di questi neo-fiti sotto il generalato del Padre Francesco, le cose si videro andar di giorno in giorno peggiorando, come gli eventi l’hanno mostrato: che è occorso nella 3ª Congregazione, d’onde diversi altri scandali hanno [103] havuto origine.

[11] Questa divisione fra Christiani vecchi e nuovi di Spagna, sebene si manifestò et s’intese, come s’è detto, dopo che il P. Francesco Borgia fu fatto Commissario in Spagna et eletto in Roma Generale della Compagnia, nientedimeno [questa divisione] hebbe il principio suo quasi con [la nascita dell’]istessa Compagnia et si vide pullulare etiandio⁵¹ vivendo il P. Ignatio.⁵² Et perché io ero ex ius allhora uno dei quattro consultori disegnato dall’istesso Padre [Ignatio], per alcune cose che udivi allhora venne in sospetion che non si camminasse con quella nettezza et semplicità che io mi persuadeva.⁵³ Et insino a quel tempo cominciai a temere dentro di me che non succedesse qualche imbarazzo nella Compagnia. Benché questa [103v] mia sospetione non

---

⁵⁰ For Palmio’s defense of his presumed love for Spaniards and how he defended them from papal interference by convincing Borromeo to intercede, see his autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 20).

⁵¹ From Latin etiamdum: still, yet.

⁵² Palmio is inconsistent here: earlier in the memorial he drew a picture of the early Society under Ignatius as resembling the early Church characterized by peace and union ([2] and [9]).

⁵³ -evi is an old Italian imperfect tense form for 1st person singular (modern -evo).
manifestai mai a persona alcuna, ma più presto mi riprendeva che se mi rappresentassero simili giudizi, stetti però sempre sopra di me, fuggendo alcuni che, essendosi avveduti meglio di me di queste rotture, alle volte ne parlavano. Et io per il gran concetto che havevo della santità del Padre Lainez, glieli scopersi come persone che giudicavo fossero tentate e perturbate. Ma col tempo ho conosciuto dipoi che havevano havuto, come si suol dire, un buon naso. Et se nella Prima Congregazione che si fece fossero stati uditi alcuni che per rimediare ai mali della Compagnia parlorno liberamente, forse non sarebbero successe le cose che vediamo.

[12] Ma perché si lasciorno qualche volta trasportare più da quello che dovevano, habentes quidem zelum Dei, sed non scientiam quam eos habere opportebat, non furno admesse le persuasioni et le ragioni loro. Di qui nacque l’indignatione del P. Bobadilla et d’altri Padri nella Prima Congregazione. Et fecero ogni diligenza per via di Paolo 4° di felice memoria che disfacesse il triumvirato che loro chiamavano et che havevano allhora grande autorità in Roma, non si sapendo se non da pochi che erano neofiti, il governo dei quali sempre è dispiaciuto nella Compagnia et certo con ragione, perché procedevano già non come Padri, ma come padroni. Tanto che non è stata provincia nella Compagnia che non si sia gravissimamente lamentata dalla 3a Congregazione insino allhora. Presenti così le cose che erano secrete, per non haver mai voluto rimediavvi si sono fatti saper con grandissimo scandalo al cielo et alla terra. Et io,

\[\text{xiii} \text{ex tentati et perturbati correcsi}\]
\[\text{xiv} \text{additum supra lineam}\]
\[\text{ xv} \text{ante de deletum}\]
\[\text{xvi} \text{ex presente correcsi}\]

\[\text{54 See above [6].}\]
\[\text{55 Meaning: Over time I have comprehended that they had foreseen what would have happened.}\]
\[\text{56 Convoked after Loyola’s death (1558) that elected the converso Lainez.}\]
\[\text{57 Palmio refers here to the movement of memorialistas that in Palmio’s view was led by conversos, especially Dionisio Vázquez, the main target of this memorial. See below [21] and [30].}\]
\[\text{58 A paraphrase of Romans 10:2.}\]
\[\text{59 Read: il quale aveva…}\]
\[\text{60 Read: fatte.}\]
essendo tornato da Milano,\textsuperscript{61} ove mi tenne l’Illustissimo Borromeo con ordine del Pontefice, il primo anno dell’Assistentaria\textsuperscript{62} mia tro- vai le cose nostre in Roma così perturbate et gli animi dei nostri così alterati che non si sentivano se non querele et lamentationi. Et tanto apertamente si parlava d’una nazione contra all’altra che pareva fosse stata affatto estinta quella nostra prima pace et unione, per la quale la Compagnia era allhora in admiratione al mondo.\textsuperscript{63} Si che la prima causa et la prima [105] origine dei mali nostri è proceduta dalla molti-tudine et dall’insolenza dei neofiti di Spagna et dal troppo credito che gli\textsuperscript{64} [si] dette e troppo favor che gli\textsuperscript{65} fece il P. Francesco Borgia.

[13] La 2\textsuperscript{a} et 3\textsuperscript{a} causa\textsuperscript{66} et radice d’onde sono proceduti disturbi che ci travagliano è stata l’asperza et la troppo grande iniquità del governo, perché s’erano i nuovi Christiani persuasi che la Compagnia non si potesse governar bene se non per mano di Spagnuoli. Però\textsuperscript{66} di quattro provincie italiane tre erano governate dai provinciali spa-gnuoli\textsuperscript{67} et il tutto si vedeva passar per mano di Spagnuoli. Erano soprintendenti spagnuoli,\textsuperscript{68} visitatori spagnuoli,\textsuperscript{69} secretari spagnuoli,\textsuperscript{70} assistenti spagnuoli.\textsuperscript{71} Perché allhora istessimo il Padre Everardo et

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{xviii} \textit{additum in margine}
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{61} Palmio was summoned by Cardinal Borromeo to preach in Milan in the summer of 1563; there he remained until the Second General Congregation in 1565.

\textsuperscript{62} Palmio was elected assistant general for Italy by GC 2 in 1565.

\textsuperscript{63} Another example of Palmio’s consistent inconsistency on the state of peace and union under Ignatius: see [2], [9], and 11.

\textsuperscript{64} Read: loro.

\textsuperscript{65} Read: loro.

\textsuperscript{66} Read: infatti.

\textsuperscript{67} Jerónimo Doménech in Sicily, Alfonso Salmerón in Naples, and Alonso Ruiz in Rome. The only Italian provincial was Leonetto Chiavone in Lombardy (see below [14]), replaced after his death by the Genoese Francesco Adorno.

\textsuperscript{68} The office of “soprintendente” supervised college rectors.

\textsuperscript{69} Palmio refers here especially to Ledesma and Ribadeneyra, who were appointed by Borja visitors of the Province of Lombardy (see below [14]). Visitors had delegated power over provincials.

\textsuperscript{70} Palmio alludes here to Polanco, who was secretary general of the Society, and Vázquez, who was assisting him for the Iberian Peninsula.

\textsuperscript{71} Besides the Spaniards mentioned in this memorial, one should add Doménech who succeeded Vázquez as rector of the Roman College; Jerónimo Rubiols who was rector of the colleges in Florence and Siena; Diego Suárez who was rector in Messina; and the converso Gaspar Hernández who was rector in Naples. See Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 21 and Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” p. 50.
io per un [105\textsuperscript{v}] gran tempo [eravamo] fuori di Roma, io per Italia predicando et visitando, il Padre Everardo nella Francia con titolo di visitatore,\textsuperscript{72} così in Roma furono\textsuperscript{73} introdotti tutti questi dei quali si serviva il P. Borgia, etiandio\textsuperscript{74} mentre eravamo noi presenti assai più degli altri Assistenti eletti dalla \textsuperscript{2\textsuperscript{a}} Congregazione Generale (che era il P. Natale\textsuperscript{75} sostituito al P. Antonio Araoz che non volse venire-
crescendo a Roma\textsuperscript{viii} ogni giorno più le contese fra lui et il P. Borgia con grandissimo danno della Compagnia—Everardo, Mirone, et io\textsuperscript{76}: Polanco, Madrid, Dionisio,\textsuperscript{77} Ruiz,\textsuperscript{78} Rodriguez,\textsuperscript{79} Solier, Ribadanera, et molte volte chiamava ancora Ledesma,\textsuperscript{80} Para et Emmanuel. Et ben-
ché in Roma fossero persone d’altrè nationi più [106\textsuperscript{i}] antiche et di miglior giuditio, tutti si lasciorno stare in un cantone. Di più, le cose di più importanza che si dovevano trattar dagli Assistenti eletti dalla Congregazione Generale, senza che a loro fussero\textsuperscript{81} comunicate, passava solamente per le mani di Polanco, Madrid \[e\] Dionisio,\textsuperscript{82} di modo che gli Assistenti erano tenuti quasi per niente. Spesse volte se gli sen-
tiva a dire\textsuperscript{83} che il governo di Portugallo non poteva andar bene, se non fosse dato ai Castellani.\textsuperscript{84} L’istesso si diceva di Germania, di Francia\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{viii} additum in margine

\textsuperscript{72} Both Palmio and Everard Mercurian were assistants general elected with Borja at GC 2 in 1565. Mercurian was appointed visitor in France 1569–71 (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” pp. 17–9) and Palmio was often requested by Borromeo to preach in Milan (see above).

\textsuperscript{73} An old Italian form for furono.

\textsuperscript{74} An old Italian word for anche.

\textsuperscript{75} Nadal participated at the Second General Congregation and sat next to Polanco. The congregation elected him one of the six \textsuperscript{definitores} and Borja asked him to work on the aggiornamento of the Jesuit Institute to the decrees of Trent, in which he participated with Lainez and Polanco two years earlier. He was appointed assistant general for Spain in October 1568, after his return from the Diet of Augsburg, where he was sent with Palmio’s enemy, Diego de Ledesma, as papal theologians (1566).

\textsuperscript{76} See above [7].

\textsuperscript{77} Dionisio Vázquez. See above ([8]) and below ([20–1] and [30]).

\textsuperscript{78} Alonso Ruiz. See above [8].

\textsuperscript{79} Cristóbal Rodriguez. See above [8].

\textsuperscript{80} See above [8].

\textsuperscript{81} An old Italian form for fossero.

\textsuperscript{82} Dionisio Vázquez.

\textsuperscript{83} Read: si sentiva loro dire…

\textsuperscript{84} Read: Castigliani.

\textsuperscript{85} Under Borja, the superior provincial of France was Olivier Mannaerts and two Spanish converso Jesuits were professors there: Juan de Maldonado and Juan de Mariana. Fois argues that this situation was due to the low number of French Jesuits (Fois, ”Everard Mercurian,” p. 18).
et di Fiandra; d’Italia non si diceva, perché diligentissimamente si metteva in prattica.\textsuperscript{86}

[14] Et fecero quanto potero\textsuperscript{87} per introdurre ancora nella provincia di Lombardia provinciale spagnuolo. Et a questo [106\textsuperscript{v}] fine la fecero visitar da due Spagnuoli: Ledesma e Ribadenera. Et non poco si contristò quella provincia per il danno che hebbe da queste visite. Finalmente trovandosi il P. Borgia in Ferrara ammalato,\textsuperscript{88} Polanco cercò occasione di visitarla et l’intentione che hebbe fu (come lui stesso disse a diverse persone che di tal parole si scandalizzarono) di radicar l’odio che haveva quella provincia alli Spagnuoli per opera del P. Palmio. Così esaminando diverse persone in diversi collegi di quella provincia, corruppe malamente la simplità di quella.\textsuperscript{89} Imperocché molti vennero a suspicar\textsuperscript{90} et a far giudizio di quelle cose, delle quali mai havevano sentito parlare, cioè che i Spagnuoli [107] volessero\textsuperscript{91} dominare. In quella provincia insino allhora si viveva nella simplità dei primi tempi et in essa tutte le nazioni erano sincerissimamente amate et accarezzate.\textsuperscript{92} Et così passando frequentissimamente per i Collegi di Lombardia, vedendo il candore et la carità con la quale si procedeva, restavano sopra modo edificati e consolati. Quello adunque che dispiaceva al P. Polanco et agli altri di sua qualità fu xix il veder quella provincia fosse governata da Italiani. Et perché io non havessi voluto\textsuperscript{xx} acconsentire che Ribadenera vi restasse provinciale, come il P. Borgia, persuaso dai sodetti Padri, haveva deliberato di nominarlo Provinciale di quella Provincia.\textsuperscript{xii} Però\textsuperscript{xxii} con le vive ragioni che io gli detti et per

\textsuperscript{xix} Fuit deletum. Fu il additum in margine
\textsuperscript{xx} ante havessi insertum in margine
\textsuperscript{xi} additum in margine. Post in Lombardia deletum
\textsuperscript{xxii} additum supra lineam

\textsuperscript{86} Meaning: the Italian Province was governed diligently. This statement sounds self-defensive—it was the author of this memorial who was provincial of Lombardy for six and assistant general for Italy for sixteen years.

\textsuperscript{87} An old Italian form for potessero.

\textsuperscript{88} See below [26]. In the middle of 1572 when Borja remained sick for four months on his return from France. Indeed, after his arrival in Rome, he died in two days (30 September).

\textsuperscript{89} Contrasting the state of simplicity of the Italian province (and assistance) before the ascendency of conversos is a kind of rhetorical refrain of this and next paragraphs (see below [15]).

\textsuperscript{90} An old Italian form for sospettare.

\textsuperscript{91} Read: volevano.

\textsuperscript{92} This is a self-defense allusion to the beginnings of the Lombardian Province, when Palmio was its superior.
la mala sodisfazione che si era havuta nella visita sua, [107\textsuperscript{v}] fui causa che lasciasse\textsuperscript{93} quel pensiero. Et havendo quella provincia huomini\textsuperscript{xxiii} assai più sufficienti in dottrina et in bontà di\textsuperscript{94} qualsivoglia [altro] che havesse potuto mandare, vinto dalle ragioni, il P. Borgia dichiarò Provinciale il P. Leonetto Schiavoni\textsuperscript{95} che fu soggetto di grande esempio, di giudizio et di molta prudentia.

[15] Questa istessa inequalità si vide troppo apertamente nel dare la professione dei quattro voti et fino a questo tempo per la simplicità in che s’era vissuto in Italia, non s’era mai né pensato, né considerato inconveniente alcuno, ma gli efetti successi hanno scoperto et hanno fatto conoscere quello che si pretendeva. Imperché nella Spagna s’è fatto grandissimo caso di questa professione [108] et molti l’hanno bramata et instantissimamente cercata. Et la causa di questo ardente desiderio non è stato\textsuperscript{96} il voler morire al mondo et vivere a Dio, che è il fine della professione, ma dall’ambizione è proceduto, considerando loro che la professione dei quattro voti nella nostra Compagnia ha seco\textsuperscript{97} congiunto il governo, perché i professi di quattro voti soli hanno nella Congregatione Generale voce attiva et passiva, soli questi sono Provinciali, Visitatori, Commissari et Assistenti. Et benché secondo le Costituzioni li collegi per ordinario dovrebbero\textsuperscript{98} essere governati dai coadiutori spirituali,\textsuperscript{99} nientedimeno quasi tutti hormai si vedono posti nella mano dei professi di quattro voti. Per il che l’ordine dei coadiutori spirituali è quasi affatto escluso [108\textsuperscript{v}] dalle congregazioni provinciali, nelle quali si eleggono gli elettori che vanno alla Congregatione

\textsuperscript{xxiii} ante ogni deletum

\textsuperscript{93} Read: lasciò.
\textsuperscript{94} Read: che.
\textsuperscript{95} This is a misspelled name of Leonetto Chiavone.
\textsuperscript{96} Read: é stata.
\textsuperscript{97} An old Italian form for con se.
\textsuperscript{98} An old Italian form for dovrebbe.
\textsuperscript{99} Const. [421]: “The general, by himself or through another to whom he delegates his authority in this matter, will appoint one of the coadjutors in the Society as the rector,” and [557]: “the professed […] should not hold the ordinary of rectors of the colleges or universities of the Society (unless this is necessary or notably useful for these institutions).” These norms were abolished by GC 34 (1995) as a perceptive norm by explaining that “it has hardly ever been applied in a uniform way in the Society” (see The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and their complementary norms (Saint Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), p. 174.
Generale con li Provinciali. Et perché a questa professione non si admettono se non quelli che hanno studiato quattro o almeno tre anni di teologia, hanno diligentissimamente procurato i Spagnuoli di studiar teologia, sapendo che questo era il mezzo di giungere alla professione di quattro voti.


xxiv ante in ogni cosa deletum

100 See Const. [682]: “Those who should assemble in a general congregation are not all the subjects under obedience to the Society, nor even the approved scholastics, but the professed and some coadjutors if it seems opportune in our Lord to summon them.” GC 34 “determined that formed coadjutors could be chosen as electors and substitutes for a general congregation, although there is a limitation on the number” (see The Constitutions, pp. 332–3).

101 See Const. [518]: “[The professed] ought to possess sufficient learning in humane letters and the liberal arts and, beyond that, in scholastic theology and Sacred Scripture. And while some might be able to progress as much in a shorter time as others in a longer one, nevertheless for the sake of a common standard a terminus will need to be set, and this will be four complete years of theology following the arts course. Thus, to be admitted to profession one should have spent four years in the study of theology and made good progress to the glory of God our Lord. As evidence of his progress each one should before his profession defend theses in logic, philosophy, and scholastic theology. Four persons will be designated to object and to judge his sufficiency according to what they think in all truth and sincerity. When the subjects are found not to have enough learning, it is better that they wait until they have it. Similarly, those also ought to wait who have not obtained fully adequate testimony to their self–abnegation and religious virtues.”

102 Read: si doveva dare loro.

103 Meaning: Cardulo accepted profession of three and not of four vows. Scaduto explains (Francesco Borgia, pp. 165–6) that Cardulo was offered profession of four vows, but he preferred to take only three.
fatto professo. Et era nelle lettere nonché nei meriti assai inferiore al P. Fulvio. Capillia, che due volte uscì dalla Compagnia in Spagna et si fece [109v] Carthusiano, venendo a Roma, fu ricevuto, ancora che gli Assistenti con molte ragioni a ciò s’opponessero, et admessò nella Compagnia con questa solemnità. Prima lo fece Maestro dei Novizzi, offì tio che in modo alcuno gli conveniva e per la instabilità et per essere stato Carthusiano, poi lo messero a leggere teologia in Collegio. 3o—gli diedero la professione dei quattro voti et nientedimeno [Capella] di nuovo si parti dalla Compagnia et, ritornando, fu tutta-via ricevuto. La 4a volta partendosi dalla Compagnia, menò seco un povero novizzo, il quale, vedendosi lontano da Roma tre o quattro miglia et intendendo che [Capella] voleva lasciar la Compagnia et farsi Carthusiano, lo piantò et se ne tornò indietro. Toledo, essendo uscito dalla Compagnia perché in Spagna non lo potevano tolerare, in Roma fu ricevuto con molta solemnità et, perché di nuovo si volesse partir se non lo facevano professo, gli diedero la professione. Con tutto questo ha lasciato la Compagnia et dei travagli che egli gli ha dati n’è scritto una lunga historia. Venne a Roma Trancoso, la cui vita fu infame in Parigi et di là si partì con tanti scandali che è maraviglia.

xxv ante i nostri deletum

104 After having read the Carthusian Ludolph of Saxony’s (c. 1300–78) Life of Christ, Loyola remained affected by the Carthusian spirituality. Indeed, he allowed the Jesuits to transfer to the Carthusian Order and even return to the Society from there. Thus, the story of Gaspar Hernández was not that exceptional as Palmio describes it here. See Charles van de Vorst, “La Compagnie de Jésus e la passage a l’Ordre des Chartreux (1540–1646),” AHSI 23 (1954): 3–34.

105 No Jesuit with this name can be identified. Perhaps it is Maximilián Capella who pronounced his four vows in January 1566 (ARSI, Germ. 1, ff. 34r–35v), and represented the Lower German Province at the Congregation of Procurators in 1568 and took part in the Third General Congregation. Sometimes his name has a French form, Maximilien de la Chapelle, and is said to be originally from Lille (see Fois, “Everard Mercurian,” p. 10) or from Flanders (DHCJ 4:3977).

106 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 32).

107 An old Italian form for misero.

108 An old Italian word for con sé.

109 There was no other Jesuit in that period with this name but Cardinal Francisco de Toledo Herrera (1532–96) who was a converso from Cordova (see the paragraph on him in Chapter Three). Palmio disparaged his Jewish ancestry and called him a “monster” in his autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 22–25; 45–6). However, Toledo never left the Society, as the text reads here, so it is unclear, to whom exactly Palmio refers, unless becoming a cardinal meant to him “leaving” the Society.

110 Read: dei travagli che le (i.e. to the Society) ha dato n’è scritta una lunga historia.

111 The Portuguese Antonio Trancoso.
che i nostri che restarono ivi per colpa sua non fossero lapidati. Et nientedimeno fu ricevuto nella Compagnia et con tante carezze che quasi ogni giorno mangiava col Generale et con gli Assistenti, con gravissima offensione di quelli che sapevano [110'] le cose sue. Questo huomo, essendo stato mandato al Collegio [Romano], dopo che l’hebbe tutto conguassato112 et scandalizzato, si partì dalla Compagnia et con i favori che gli procurorno altri Spagnuoli che stavano nella corte di Roma,113 fu ricevuto al servitio del Castellano.114 Finalmente s’è vista tanta inequality in ogni cosa che la Corte di Roma era piena di mormorationi contra di noi.115

[17] L’asperza del governo era talmente cresciuta che, essendosi affatto perso l’amore, si viveva col timore e tremore sotto un governo dispotico et non paterno. Et per questa causa nell’interrogatorio che si scrisse nella 3a Congregatione Generale la prima cosa fu che si domandasse, se la persona che si haveva da eleggere per Generale si potesse sperare [111] che dovesse reggere con spirito paterno et non dispotico.116

[18] Questa terribilità si usava nelle altre nationi più presto che nei Spagnuoli. Et le scappate et mali dipormenti di questi s’escusavano et si coprivano. Et quando alcuni ne parlavano, lamentandosi dei mali dipormenti loro, subito si diceva che ciò procedeva dall’odio che si portava agli Spagn[u]oli,117 come avvenne inxxvi Aloigio che

__xxvi ante ad deletum__

112 Read: conquassato.
113 I.e., the papal court.
114 Meaning: he was received in Spain.
115 Palmio’s autobiography (ARSÌ, Vitae 164, f. 35r): “Tutta la corte murmurava, vedendo che non si faceva conto in la Compagnia se non d’una natione, d’onde nacque una grandissima aversione, non da Spagnuoli, ma da certa sorte di gente novamente conduta di Spagna in queste bande, molto diversa da tanti Spagnuoli santi, modesti et prudenti, che erano stati in Roma al tempo d’Ignatio et di Lainez, amati et honorati da tutti.”
116 That was the first article of a questionnaire given to the electors before the four-day period for investigating who appears most apt for the office of superior general: “[Future superior general] is one to believe that […] will govern the Society in a paternal manner, and not in a tyrannical one, to use the words of Reverend Father Lainez, of holy memory, so that subjects have easy access to him and that they would happily in the Lord wish to open their hearts to him in confidence” (see Padberg, For Matters of Greater Moment: p. 136).
117 This sentence sounds like Palmio’s self-defense in front of the accusations of being an enemy of Spaniards. This apologetic style permeates Palmio’s autobiography. See below, where Palmio makes clear his apology: “hanno detto che io perseguitava i Spagnuoli et che ero causa che gli altri similmente li perseguitassero” ([18]).
visse nel Collegio di Bologna con grandissimo scandalo et, uscendo dalla Compagnia, si fece conoscere quello che era.\textsuperscript{118} Gioan Gorea in Milano,\textsuperscript{xxvii} cui diportamenti havendo inteso il Cardinale Borromeo dal Castillano,\textsuperscript{119} di Milano, disse liberamente che la Compagnia lo doveva mandare in gallea.\textsuperscript{120} Quest’huomo, dopo d’essere stato molti anni [111\textsuperscript{v}] nella Compagnia sempre inquieto et havendo vissuto in quella assai licentiosamente et superbamente, da se stesso è uscito et ha fatto parlare assai di se stesso. Questo avvenne ancora a Padre Spessi,\textsuperscript{121} il quale, dopo molti travagli e scandali\textsuperscript{xxviii} che dette alla religione, l’ha abbandonata.\textsuperscript{122} Et perché questi huomini volevano vivere licentiosamente, ogni volta che gli\textsuperscript{123} superiori li volevano correggere et fare che caminassero come dovevano, servendo a Roma, dicevano che nella Lombardia erano perseguitati i Spagnuoli. Et la persecutione che gli era fatta\textsuperscript{124} (se però persecution nominarsi poteva) era questa che il Provinciale\textsuperscript{125} non voleva permettere in modo alcuno che si stesse fuori di casa la notte insino a sei e sette ore a banchetti et a veder giocare cavallieri [112] et signore, come più volte fece Gorea in Modena e in Parma. Né gli permetteva\textsuperscript{126} che tenessero danari, che si trattenessero tutto il giorno in visite di donnicciole et altre cose che non conviene scriverle. Et perché, mentre che io fui\textsuperscript{127} Provinciale,\textsuperscript{128} mai volsi comportare\textsuperscript{129} simili cose, come han[no] fatto ancora quelli

\textsuperscript{xxvii} il deletum
\textsuperscript{xxviii} additum in margine
che mi sono successi, pensando [di] giustificarsi, hanno detto che io perseguiva i Spagnuoli et che ero causa che gli altri similmente li perseguissassero. Et perché si lasciavano troppo dominar dalla passione, non volsero mai considerar che l’istesso modo si tenne con Aloisio Venetiano, Olivela, Antonio Venetiano et altri che ancora che fossero Italiani et di bello ingegno. Nientedimeno non si volse mai comportare il troppo licentioso loro vivere et, [112'] perché non si volsero emendare et accettare paterni avvisi che gli erano dati, finalmente si licenziò dalla Compagnia. Lasciò Aloisio Guirino, il Viperano, Cosmo Figliarti, et altri, pure Italiani, perché non si volevano correggere, si licenziorno, sì che la disciplina religiosa con carità et affetto paterno in tutti sempre si procurò. Né cosa mai indecente et ripagnante alla religione si tolerò nei soggetti Italiani. 

Di Spagna uscì uno dalla Compagnia che si chiamava Urtado, parente di Ribadeneyra, et se ne venne a Roma, ove si è diportato tanto

---
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male che sarebbe stato [di] grandissimo bene al Collegio Romano che mai l’havesse veduto. Costui però [lo] si tenne sempre, come si dice, nel bambaso\textsuperscript{142} [113] [e] subito fu adcesso allo studio della filosofia senza che servisse mai in cosa alcuna della Compagnia et, perché ogni giorno doventava più insolente, essendo stato mandato in Spagna, finalmente usci dalla Compagnia. Venne un altro par di Spagna nominato Loiando.\textsuperscript{143} Et benchè per l’insolenza sua mai l’havessero potuto tolerar in Spagna, in Roma fu abbracciat, imbalsamato et mandato al Collegio [Romano], d’onde pochi giorni dopo una mattina a buon’ora se ne fuggì. Fu ricevuto un altro che si chiamava Mena\textsuperscript{144} [e] che era stato soldato. Et havendolo fatto studiar qualche poco, subito lo fecero ordinare sacerdote. Di questo huomo per spatio di dieci anni continuì che stette in Perugia altro [113\textsuperscript{v}] non s’è sentito che querele et cose di grandissima importanza, per le quali meritava essere severissimamente castigato et cacciato dalla Compagnia. Finalmente essendo capitate certe lettere in mano del Generale Everardo, che una donna scriveva al sodetto Mena, domandandogli che cosa voleva si facessero di certe robbe che gli\textsuperscript{145} haveva lasciato in casa. Vedendosi scoperto et non havendo più i patroni che lo sostentavano, se ne fuggì.

[19] Vennero da Spagna sei o sette coadiutori tentati, perché volevano studiare et gli\textsuperscript{146} fu concesso ciò che domandorno, per il che tutti i coadiutori del Collegio [Romano] gravissimamente si perturborno et ci fu da fare assai per quietarli. Et questi s’havessero [114] parlato di simil cosa, sarebbono stati molto bene sbassati e travagliati, come ad alcuni è avvenuto, i quali s’erano perturbati et mormoravano, vedendo questi esempi. Et questi Spagnuoli, a chi\textsuperscript{147} fu concesso lo studio, insolentissimamente diportandosi, dettero\textsuperscript{148} assai che pensare ai superiori et non vedevano, come mai potessero essere sacerdoti, se ben loro questo sopra ogni altra cosa pretendevano.

\textsuperscript{142} Bambaso is a dialectical version of bambagia, which is the softest part of cotton.

\textsuperscript{143} Unidentifiable.

\textsuperscript{144} Rodrigo Mena.

\textsuperscript{145} Read: le (alla donna).

\textsuperscript{146} Read: loro.

\textsuperscript{147} Read: ai quali…

\textsuperscript{148} Read: diedero.
Dionisio Vasches\textsuperscript{149} messe il Collegio Romano in grandissima confusione, volendo mettere [in] prigione Camillo Carga, fratello di Giovan Carga, huomo di molta riputatione nella Corte, solamente perché haveva detto che non voleva fare non so che. Et comandò quattro di quei coadiutori spagnuoli ché lo prendessero, [114'] cosa che pose il Collegio in tanto conguasso che per molto tempo s’è risentito di quella alteratione, massime perché s’era inteso che haveva detto, che gli era stato dato il governo del Collegio Romano per domare i cervelli Italiani et per insegnarli\textsuperscript{150} l’obbedienza. Questo huomo è Christiano nuovo di bruttissimo aspetto et quello che importa più, pieno d’ogni sorte di doppiezza et di simulatorie. Et da lui sono proceduti infiniti scandali in Italia et in Spagna, come in altro luogo si narra più alla lunga.\textsuperscript{151} Il Padre Borgia da Fiandra lo chiamò a Roma et a certo modo da lui si lasciò sempre governare. Et non sapessimo\textsuperscript{152} mai, d’onde procedesse che il P. Borgia, huomo religiosissimo, dasse tanto credito [115] et estimasse tanto un huomo che a lui dette sempre grandissimi travagli et fu perniciosissimo alla Compagnia. Ma, benché tal fosse, nientedimeno ogni giorno di più procurava d’innalzarlo.\textsuperscript{153} Più volte parlò meco\textsuperscript{154} per farlo rettore del Collegio Romano et desiderava summamente che io approvassi questo suo disegno, ma la [mia] coscienza mai me lo permesse. Però domandandomi ogni giorno perché quest’huomo non mi piaceva, io gli risposi che per molte ragioni non mi poteva piacere. La prima era perché in lui regnava una gran doppiezza et perché lo vedeva pieno d’ambizione. La 2°—perché havevamo Italiani nel Collegio [Romano] per questo uffitio più idonii et dotati di gran virtù. La 3°—non essendo stato giudicato in Spagna atto a governare se non una [115'] casuccia, qual è Modena in Italia, con buona coscienza non se gli poteva dare il governo del primo\textsuperscript{155} collegio che haveva la Compagnia. La 4°—essendo venuto nuovamente in queste bande,\textsuperscript{156} non

\textsuperscript{149} Vázquez. See above ([8] and [13]), and below ([30]). See also Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, ff. 149r–150v).

\textsuperscript{150} Read: insegnare loro.

\textsuperscript{151} Palmio refers here probably to his autobiography (see ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, ff. 149r–150v).

\textsuperscript{152} Read: sapemmo.

\textsuperscript{153} Meaning: to promote him.

\textsuperscript{154} Read: con me.

\textsuperscript{155} Primo not in a chronological sense, but as the most important and exemplary college, which the Roman College was.

\textsuperscript{156} Meaning: in Italy.
haveva cognizione alcuna delle cose nostre. Et soggiunsi, “Et come Vostra Paternità suol dire che conviene che i Spagnuoli siano deputati ai governi di Spagna per la cognizione che hanno del paese et del modo che s’ha da tener con quella gente, per la medesima ragione, tenendosi soggetti Italiani di quelle parti atti et dotati che sono necessarie per governare bene, par che a loro convenga dargli i governi d’Italia.”\(^{157}\)

La 5a-è la brutta sua ciera che pare un Moro et [116] ha gli occhi così traversi che spaventa quando si guarda. Però venendo alcun prelato per parlare al Rettore [del Collegio Romano] par non convenga se gli rappresenti avanti un huomo di così brutto aspetto e [in più] neofito. A queste ragioni non mi rispose una minima parola. Et nientedimeno, ancora che\(^{158}\) tutti gli Assistenti, quando lo propose per farlo Rettore, gli contradicessero, lo volse per ogni modo far Rettore del Collegio Romano\(^{159}\) et a me, che gli era stato tanto contrario, ordinò ché [io] lo intronizassi.\(^{xxxiii} 160\)

Ma il buon Padre [Borgia] molto presto se ne pentì et conobbe l’errore che haveva fatto per i scandali, tumulti et importantissime turbationi che successero nel Collegio per colpa di quest’huomo, il quale a me disse, lamentandosi del Padre Borgia, questo che qui seguita.\(^{161}\) Che dandogli il sodetto Padre istruzioni e modo col quale doveva governare il Collegio Romano, gli disse che imitasse Gioan da Vega, il quale, essendo fatto Vicerè di Sicilia,\(^{162}\) usò nel principio del suo governo rigorosissimamente giustizia con alcuni principali et, havendo a questo modo spaventati i Siciliani, li tenne sempre suggetti. Così fece questo povero huomo che bensì dimostrò

\(^{157}\) This is a weak argument, for the community of the Roman College was international and not Italian.

\(^{158}\) Meaning: even though.

\(^{159}\) Palmio’s autobiography (ARSי, Vitae 164, f. 26–27v): “Come Dionisio Vazquez fu fatto Rettore del Collegio Romano da Borgia contra la mente de tutti li assistenti et d’altri Padri principali spagnoli che intravenero nella consulta.”

\(^{160}\) Meaning: to invest him.

\(^{161}\) Palmio’s autobiography (ARSי, Vitae 164, f. 27v–30): “Della grande turbatione et seditione che nacquero nel Collegio Romano per l’asprezza di Dionisio et della ferita mortale che all’hora hebbe la unione et la pace della Compagnia,” where much more colorful details of this episode can be found.

\(^{162}\) The viceroy of Sicily Juan de Vega and his wife Leonor de Osorio were great supporters of the Society’s work on the island. Vega’s converso physician, Baltasar de Torres, entered the Society.
nel principio del suo governo essere senza giudizio et intelletto. Et perché secularmente et dispoticamente volse governare uomini religiosi, perse se stesso et mise tutti in grandissimo tragaglio.

[21] Con questa instituzione che disse [di] haver havuta dal P. Borgia volse mettere [in] prigione un Portoghese, chiamato [117] Roboredo,\(^{163}\) il quale per quello che haveva fatto apena meritava, come si dice fra noi [gesuiti], di mangiare in tavola picciola.\(^{164}\) Questo huomo adunque, veduto che lo volevano mettere [in] prigione, pian piano accostandosi alla porta del Collegio [Romano] pieno di timore, se ne fugì, correndo a casa dell’Ambasciatore di Portogallo.\(^{165}\) Et Marco, [il compagno] del P. Generale [Borgia],\(^{166}\) che si trovò presente a questo caso, con altri\(^{xxxiv}\) Spagnuoli gli corse dietro. Questo vedendo i scolari, tutti uscirono fuori delle scuole, gridando “Piglia, piglia, ché il gat[t]ino fugge!” perché restassimo tutti molto bene mortificati. Ma dipoi molto più [restammo mortificati] per l’altra scempieria che [Vázquez] commesse contra Camillo Carga, che fu assai peggiore di questa, perché era, come ho detto, fratello [117\(^v\)] di Gioan Carga, come ho detto, ben conosciuto et estimato nella corte.\(^{167}\) Et Camillo era veramente buon giovane, se non che era alquanto vivetto. Allhora stando il Collegio [Romano] tutto in conguasso per questo caso et trovandosi il P. Generale assai turbato, mi ordinò che quanto prima andassi al Collegio et vedessi di quietarlo, come feci per gratia di Dio. Et hebbe allhora causa il P. Generale di conoscere che gli havevo detto la verità.\(^{168}\) Essendo per queste cause Dionisio levato dal governo del Collegio Romano,\(^{169}\) venne in tanta melanconia (perché la superbia et l’ambizione dalle quali era posseduto sopra modo l’affligevano) che

\(^{xxxiv}\) ante non so deletum

\(^{163}\) Unidentifiable.

\(^{164}\) The little table is a penance where one eats at a low table while kneeling during the community meal.

\(^{165}\) Perhaps Lourenco Pires de Tavora, who was Portugal’s ambassador to the papal court since 1559.

\(^{166}\) *1527 Valls (Catalonia); SJ 1554; †1583 Barcelona (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 92), who probably was of Jewish descent.

\(^{167}\) *That is at the papal court.

\(^{168}\) Compare Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 30–30\(^v\)): “Come Dio fece conoscere al Borgia quanto s’era ingannato di Dionisio.”

\(^{169}\) After only one year in office as rector of the Roman College, Dionisio Vázquez was replaced by yet another Spanish Jesuit: Doménech. On Vázquez see above ([8], [13], and [20]) and below ([30]).
cominciò a dire che si voleva fare Cartusiano o Heremita. Et lamentandosi gravissimamente [118] meco del P. Borgia, lo nominava autore di tutte le scappate che egli haveva fatto. Con tutto questo [P. Borgia] non si risolse di lavarsi le mani di questo huomo.\textsuperscript{170} Ma fomentando più presto la superbia di lui, con intensione di voler sollevarlo dalla malinconia che lo teneva oppreso, lo mandò a visitar la Provincia di Napoli, dove tuttavia persevera Viceprovinciale,\textsuperscript{171} ancora che di lui ci venghino\textsuperscript{172} scritte ogni settimana [sulle] diverse scappate che fa in quella provincia et mandate queerele etiandio da gentilissimi\textsuperscript{xxxv} forastieri [e] grandissimi benefattori nostri per li mali modi che tiene con loro. Per me son certo, essendo il P. Borgia huomo così virtuoso et religioso com’è, che desidera levare affatto dal governo quest’huomo, ma non lo fa, [118\textsuperscript{v}] perché è ingannato et [perché] gli è [stato] dato ad intendere che questa sarebbe occasione agli Italiani d’alzarsi troppo contro Spagnuoli. Et nientedimeno chiaramente si vede che siano [Spagnuoli] in termine, [et] che se non si procede bene, e presto resterà macchiato il buon nome et la buona fama della Compagnia in Napoli, come [del resto] è avvenuto, perché finalmente è stato tolto Dionisio di Napoli come huomo infame.\textsuperscript{173} Et nella Spagna è stato autore dei tumulti che ci travagliano et ci travaglieranno, se Dio per sua gran misericordia non ci mette la mano.\textsuperscript{174}

[22] I vecchi Christiani e tutti i buoni Spagnuoli sanno et conoscono molto bene che di cuore gli\textsuperscript{175} amiamo et di questo ne sono più che certi. Et [119] nelle Congregationi Generali seconda e terza han toccato con mano che tutto il mal loro e nostro è proceduto dai neofiti et da quelli particolarmente che governavano in Roma. Et con che raggion si può lamentare la nation spagnuola che nella Italia si mettano Provinciali, Visitatori et Rettori italiani. Prima si lamentavano,

\textsuperscript{xxxv} ex gentilissimi correci

\textsuperscript{170} Meaning: Borgia did not decide to get rid of Vázquez.

\textsuperscript{171} This information is inconsistent with what Palmio writes at the end of this paragraph, when he mentions that Vázquez was fired from his office in Naples and sent to Spain, where he would provoke many troubles. Also the next sentence is written as if Borja were still alive.

\textsuperscript{172} Read: vengono.

\textsuperscript{173} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, f. 30\textsuperscript{v}–31\textsuperscript{i}): “Della turbatione che causò Dionisio in Napoli.” See also \textit{Vitae 164}, f. 44.

\textsuperscript{174} See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, f. 105\textsuperscript{i}). See above [11] and below [30].

\textsuperscript{175} Read: li.
perché non si adoperavano gli Italiani, non vi essendo soggetti che fossero atti et idonei ai governi; adesso, ché ne vedono tanti sufficienti et ché s’adoperano come si fa in tutte le altre nationi, dicono che non c’è intenzione di voler sollevarlo dalla sua posizione. 171 Th is information is inconsistent with what Palmio writes at the end of this paragraph.


---

171 Th is information is inconsistent with what Palmio writes at the end of this paragraph.
176 Read: direbbero.
177 It was said by Pope Gregory XIII during an audience with Palmio that is described by the latter below ([23]).
178 Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 37†): “Della turbatione nella quale fu fatto Everardo generale et delle cose successe nel suo generalato piene di travaglio et di scandalò.” See also Vitae 164, ff. 88–9. The Third General Congregation opened on 12 April and ended on 16 June 1573. It was convoked by Polanco who was elected vicar general after Borja’s death. See Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” pp. 49–75.
179 If there were 48 delegates at the congregation, the Spaniards comprised 50 per cent (24 votes), so they were actually one vote short of a majority (25)—contrary to what Palmio claims here. Eventually, Mercurian was elected with 27 votes on the first ballot, “se bene Polanco hebbe alcuni voti” (see Palmio’s autobiography in ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 39†). 13 votes were cast for Spanish candidates. It follows that at least 3 Spaniards must have voted for Mercurian and that Polanco must have received fewer than 13 votes.
cominciò la Congregazione si intese che si era dato informatione al Papa\footnote{Pope Gregory XIII.} che la maggior parte delle persone della Compagnia erano Spagnuoli et che non c’era soggetto che fosse atto al Generalato, se non tra Spagnuoli. Et ci fu gran congettura che detta informatione fosse data al Papa per mezzo di Polanco.\footnote{As vicar general Polanco was summoned by Pope Gregory XIII on 15 April 1573.} Et non è vero che tra le altre nationi non si trovasse persona idonea per il Generalato. Prima uno dei principali cardinali ci accusò \footnote{It was probably Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the grandson of Pope Paul III (who approved the Society in 1540) and a major Jesuit benefactor. It was this cardinal who informed Polanco about pope’s desire to receive him (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” p. 52).} di questa informatione data al Papa.\footnote{It was probably Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the grandson of Pope Paul III (who approved the Society in 1540) and a major Jesuit benefactor. It was this cardinal who informed Polanco about pope’s desire to receive him (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” p. 52).} Et come s’intese da un’altro cardinale, questo fatto si scopere in questo modo: perché alcuni cardinali molto principali parlorno al Papa, mossi dalle lettere del Re di Portogallo\footnote{King Sebastian I of Portugal (1554–78). His confessor and companion was a Portuguese Jesuit, Gonçalves da Câmara, a cousin of L. Henriques, confessor of the Cardinal Infante.} et ancora, come si disse, del Re di Spagna, acciò Sua Santità provedesse che non fosse sempre Generale spagnuolo. Et benché sopra ciò havesse anch’Ella havute lettere dalli istessi Re del sodetto timore, \footnote{Pope Gregory XIII would have said that and suggested the candidacy of Mercurian during his audience with Polanco on April 15 (see DHCJ 2:1612).} Sua Santità rispose che non si poteva far Generale se non spagnuolo, perché haveva havuto informatione che eravamo quasi tutti Spagnuoli et che fra noi non v’era huomo atto al Generalato, se non dalla natione spagnuola.\footnote{Pope Gregory XIII would have said that and suggested the candidacy of Mercurian during his audience with Polanco on April 15 (see DHCJ 2:1612).}

[24] Da questa risposta del Papa giudicorno i Cardinali che fosse trama dei Spagnuoli et così lo pregorno ché si degnasse cercar la verità. Però fatta la [121] Congregatione Generale, mi disse uno di quei Cardinali che haveva parlato al Papa che, per intendere se erano vere le informationi che gli erano state date, dette Sua Santità commissione a due cardinali che non mi nominò, né manco io cercai di saper chi fossero, acciò che si informassero diligentissimamente della verità, cioè del numero delle persone della Compagnia; degli elettori che dovevano venire alla Congregatione; quanti voti erano necessari per l’elettione del Generale; della qualità et sufficienza di diverse persone di diverse nationi, commettendo agli’istessi cardinali che da parte di Sua Santità comandassero alle persone che sopra ciò fossero da loro esaminate in virtù di santa obedientia a dir la verità. Et gli prohibissero
sotto pena di scomunica, cui assolutione fosse riservata [121v] a Sua Santità, ché non dicessero a persona vivente cosa alcuna di quanto erano stati ricercati, che dovessero dire per ordine e comandamento suo. A questo modo Sua Santità hebbe una essatta e compita informazione d’ogni cosa.

[25] Poi, havuta questa informatione, [Sua Santità] fece chiamare a sé il P. Polanco et gli ordinò che disponesse le cose di tal maniera che non fosse eletto Generale spagnuolo. Et allhora interrogré molto essattamente di tutto quello che haveva inteso per vedere ciò che egli rispondeva. Et con le risposte che [Polanco] diceva restò Sua Santità molto poco sodisfatta di lui. L’istesso offitio fece l’Illustrissimo Farnese 183 da parte di Sua Santità con Polanco et [questi] contrastò sopra di questo molto alla lunga con Sua Signoria Illustrissima. Et benché il Cardinale l’esortasse ad obbedire et a non far tante [122] repliche, nientedimeno [Polanco] non si quietò. 184 Di tutto questo che trattò e col Papa e col Card. Farnese [Polanco] mai fece una minima parola con noi altri Assistenti, ma ben si vedeva ritirarsi con Madrid, Natale, 185 Ribadenera et altri Spagnuoli, il che ci dava non poco da pensare. Primo, per le cose che haveva fatte e dette in Lombardia. 2°, per esser venuto da Ferrara a Roma senza causa et haver procurato certo breve per il P. Borgia, nel quale il Papa si doleva della sua infirmità con allegarsi però d’haver veduto antiquum amicum et familiarem nostrum Polancum, parole che ci dettero gran sospetto et dipoi si seppe che il sudetto breve era stato formato e scritto da un amico suo che lo volse servire con quelle parole. 3°, perché, essendo [122v] ritornato a Ferrara, fece grandissima instanza al P. Natale, Vicario, 186 ché mandasse il sodetto breve per tutte le province oltramontane sotto pretesto che in questo si vedesse et s’intendesse l’amore che il Papa portava al Padre Generale. Ma l’intention sua fu, come dipoi si scoperse, che in tutta la Compagnia s’intendesse che gli era caro il Papa per quelle parole. Ma gli avenne tutto il contrario, perché in conspectu omnium nostrorum in camera del Papa restò confuso, come chiaramente si raccoglie da quello che Sua Santità gli disse, che è scritto e notato in un foglio da parte, quando andassimo

183 King Sebastian I of Portugal (1554–78). His confessor and companion was a
Portuguese Jesuit, Gonçalves da Câmara, a cousin of L. Henriques, confessor of the
182 It was probably Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the grandson of Pope Paul III
181 As vicar general Polanco was summoned by Pope Gregory XIII on 15 April
180 Pope Gregory XIII.
184 Pope Gregory XIII would have said that and suggested the candidacy of
185 Cardinal Alessandro Farnese.
186 Polanco’s objection was that excluding entire nation from the election would
constitute constitutional problems (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,”
p. 52).
187 Jerónimo Nadal (see above [12]–[13]).
188 Nadal was vicar general during Borja’s absence from Rome 1571–2.
per domandar la benedittione avanti il Collegio. Il ragionamento sopradetto che fece il Papa con Polanco ci fu narrato da un cardinale che l’haveva inteso [123] da Sua Santità. Il ragionamento e contrasto che passò con l’Illustissimo Farnese ce lo disse Aloisio Mendoza,189 il quale ancora che190 fosse Spagnuolo, gravemente s’offese di Polanco.

[26] Andassimo, il P. Canisio et io,191 con ordine d’una consulta che sopra ciò si fece a parlare a Sua Santità, che era in Frascati, sopra alcune cose che occorrevano per la morte del Cardinale d’Augusta.192 Et dipoi che furno trattate le cose per le quali eravamo andati, voltandosi a me Sua Santità, mi fece queste interrogationi in presenza del P. Canisio. Primo, se erano giunti i Padri che dovevano venire alla Congregatione. 2°, quante persone vi si dovevano trovar d’ogni natione. 3°, quanti voti erano necessari per fare un generale. Et benché fosse del tutto informato Sua Santità, nientedimeno da diverse [123 v] persone domandava per vedere se ci accordavamo insieme. Intendendo dalle risposte che io gli diedi, il gran numero dei voti che havevano i Spagnuoli, et come il P. Canisio193 non fosse elettore,194 et che dalla provincia sua in luogo di lui fossero venuti Spagnuoli, movendo il capo con grande admirazione disse, “Questo non sta bene. Faranno Spagnuoli ciò che vorranno.” Et volendo io escusare il fatto, allhora Sua Santità, stendendo la mano su la mia spalla, disse queste parole: “Non bisogna che una natione s’alzi tanto fra noi; non conoscete il francischino? Il vostro P. Lainez nel Concilio di Trento procurava che si riformassero le religioni194 et il franceschino gli disse: “Padre Lainez, ringratiate Dio...

---

189 See [16] where Palmio narrates that in the process of admission to the profession of four vows Mendoza was preferred over Fulvio Cardulo.
190 Meaning: even though.
191 From this account it is clear that Palmio influenced Pope Gregory’s decision to intervene during GC 3 as argued by Padberg (“The Third General Congregation,” p. 50).
192 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 38’).
193 Peter Canisius was not a delegate at the congregation. He happened to be in Rome at the time, having been summoned by the pope. The congregation invited him to attend without right to vote in the election of assistants (see decree 5 in Padberg, For Matters of Greater Importance, p. 139). The delegate from his Upper Germany province was the provincial Paul Hoffaeus, who was not a Spaniard.
194 Lainez took a very active part in all three sessions of the Council of Trent, but nothing is known about his dealings with the reformation of religious orders (see DHCJ 4:3833–7).

Et di ciò c’è stata[si] gran sospizione.196 Prima, per l’offitio che fece in Ferrara col Generale, acciò nominasse il Vicario, dicendo che se Dio permettesse altro della persona sua, che di certo sarebbe fatto Vicario un Italiano in Lombardia. 2.o, per haver condotto il povero Padre Francesco a Roma quasi per forza, che era moribondo.197 3.o, per le parole che gli disse l’istesso[pol] Padre per la strada: “Polanchilio Polanchiglio, tu vuoi essere Generale e nonch[ali] sarai Generale.”199 4.o, per haver detto lui etiandio al Lucio Croce200 che non poteva essere Generale se la persona non spagnuolo. 5.o, perché domandando in Roma a me et ad altri che giuditio si facesse del P. Natale et di Madrid et di [125] alcuni altri Spagnuoli, apertamente si lasciava intendere che niuno di loro era atto per il Generalato et così, exclusis illis, veniva a restar lui solo atto al Generalato. 6.o, perché propose nella Congregatione Generale se la persona poteva dare il voto a se stessa con buona con-scienza, giudicandosi più degna et più idonea di tutti. Et questo parlare

---

195 On 15 April 1573, three days after the congregation convened but before the period of four days, the quatri duo, had passed.
196 Compare Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 38 and 39).
197 See above [14].
198 Meaning: never (from Spanish “nunca”). The Spanish Jesuits in Rome spoke a sort of Span-lian.
199 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, f. 38), where Palmio reveals that Luisio Mendoza, Agostino Mazzin, and Marcos (Borja’s servant) narrated this episode.
200 Between the years 1532 and 1596 (see Scaduto, Catalogo, p. 39).
dispiacque a tutti e si dubitò che disegnasse la propria sua persona, massime che si sapeva che né lui né altri havrebbono dato il voto né a Natale né a Salmerone, che erano quelli sopra i quali si poteva disegnare della natione spagnuola.\textsuperscript{201}

[27] La 4.\textsuperscript{a} causa è stata la protesta che fecero i Padri Portughesi\textsuperscript{202} che andarobbono al Papa, si non si dava ordine firmissimo ché non fosse [un] nuovo\textsuperscript{additum in margine} [125'] Christiano eletto generale. Et come si è detto di sopra, vedendo che c’era pericolo che Polanco fosse eletto, dettero le lettere che havevano portate dal Re di Portogallo, dal Re Filippo\textsuperscript{203} et Cardinale di Portogallo\textsuperscript{204} al Papa et a diversi cardinali.\textsuperscript{205}

\textsuperscript{additum in margine:} La 4.a causa viene dalla protesta che fecero [sic] portughesi per escludere il P. Polanco

\textsuperscript{201} One wonders why Polanco and others would not vote for Nadal or Salmerón.

\textsuperscript{202} The Portuguese Jesuits attending the Congregation were Pedro da Fonseca, Inácio Martins, and Leão Henríques—a substitute for the sick provincial Jorge Serrão (see Rodrigues, \textit{História da Companhia}, 2/1:307). The latter’s right to participate in the congregation was questioned for he was appointed rather than elected as delegate (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” pp. 51–2).

\textsuperscript{203} Ribadeneyra claimed that Philip wrote to his ambassador in Rome, Juan de Zúñiga, on Henríques’s request, but unaware of the latter’s intrigues (see Medina, “Everard Mercurian and Spain. Some Burning Issues,” p. 945).

\textsuperscript{204} The uncle of King Sebastian, Cardinal Infant Don Enrique (see Padberg, “The Third General Congregation,” pp. 53–4). After the election of Mercurian, Pope Gregory XIII wrote letters to both King Sebastian and Cardinal Henry on 10 September 1575, in which he assured them that he sought to satisfy their desires insofar they were made known to him. They are preserved in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Arm. 44, vol. 22, ff. 65\textsuperscript{v}–66\textsuperscript{v} (see Gonçalves, “Jesuits in Portugal,” pp. 710–1). Henry’s anti-converso feelings were confirmed on other occasions: he pressed to remove the rector of the University of Évora, Paulo Ferrer, appointed to the position by Borja, because of his converso provenance (ARSI, \textit{Lus.} 68, f. 51).

\textsuperscript{205} Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae} 164, f. 37\textsuperscript{v}): “La provincia di Portogallo talmente si trovava alterata et turbata che i Padri vene ro rissoluti di fare ogni cosa acciò che il generalato non andasse in mano di novi cristiani, come facilmente poteva avvenire. Portorno adunque lettere al Papa del Re di Portogallo et del Cardinale et de alcuni Spagnuoli […] nelle quali si supplicava S.S. che prove desse in ogni modo che il generalato non venesse in mano de novi Christiani […] Narravano insieme molte cose orende et scandalose de i novi cristiani condanati dall’Inquisitione in Portogallo et in Spagna, donde nasceva che erano in tanto odio appresso tutti et che tanto da loro si temeva” (37\textsuperscript{v}). See also Palmio’s autobiography, f. 96 and, especially, ff. 100–2: “Ché questi novi cristiani siano esclusi non solo dall’elettione, ma etiandio dalla Compagnia et intendo che questo è che pretendono il Re di Spagna e di Portogallo et con questa intenzione erano venuti questi Padri portughesi e non l’hanno nascosto questa loro intenzione, ma chiaramente l’hanno proposta et l’hanno domandata con grande instanza che la Congregatione vi prove desse, [because] nella nostra Compagnia che tutta è occupata nella dottrina et fede catholica e però ha bisogno d’huomini che non habbiano macchia alcuna et hanno insieme protestato e detto pubblicamente che faccino ricorso a S.S.tà se la Congregatione non vi prove deva e così lo fecero: […] volevano che si facesse decreto \textit{de excludendis istis neophytis}.”
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Zúñiga, on Henríques’s request, but unaware of the latter’s intrigues (see Medina, 204 205 Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, provenance (ARSI, 204 The uncle of King Sebastian, Cardinal Infant Don Enrique (see Padberg, “Th e 205 The Portuguese Jesuits attending the Congregation were Pedro da Fonseca, 203 Ribadeneyra claimed that Philip wrote to his ambassador in Rome, Juan de 202 Th e Cardinal’s right to participate in 201 Et parendo a tutta la 200 appendix i 199 The Holy Roman Church

208 Paul Hoff aeus was superior of German Province (1569–81) and Assistant

207 Miguel de Torres (1509–93) was provincial of Portugal (1552–3, 1555–61) and

of Andalusia (1554–5), and rector in Lisbon (see DHCJ 4:3824).

206 Bartolomeo Gallio (1527–1607) was the Cardinal Secretary of State 1572–85. He

was born near Como and hence was called “cardinal of Como” (see The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church: http://www.fiu.edu/~mirandas/bios1565.htm).

209 Cardinal Gallio arrived on the day of the ballot (April 22), interrupting

Possevino’s speech to the congregation on the necessary virtues that the newly elected

superior general should have.

210 Read: chiesa.

211 In his account of the congregation, Sacchini wrote that Polanco explained to

Galli that they would obey, but that the situation presented grave difficulties meriting

further discussion (see Sacchini, Historiae, p. 5 and Padberg, “Th e Third General

Congregation,” p. 54).
Congregazione cosa troppo indegna che si mettesse in dubbio fra noi, se si doveva obedire al comandamento pontificio, [Polanco] determinò di mandar quattro persone a Sua Santità, sì per renderle le debite gra- 
tie per la cura che si degnava tener di noi, sì per pregarla humilissima-
mente [perché] si contentasse lasciare la [127] elettione del Generale 
libera alla Congregazione. Fossimo elletti quattro per far questo offitio 
col Papa et uno fu di questi il P. Leone, Portughese, che haveva portate 
e date le sodette lettere.\footnote{According to Ribadeneyra’s account, on the cardinal’s departure the Spanish del-
egates did not reply and the delegates from other provinces were enraged at who may 
be the author of the intrigue. All eyes turned to the Portuguese and Leão Henríques 
threw himself on his knees, confessed his conspiracy and asked for forgiveness, offer-
ing himself to go back to the pope and request that Gregory revoke his interference. 
See \textit{Historia de la Compañía de Jesús de las provincias de España y parte de las del 
Peru y nueva España y Philippinas} (ARSI, \textit{Hisp. 94}, ff. 112–3). See also ARSI, \textit{Congr. 
20b}, f. 210r.} Havendo la Sua Santità di Nostro Signore inteso l’humile domanda che si gli fece da parte della Congregazione, 
benignissimamente si contentò [di] concenderli\footnote{Read: concedere loro.} ciò che dimandava, 
ma con questa conditione che, accadendo che fosse eletto Spagnuolo, 
non si publicasse, se prima non se gli faceva intendere la persona che 
era stata eletta, perché veramente non fu mai intentione né di Sua 
Santità, né dei sudetti Re, né di persona alcuna della Congregazione 
escludere la nation spagnuola da Generale, ma solamente provedere\footnote{See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, \textit{Vitae 164}, f. 39).} 
che il generalato non andasse in mano di [un] Christiano nuovo.\footnote{Mercurian was elected on 23 April.} Il giorno seguente adunque, dopo che si ottenne la libertà dal Papa, 
fu eletto Generale il P. [127v] Everardo Mercuriale.\footnote{The four assistants general were elected on 9 May: Oliver Mannaerts for 
Germany, France, and Flanders; Gil González Dávila (\textit{in absentia}) for Spain; Pedro 
da Fonseca for Portugal; and Benedetto Palmio for Italy, who indeed was assistant 
general already under Borja.} Dipoi si eles-
sero i quattro Assistenti che furono: Fonseca della natione Portughese, 
Egidio per la Spagnuola, per le nationi tramontane Oliverio, per l’Italia 
io che erol ancora stato Assistente del P. Francesco Borgia.\footnote{Th e four assistants general were elected on 9 May: Oliver Mannaerts for 
Germany, France, and Flanders; Gil González Dávila (\textit{in absentia}) for Spain; Pedro 
da Fonseca for Portugal; and Benedetto Palmio for Italy, who indeed was assistant 
general already under Borja.} [29] La\textsuperscript{ib} 5\textsuperscript{a} causa fu l’indignatione del P. Polanco che nella 
Congregazione dei definitori, che eravamo dodici, lesse una scrittura
per la quale narrava l’eletione del Generale come ambita e procurata. Crebbero i disturbi per il decreto che l’anteposero alcuni di questi nuovi Christiani in favor loro, per il quale pretendevano che nuluno potevall’essere escluso dal Generalato sotto questo titolo [solo] perché fosse Christiano nuovo.217 A questo decreto si opposero i Portughesi con decreto contrario che presentorno, acciò restasse questa gente in [128] perpetuo esclusa dal Generalato. Per ottenere adunque questi neofiti l’intento loro procurarono secretissimamente per mezzo di un Cardinale [di] ottenere che il Papa comandasse che la Congregatione accettasse il decreto da loro proposto. Et procurarono fare ancora appresso Sua Santità sospetta l’eletione del Generale et dell’Assistente del Portogallo. Sopra queste cose si fece grandissima inquisitione per ordine del Generale et, essendosi eletti cinque padri di diverse nationi,218 gli fu commesso et ordinato che procurassesero d’intendere se nell’ottenere [il voto] n’era intraventuta macchia alcuna d’ambizione.219 Et havendo questi padri fatta la debita diligenza col giuramento in publica congregazione, attestorno che le eletzioni erano state legittimamente fatte et che falsa era l’accusatione che fu deferita a Sua Santità. Però l’istessa Congregatione [128v] ordinò che il Generale dasse piena informazione della diligenza che s’era usata et della verità che s’era trovata con dichiarargli insieme che la Congregatione giudicava che per mantenere la pace et unione nella Congregatione niuno dei sodetti decreti si dovesse accettare et approvare, rimettendosi però in questo et in ogni altra cosa a quanto havesse ordinato et comandato Sua Santità, la cui risposta fu laude il parere della Congregatione, come appare dalla relatione che gli fece il Generale per ordine della

---

217 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSi, *Vitae 164*, f. 43r–44), where Palmio writes also about a decree promoted mainly by Dionisio Vázquez on taking out of the General Exam the question about being New or Old Christian, which was strongly opposed by Palmio who was part of the team of *definitori*.

218 When the pope learned about these allegations, he summoned Salmerón on 22 May to inquire about the scandal. The day after, Salmerón informed the congregation about his visit to the pope and Mercurian asked to set up a committee to investigate the charges. After a week of work, the committee composed of Salmerón, Francisco Adorno, Hoffaeus, Claude Matthieu, and Miguel de Torres unanimously judged that there were no irregularities (see ARSi, *Congr. 20b*, ff. 190r–v and 198r–v).

219 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSi, *Vitae 164*, f. 39r)

220 Read: desse.
Congregazione che si trova scritta in un foglio separato con la risposta del Papa.\footnote{I have been unable to trace this document.}

[30] Dalla esclusione di questo decreto che volevano fare i neofiti avvenne che si deliberò di far tutti gli officii possibili, come han fatto appresso il Re di Spagna et il suo \footnote{The movement of memorialistas. See above [11] and [21].} consiglio, per separar la Spagna dall’obbedienza del Generale.\footnote{See above ([8], [13], and [20]–[21]).} Et l’autor principale di questa mala impresa è stato Dionisio Vasches, del quale s’è parlato di sopra,\footnote{Letters destined to the exclusive (soli) view of the superior general.} con molti altri che si trovano notati nei soli\footnote{Pablo Hernández was Mercurian’s envoy to Spain (see Philip Endean, “The Strange Style of Prayer”: Mercurian, Cordeses, and Álvarez,” in McCoog, ed., The Mercurian Project, pp. 362–4).} del P. Paolo Ernandes,\footnote{Antonio Cordeses (1518–1601) was admitted to the Society by Araoz in 1542. At the time of GC 3 he was provincial of Aragón. In 1573 he was appointed rector of the Penitentiary in Rome and superior of the Province of Toledo (–1578). During his tenure in Gandía and Aragón, he promoted the apostolate with moriscos (see \textit{DHCJ} 1:952–3). He accused Ribadeneyra, Solier, and Santander of being part of the memorialistas movement.} Alarcon et Cordoses\footnote{A paraphrase of \textit{Philippians} 2:21.} che dettero informazione fedele e prima di tutti gli officii che faceva la lega di costoro in Spagna contra del Generale della Compagnia.

[31] La 6$^a$ è stato il gran mancamento del P. Everardo, il quale da se stesso s’intricò, lasciandosi ingannar da alcuni che cercavano \textit{quae sua erant, non quae Jesu Christi},\footnote{On how Mercurian’s election “implied a sharp blow to the unity and charity within the Society,” see Medina, “Everard Mercurian and Spain. Some Burning Issues,” pp. 945sq.} et suscitò grandi scandalì et tumulti nella Compagnia.\footnote{This document is unknown.} Prima, perché volse difendere l’insolenza di Mazarino contra l’Illustissimo Borromeo. 2$^o$, perché si messe a perseguire [129$^v$] ingiustamente et troppo impetuosamente due padri che havevano data certa informatione al Papa, acciò, come Padre benignissimamente che c’era, si degnasse avvisare il Generale che provedesse ad alcune cose. Et di questa istoria, perché è [stata] scritta alla lunga separatamente,\footnote{Th is document is unknown.} non dirò qui altro. Et havendo havuti i memoriali che furno dati al Re di Spagna contra di lui et della Compagnia, tacque, lasciando di fare la provisione che doveva et che poteva massime essendo stato informato il Sommo Pontefice di questi mali officii che si facevano in
Spagna. Et havendo animo deliberato per l’amor grande che portava alla Compagnia di voler disfare et annichilare queste fattioni, ma il Generale, mettendosi a far quello che non doveva né poteva legitimamente fare, [130] lasciò correre le cose di Spagna senza farne una minima dimostrazione et, perché non se gli pose il rimedio quando se gli poteva mettere. Vedo che anderanno crescendo tanto [le fationi] che causeranno ruina e confusione estrema nella Compagnia, se Dio per sua infinita misericordia non provvede.

[32] La 7a causa della quale sono proceduti molti travagli della Compagnia è stata l’essattione delle legitime,220 sopra che haverei da scrivere molti fogli di carta. Et non è stata provincia alcuna delle nostre che di questa essattione gravissimamente non si sia lamentata per le querele et infamie che in ogni banda si sentivano spargersi contra di noi. In ogni luogo si litigava per essigere le legitime et per molte [130v] settimane nella 2a e 3a Congregatione Generale si disputò alla lunga con desiderio di levar questo scandalo che il mondo riceveva contra di noi.221 I Principi, le Repubbliche [et] le Comunità gridavano contra di noi et i Padri di Spagna nella 2a Congregatione presentorno decreti fatti dal Re contra queste essattioni. Et con tutta la diligenza che si facesse per cavar danari da tutte le bande per sostenere il Collegio Romano che non haverave fundazione alcuna, nella 3a Congregatione lo ritrovasimo aggravato di 23,000 scudi di debito.231 Come per essere sovvenuto et aiutato più volte ne ho parlato a Sua Santità et a molti cardinali con dargli232 una esatta informazione dello stato del Collegio et dei debiti che haveramo et del modo et delle cause, le quali si [131] erano fatte. Finalmente, essendo restata Sua Santità chiarità della verità et conoscendo il frutto che sì raccoglieva dal Collegio Romano, ci cominciò a provvedere, come l’haverave supplicato, di 5 mila scudi l’anno, sin che se gli offerisce occasione di fundarlo, come mi promesse di volerlo fondare. Et questa promessa, come si vede, liberarissimamente l’ha compita. Et se non haveravamo havuto l’aiuto di questo benedetto Pontefice, senza fallo sarebbe andato a terra il Collegio di Roma. Et Dio ci fece conoscere che quando si fossimo disposti a lasciar tante liti che si facevano et seguitar la sententia dell’Apostolo per publica edificazione

220 Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 20r—).
221 See Decree 8 of GC 2 and Decrees 17 and 20 of GC 3 in Padberg, For Matters of Greater Moment, pp. 113, 141–3.
222 See Palmio’s autobiography (ARSI, Vitae 164, ff. 40–41v).
223 Read: con dare loro.
del mondo, *quia omnia licent, sed non omnia expedient*,\(^{234}\) come veramente ci ha proveduto, et liberati dall’infamia che si sentiva in ogni banda [131v] spargersi contra la Compagnia.

[33] Et acciò che si veda a che [cosa] ci haveva ridotto la cura della robba con pretesto però buono d’allevare giovani al servitio di Dio, solo\(^{235}\) per fine\(^{235}\) voglio contare. Venne a stare a Roma una Signora Lucretia, Siciliana, et essendosi maritata con un gentilhuomo, offerse tutta la sua robba, che era di qualche valore, con conditione che la volevano godere loro in vita et che dopo la morte restasse alla religione, purché la Compagnia pigliasse l’assunto di litigare et districare questa facoltà et che a nome della Compagnia si litigasse per l’autorità che tiene in Sicilia, facendo però loro tutta la spesa. Il padre, che era dal P. Borgia deputato a trattare il negotio della robba, persuase al Generale, senza domandare [132] parere agli assistenti, come si faceva per ordinario in simili materie che si accettasse simile partito; ma, havendo ciò inteso gli Assistenti, procurorno che si repudiasse come cosa indegna della nostra religione.\(^{236}\) Ma perché già s’era abbracciata tal impresa, si procurò d’andare avanti et di qui ne successero tanti inconvenienti che cilvi confondevamo\(^{237}\) quando ci erano detti. Et Dio per sua misericordia ce ne liberò et non permesse che simili facoltà venissero alla Compagnia et per tal mezzo. Queste sono sette cause brevemente raccolte, donde sono nati i mali nostri, et humilmente prego la Maestà di Dio che ce ne liberi et conservi in gloria sua questa vigna *quam dextera sua plantavit*.\(^{238}\)

---

\(^{234}\) 1 Corinthians 10:23.

\(^{235}\) Read: alla fine.

\(^{236}\) Meaning: of the Society of Jesus.

\(^{237}\) Meaning: we were embarrassed.

\(^{238}\) Psalm 79:16.
Nicolaus, Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, ad futuram rei memoriam:

Humani generis inimicus, illico quo verbum Dei cadere in bonam terram conspexit, operam dedit seminare zizaniam, ut, conculcato semine, nullum fructum produceret; prout vas electionis, Paulus apostolus, precipuus huius zizanie extirpator, refert quod in initio inter conversos ad fidem differentia antelationis exorta est, Iudeis cum gentilibus de prelatione certantibus, alii alter in Dei Ecclesiam scisuram inducere cupientibus, cum alii Cephae, alii Apollinis esse certarent; Redemptor noster hec providens, ab initio nascentis Ecclesie ordinavit: qui huiusmodi zizaniam extirparent, humanaque imbecillitate pec-cantibus aut laxis occurrerent; prout ipse Apostolus ad Romanos scri-bens, omne huius antelationis dissidium divinis verbis evertit; atque Petrus, apostolorum princeps, in singulis diocesis ordinatis episco-pis, omnem schismatum occasionem submovit. Nos, Redemptoris nostri exemplo, cuius vice ad huiusmodi potissime tollenda dissidia, locum, licet inimeriti, tenemus in terris, prefatorum exemplis edocti, omni vigili cura compellimur operam dare ut his, qui inter fideles pos-sent aliquam divisionem parere, nostri pontificalis officii auctoritate occurramus, ut inter fideles caritas, amor ac unitas vigeat. Nihil enim est quod tam inter fideles conveniat quam quod in omnibus sit velle unum, inquiente Apostolo: sicut enim corpus unum est et membra multa habet, omnia autem membra corporis, cum sint multa, unum corpus sunt, ita et Christus; etenim in uno spiritu omnes nos in unum corpus baptizati sumus, sive Iudei sive gentiles, sive servi, sive liberi; omnes in uno spiritu potati sumus; unum corpus, et unus spiritus, sicut vocati estis in unam spem vocationis vestre. Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptismus, unus Deus et Pater omnium. Percepiimus quos-dam novos zizanie seminatores, affectantes huius unitatis et pacis, fidei nostre salutare fundamentum corrupere; ac, quod per vas electionis apostolum Paulum extirpatum fuerat, dissidium, in diversis partibus, maxime in regnis carissimo filio nostro Ioanni, Castelle et Legionis regi illustri, subjectis, renovare; ausu temerarioasserere quod qui, aut
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ex gentilitate aut ex iudaismo, aut ex alio quovis errore christianae fidei
veritatem cognoverunt et baptizati sunt, et, quod gravius est, eorum
filios, propter novam assumptionem fidei non debere ad honores,
dignitates, officia, tabellionatus et ad testimonium in christicularum
causis perhibendum admitti; eos verbis et factis contumeliis afficiences;
que, cum a Redemptoris nostri institutis aliena sint, eodem apostolo
Paulo testante, cum dicit: Gloria et honor et pax omni operanti bonum,
Iudeo et Greco; non est enim acceptio personarum apud Deum; et:
Omnis qui credit in illum non confundetur; non enim est distinctio
Iudei et Greci; nam idem Dominus omnium, dives in omnes qui invo-
cant illum; et alibi: In Christo Iesu nec circumcisio aliquid valet, nec
preputium, sed fides que per caritatem operatur. Hos, ut a veritate
fidei catholice aberrantes, ad viam veritatis deducere, et quatenus qui
in premisis excederent, animadvertere cupientes, cum non tam aucto-
ritatibus premisis divinis contradicant, sed et illustrium principum
quondam Alphonsi, Sapientis cognominati, et Henrici, et carissimi filii
nostri Ioannis moderni, Castelle et Legionis regum, pro fidei augmento
perpetuis sanctionibus authenticis litteris eorum sigillis munitis, gravi-
bus penis vallatis, et per nos visis et mature discussis, quibus sanxerunt
ut inter noviter conversos ad fidei, maxime de populo israelitico, et
antiquos christianos, nulla in honoribus, dignitatibus, officiis tam
ecclesiasticis quam secularibus suspiciendis et habendis discretio fie-
ret; ac affectantes, ut quisque que recta sunt sapiat; et qui, contra chri-
stiane legis normam, falsa seminare et proximos scandalizare, que
unitatis et pacis contraria sunt presumpsit, debitis penis affecti,
eorum errores agnoscant; prefatorum principum ordinationes et
decreta, ut iuri et sacris canonibus conformia, super his edita, ex nostro
proprio motu et certa scientia approbamus, confirmamus et apostolice
auctoritatibus munimine roboramus, ac omnibus et singulis cuiuscum-
que status, gradus aut conditionis aut in futurum convertendo, seu ex gen-
tilitate vel iudaismo aut ex quavis secta venerint aut venire contigerit,
ac eorum posteros tam ecclesiasticos quam secularis, catholice et
secundum quod decet christianum viventes, ad omnes dignitates,
hores officia, tabellionatus, testium depositiones, et ad omnia alia,
ad que alii christiani quantumcumque antiqui admissi solent, admit-
tant; nec propter fidei novam receptionem, inter eos et aliis christia-
nos discretionem faciant, nec verbis aut facto contumeliis afficiant, nec
affici permittant, sed omni eorum possibilitate contradictant et oppo-
nant; et eos omni caritate sequantur et profiteantur sine persona-
rum acceptione; omnes catholicos unum esse corpus in Christo secundum nostre fidei doctrinam, quos omnes tales esse, et pro talibus ab omnibus haberi harum serie decernimus et declaramus. Verum si qui ex his post baptismis reperiantur christianorum fidei non sapere, aut gentilium et ludeorum errores sectari, vel dolo aut ignorantia christiane fidei non servare precepta, quibus casibus que in Toletanis conciliis et maxime in capitulo Constituit, et alibi contra huiusmodi apostatas a fide Christi, non pariter cum alis fidelibus bonis ad huiu-
smodi honores admissendos decreta sunt, locum sibi vindicant, prout prefati reges recte sacros canones intelligentes in premissis eorum con-
stitutionibus, quasdam eorum regnorum leges interpretati sunt, aut alias minus quam christiano conveniat agere aut sapere. Qui de hoc scandalizatus fuerit, adeat ad competentem iudicem, et quod iustum est fieri, publica auctoritate iuris, servato ordine studeat; nec quisquam propria auctoritate, aut iuris ordine non servato, contra divinarum humanarumque legum doctrinam alicui in eos aut eorum aliquem audeat attentare. Et quia parum est ordinationes fieri, nisi sint qui eas tueantur, venerabilibus fratribus archiepiscopo Hispalensi, aut qui nunc est, aut pro tempore erit dicte Ecclesie commendatario, et Toletano episcopo, ac Palentino, Abulense et Cordubense episcopis, necnon directo filio abbati monasterii sancti Facundi Legionis dioce-
seos, et cuilibet eorum in solidum, committimus et mandamus ut con-
tra eos, qui contraria premissis in posterum dogmatizare presumpserint, et prefatis Christi fidelibus verbo aut facto propter premissa injurias intulerint, aut hacenus intulerunt, et contra prestantes auxilium, con-
silium vel favorem, omni iuris sollemnitate omissa, sola facti veritate inspecta, singulis diebus et horis, ad privationis, inhabilitationis, per-
sonalis capture, et alias penas pecuniarias, prout qualitas delicti requi-
rere videbitur, procedant, vel alter eorum procedat; non obstantibus felicis recordationis Bonifacii Pape octavi predecessoris nostri, quibus cavetur ne quis extra suam civitatem et diocesim, nisi in certis exceptis casibus, et in illis ultra unam dietam a fine sue dioceos, ad iudicium evocetur; seu ne iudices a Sede Apostolica deputati, predicta extra civi-
tatem et diocesim in quibus deputati fuerint, contra quoscumque pro-
cedere; sive alii vel aliiis vices suas committere, aut aliquos ultra unam dietam a fine dioceosorum quodem trahere presumant, ac de duabus dietis in concilio generali; quam alii constitutionibus a Romanis Pontificibus predecessoribus nostri, tam iudicibus delegatis, quam alii, edictis, que archiepiscoporum, abbatum, et aliorum predictorum,
ac cuiuslibet eorum iurisdictioni ac potestati, possent quomodolibet
obviare, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque; seu si alicui vel aliqubus
communiter vel divisim a dicta Sede indultum sit, quod interdici,
suspendi vel excommunica, aut ultra vel citra ad iudicium evocari
non possint, per litteras apostolicas non facientes plenam et expres-
sam, ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto huiusmodi, mentionem. Sane,
quia difficile foret presentes litteras ad singula in quibus forsam de eis
fides facienda foret, loca deferri volumus, et dicta auctoritate aposto-
lica decernimus quod earum vero transumpto manu publica suscripto
et alicuius ecclesiastice persone curie sigillo munito, fides plenaria
adhibeat, et proinde stetur ac si ipse presentes littere producere forent
seu ostense: contradictores per censuram ecclesiasticam, appellatione
postposita, compescendo. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc
paginam nostre approbationis, confirmationis, roborationis, mandati,
constitutionis, et declarationis et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu
temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare presumperit, indi-
gnationem omnipotentis Dei, et beatorum Petri et Pauli, apostolorum
eius, se noverit incursurum. Datis febrarii, Camarinensi diocesis,
anno Incarnationis dominice millesimo quadragesimo nono, octavo kalendas octobris, pontificatus nostri anno tertio.”

Source: Oropesa, Luz [Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes,
2002], cap. XXXVIII.
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