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This volume contains the fruits of a conference organized at the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna on 23–25 October 2013. We brought together 15 specialists on the history of medieval Judaism to discuss the legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz. Bernhard Blumenkranz was born in Vienna in 1913 to a family of Polish Jews.1 He went to France at about the time of the Anschluss; he was arrested and placed in the Gurs prison camp in Pyrénées Atlantique, where the Vichy government interred foreign-born Jews. He escaped from Gurs and made his way to Switzerland, where he stayed out the war in Basel and prepared a doctorate at the University of Basel on the portrayal of Jews in the works of Augustine.2

After the war, he moved to France and wrote a thèse d’État entitled ‘Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430–1096’ (Jews and Christians in the Western World, 430–1096). Through his numerous publications and through the foundation of two important research institutions (the Mission française des archives juives in 1961, and the « Nouvelle Gallia Judaica » in 1971), he revitalized the study of Jewish history in France and in Europe. His many publications and his teaching had a profound impact on the scholarship concerning medieval Jewish history and on the history of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. Most of his rich production falls into three areas. His earliest work deals with Christian perceptions of Jews and Jewish-Christian relations in the early Middle Ages: from Augustine to the first crusade. Much of this work involved the close study of Latin texts, for some of which he produced critical editions (notably Gilbert Crispin’s Disputatio judei et christiani, published in Utrecht in 1956).1 His second major field of research, beginning in the 1960s, was the place of Jews in Medieval Christian iconography. Finally, towards the end of his career, he wrote extensively about the history of the Jews in France, from the Middle Ages to the modern era.

In all of these areas, Bernhard Blumenkranz’s work was fundamental in reassessing and in reinvigorating research. A generation of scholars has been profoundly influenced by his work, and much of the work in these three fields over the past fifty years has been built on the foundations that he laid. In some cases his conclusions have been called into question or nuanced: for example on the First

---

1 This brief biography is based on ‘Blumenkranz, Bernhard,’ in Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Judaïsme, Geoffrey Wigoder and Sylvie Anne Goldberg, ed. (Paris: R. Laffont, 1996) and on Gilbert Dahan’s preface to Bernhard Blumenkranz, Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430–1096 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006).
Crusade as a break between an early Medieval Christian society largely tolerant of Jews and a later Medieval society overwhelmingly hostile. But even where scholars have argued against his positions, they have acknowledged their fundamental debt to the questions he posed and to his ground-breaking research in the field.


We would like to thank all of those who made possible this conference and this publication. The conference grew out of an international European collaboration. In France, we benefitted from the contribution of the JACOV team («De Juifs à Chrétiens : aux origines des valeurs») at the University of Toulouse, the Nouvelle Gallia Judaica (a research unit founded by Bernhard Blumenkranz) and the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme Ange Guépin in Nantes. Our Austrian partners were the Historisch-Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät of the Universität Wien; the Institut für Geschichte of the Universität Wien; the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung embedded at the same University; the Institute for Jewish History in Austria, and last but not least the Institut für Mittelalterforschung der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, which hosted the conference (with special thanks to Walter Pohl). Franco-Austrian help came from the Institut Français de Vienne. Particular thanks go to Nicolas Stefanni in Nantes and Karin Jirik in Vienna for their handling of the logistics. Last but not least, thanks to the European Research Council (ERC), which provided funding
through the RELMIN project (*The Legal Status of Religious Minorities in the Euro-Mediterranean World, Fifth-Fifteenth Centuries*). Our thanks also to Brepols and in particular to Loes Diercken for help with the publication.

This volume is part of a wider reflection, as the seventh volume of the collection *Religion and law in Medieval Christian and Muslim Societies* on social and legal status of religious minorities in the Medieval world. The first volume, *The Legal Status of Dhimmī-s in the Islamic West*, published in 2013, examined the laws regarding Christian and Jews living in Islamic societies of Europe and the Ḍār al-Ḥarb and the extent to which such legal theory translate into concrete measures regulating interreligious relations. The second volume in this series (published in 2014), was devoted to *Jews in Early Christian Law: Byzantium and the Latin West, 6th-11th centuries*. Volume 3, *Religious cohabitation in European towns (10th-15th centuries)*, was published in 2014, as was volume 4, a monograph by Clara Maillard entitled *Les papes et le Maghreb aux XIIIème et XIVème siècles: Étude des lettres pontificales de 1199 à 1419*. Volume 5 (2015) was devoted to *Expulsion and Diaspora Formation: Religious and Ethnic Identities in Flux from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century*, whereas volume 6 (2015), opening up comparative perspectives from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century, addresses *Religious minorities, integration and the State* Subsequent volumes, to be published in 2016, are *Law and Religious minorities in Medieval Societies: between theory and praxis*; and *Medieval Minorities: Law and Multiconfessional Societies in the Middle Ages*. And the RELMIN database continues to make available online key legal sources of the Middle Ages concerning religious minorities.4

Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan

---

4 http://www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/.
With your indulgence, I would like to begin this contribution on a brief personal note, a note of appreciation for generosity on the part of the scholar memorialized in this conference. During the summer of 1965, I arrived in Paris to begin a year of research toward my Columbia University dissertation. My advisor – Gerson Cohen – had written to Bernhard Blumenkranz to introduce me, and I followed up by contacting him. Bernhard Blumenkranz was extraordinarily kind to me; he provided orienting guidance, invited me to join his seminar at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, met with me from time to time during the year, and invited my wife and me to his home. I have always felt grateful for his encouragement and support at this early point in my career and thus welcomed with delight the invitation to situate the œuvre of Blumenkranz.

In this chapter entitled ‘Medieval Christian–Jewish Relations in the Writings of Bernhard Blumenkranz’, I shall focus on Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages as projected by Bernhard Blumenkranz in his *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430–1096* (which was in effect a continuation of his important doctoral study on Saint Augustine).1 In order to comprehend both Blumenkranz’s study of Christian–Jewish relations in his dissertation and in *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental*, it is necessary to recall the circumstances under which he began his academic career in Paris.

This was a period during which the material devastation of World War II was still very much in evidence, as was the destruction of institutions of intellectual life. France had long been the center of active and important Jewish studies prior to the war, but the institutional frameworks for supporting research and the training of young scholars were decimated. Blumenkranz’s life – like so many other lives – had been radically disoriented by developments during the 1930s and the eventual war. He had left his native Austria in the face of the rise of Nazism, had suffered internment in France and had made his way to Switzerland, and there

---

had completed his valuable doctoral dissertation on Saint Augustine. Once resettled in France subsequent to the end of the war, Blumenkranz became an integral part of – indeed a leader in – the effort in France to revitalize the study of the Jewish past. To do so, he created a number of important vehicles for collecting and disseminating the sources that reflect French-Jewish history and for publishing valuable scholarly works as well.

The same post-war environment influenced the foci of Blumenkranz’s own scholarship. The rise of anti-Semitism as an intellectual and eventually political force in Europe made the issue of Judaism and the Jews central to much Western thinking during the closing decades of the nineteenth century and the opening decades of the twentieth. The anti-Semites made a series of damaging assertions about Jews – their nature, their history, and reactions to them over the ages. According to anti-Semitic thinking and research, Jews were indisputably different from their neighbors, at least in all Western societies. It was further alleged that Jews had a lengthy – indeed interminable – history of causing serious harm to societies that hosted them. The harmfulness of the Jews was – in the anti-Semitic view – widely recognized and acted upon. Jews were allegedly the objects of unceasing hatred on the part of their majority neighbors. This in effect made the modern phenomenon of anti-Semitism merely the continuation of age-old and ubiquitous anti-Jewish sentiment, although the anti-Semites claimed to have reached more accurate perceptions and more penetrating analysis of the purported ‘Jewish problem.’

These claims were widely accepted in broad sectors of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century European society. They had to be challenged by those who found them inaccurate or in fact abhorrent, and they were indeed vigorously combatted. A number of alternative explanations for recurrent Judeophobia were proposed by Western thinkers, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. Some Jews and non-Jews were attracted to economic causation as the explanation for historic anti-Jewish sentiment. Jews – it was claimed – had been denied open access to majority economies and had, as a result, gravitated to banking and moneylending, both of which have historically been unpopular. Other observers were attracted to sociological considerations. Jews had allowed themselves to accept minority status in the societies of others over the ages, thereby forfeiting the normality of almost all other peoples, who lived in majority societies in their own lands. Societal minorities are often disliked and feared by their majority neighbors, and – in this sociological view – so it was over the ages with the Jewish minorities.2

2 The focus on Jewish economic and sociological deformities was paramount among the Jewish nationalist and Zionist thinkers and historians. For discussion of both groups, see the valuable overview of Michael Brenner, Prophets of the Past: Interpreters of Jewish History (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), Chapters 3 and 5.
Yet another perspective on anti-Jewish sentiment highlighted historical factors, especially the role of Christianity and the Church. In the 1930s, as the Nazis were coming to power, the English clergyman James Parkes argued that, despite the Nazi claim to have left religious considerations behind, in fact anti-Semitism could be traced back into the history of Christianity. Parkes projected the history of anti-Semitism as a three-part saga, beginning in Antiquity with the earliest stages in the development of Christianity, intensifying during the Middle Ages under altered circumstances, and culminating in what Parkes saw as the frightening specter of modern anti-Semitism. Immediately after the end of the war, the French historian and thinker Jules Isaac made a powerful and influential case for the Christian roots of modern anti-Semitism. Isaac’s views had enormous impact on a number of Christian churches and on broad public opinion.

All this was very much in the air as Blumenkranz began his scholarly career and profoundly influenced his scholarship. His doctoral dissertation on Augustine represented an effort to analyze the thinking of one of the major synthesizers – indeed the major synthesizer – of early Christianity. Blumenkranz proceeded from Augustine onward in what is arguably his most important scholarly contribution, his Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental. In one sense, Blumenkranz in Juifs et chrétiens was simply moving along chronologically, from late Antiquity to the first half of the Middle Ages. However, the movement involved much more than simple chronology. His doctoral dissertation focused on one man, Augustine of Hippo – a giant to be sure – and his thinking. Juifs et chrétiens was a far more ambitious work, in which Blumenkranz set out to survey the nature of Christian-Jewish thinking over an extended period of time and had to utilize for this purpose a very wide range of sources. This is part of the reason I have designated Juifs et chrétiens his most important scholarly contribution.

There is a second consideration as well in such a designation. Blumenkranz’s study of Augustine was highly influential, but Augustine has been subjected to recurrent investigation, with major recent syntheses by Jeremy Cohen and Paula Fredriksen. The Blumenkranz study of Christian–Jewish relations was painstakingly grounded in collection of relevant Christian sources, which appeared as a series of publications in the Revue des études juives and subsequently as Les

---


auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les juifs et le judaïsme. The relative paucity of sources for the first half of the thus Middle Ages has impeded the study of Christian–Jewish relations during this period, and the Blumenkranz study has remained authoritative, which is yet another reason I venture to call it his most important scholarly contribution. For this same reason, the book merited renewed scrutiny in the context of the conference out of which this volume has been produced.

Let us note immediately the personal meaning of Blumenkranz’s studies of both Augustine and Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages, as indicated by the author himself. Blumenkranz opens Juifs et chrétiens with brief but striking general observations. His opening words are: ‘Every minority has disquiet as its portion, disquiet that causes it to reflect on its relations with those – in simplest terms the majority – that surround it, that hostilely confront it.’ He proceeds to note that this disquiet moves members of minority communities to examine the present circumstances of their relations with the majority, but to push that examination back into the past as well.

These general observations are applied immediately to the Jews. ‘The Jews, having known this minority condition for almost two millennia, have never ceased to proceed to this confrontation.’ Jews, in other words, have over the ages been keenly sensitive to their minority circumstances and have regularly reflected upon it. This leads to the following unexpected sentence: ‘Belonging to this minority, I could not escape this tendency of its spirit. In this way I was led to study the attitude of the Church Fathers toward the Jews [a reference to his dissertation].’ In these remarkable observations, Blumenkranz indicates that his previous study of Augustine and his present study of Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages are by no means disinterested intellectual forays. Rather, both works have profound personal meaning for him as a member of the minority partner in the Christian-Jewish dyad.

Blumenkranz – ever the meticulous scholar – proceeds to identify the parameters of his study on Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages. He clarifies both the geographic boundaries of his study and its chronological limits. His study is focused on Christian–Jewish relations in Latin Christendom, that is to say the Mediterranean areas of Italy, southern France, and Iberia, which housed old and well established Jewish communities, and the more slowly developing northern areas of England, northern France, the German territories, and on into Poland, where Jewish presence was new and slowly but

7 Blumenkranz, Juifs et chrétiens, p. ix.
8 Blumenkranz, Juifs et chrétiens, p. ix.
steadily growing. For tracing Christian–Jewish relations from Augustine and late Antiquity down through the European Middle Ages and into Western modernity, this is unquestionably the appropriate area to study.

The geographic boundaries established by Blumenkranz require further brief comment. He did not seek to place these Jews of Latin Christendom within the broad context of Jewish life during the first half of the Middle Ages. He might well have noted that the Jews upon whom his volume was going to focus constituted a very tiny minority on the world Jewish scene. During the first half of the Middle Ages, the overwhelming majority of Jews in the world lived in the vast reaches of the Muslim world; there was an old and comparatively small Jewish community in the Byzantine Empire; the Jewish population of Latin Christendom was negligible. Nonetheless, it certainly made sense for Blumenkranz to focus on this set of European Jewish communities – small though they were, since they constituted the connecting link between the Jews of late Antiquity and the Western Jews of the second half of the Middle Ages and modernity. It is, however, worth bearing in mind that these medieval European Jewish communities were extremely small in size.

The chronology of juifs et chrétiens is clearly specified as well. The terminus a quo for the study is 430 and the terminus ad quem is 1096. The former is simply the date of Augustine’s death and is clearly symbolic. With the death of Augustine, the basic contours of the early Church were set in place. As regards the Church’s stance toward Judaism and Jews, the same is true. What is often designated the ‘Augustinian synthesis’ laid the foundation for Jewish life in medieval and modern Christendom. In Augustine’s view, Jews had been granted by God the right to safe and secure existence in Christian societies. At the same time, they were to be limited in such ways as to assure that they inflict no harm on the Christian societies that hosted them, and they were to be constantly engaged by Christians in an effort to convince them of the Christian truth. 1096 was the date of the violent assaults on a number of Rhineland Jewish communities associated with the onset of the First Crusade. For Blumenkranz, this date likewise was symbolic, pointing to the changes in Christian–Jewish relations that lay at

---

9 There was to be sure a second grouping of Jews in Christendom during the Middle Ages, viz. the Jews of the Byzantine Empire. However, this sector of the medieval Christian world left little or no imprint on the evolution of European Jewish life and views of Jews in modern Europe.

10 I have emphasized this small size in The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom 1000–1500, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

11 The Jewish sources have been recently reedited (with a German translation) by Eva Haverkamp, Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs, MGH Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterlichen Deutschland, vol. 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 2005). See in English Robert Chazan, European Jewry and the First Crusade (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).
the heart of the difficult circumstances that characterized Jewish life during the second half of the Middle Ages and the early modern centuries.

It is worth noting the linkage between the geography of *Juifs et chrétiens* and its chronology. Augustine’s thinking, symbolized by Blumenkranz in the date of 430, was conditioned by the Mediterranean ambience in which Augustine lived and produced his remarkable *oeuvre.* This Mediterranean ambience remains in fact the focus of the Blumenkranz analysis in *Juifs et chrétiens,* since this constituted the area in which the majority of European Jews lived during the first half of the Middle Ages. 1096 – while often projected mistakenly as a broadly significant date in European Jewish history – in fact reflects developments in rapidly evolving northern Europe, very distant geographically, socially, and culturally from Augustine, the Mediterranean Basin, and the well established patterns of Jewish life and Christian–Jewish relations long in evidence there. We shall return to this linkage at a later point.

In *Juifs et chrétiens,* Blumenkranz addresses four broad aspects of Jewish-Christian relations during the first half of the Middle Ages: (1) normal social interaction between the Christian majority and the Jewish minority, which – according to Blumenkranz – involved no significant elements that would have been responsible for hostile and destructive Christian–Jewish relations; (2) competition for converts, which did to an extent – but only a limited extent – create friction between the two communities; (3) polemical exchanges between the two faiths, which heightened the sense of distance between the two communities, but again by no means decisively; (4) legal inequalities imposed on the Jews by the dominant role of the Church in European society. This set of issues led Blumenkranz to a complex overview of Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages, with the eventual sense that the social interactions were firmly positive, the religious and legal relations were mildly negative, and the combination was comfortable enough for European Jews to live productively throughout these centuries.

In the first section of his book, Blumenkranz musters evidence of what he claims to be positive – or at least non-negative – Christian–Jewish interactions. His evidence is quite convincing. He notes that, during the first half of the Middle Ages, the external appearance of the Jews of Europe was in no way different from that of their neighbors and that the language utilized by the Jews did not distinguish them either – Jews utilized regularly and comfortably the language of the environment in which they lived. He further claims that Jewish economic activities were diversified and that there was no identifiably unique Jewish economic outlet or outlets.

The second major aspect of Blumenkranz’s analysis of Christian–Jewish relations – the competition for converts – sounds a bit strange five decades later. In this regard, Blumenkranz was deeply influenced by the claims of Marcel Simon as
regards the Jews of late antiquity. Simon, in his path-breaking work *Verus Israel*, had argued that much of the tension between Christians and Jews in late antiquity flowed from active missionizing on the part of Jews and the competition this engendered with Christian missionizing. Bumenkranz posited a continuation of this Jewish activism and the tensions it created into the Middle Ages. Many decades later, this sense of Christian–Jewish tension in late antiquity has receded considerably. For the first half of the Middle Ages, there is little or no sense of active Jewish missionizing and the role it might have played in Christian–Jewish relations.

Blumenkranz’s depiction of the polemical issues debated by Christians and Jews during the first half of the Middle Ages is extensive and deserves ongoing attention. He examined the extant Christian sources carefully (Jewish polemical sources from the first half of the Middle Ages have not survived), and the Blumenkranz catalogue of issues argued by early medieval Christians and Jews is exhaustive. He insists, however, on clarification of the nature of this polemical argumentation. He claims that the polemical exchanges were generally spontaneous and relatively open – in effect an intellectual engagement. What does not appear – notes Blumenkranz – is the much later organized effort to confront Jews with sophisticated arguments carefully drawn up by ecclesiastical experts, with the ultimate objective of persuading Jewish auditors to abandon Judaism and accept Christianity. For Blumenkranz, the nature of the early medieval polemical exchanges reinforces the sense of amicable Christian–Jewish relations. Finally, the legal impediments imposed on the Jews are treated in much the same way. They involved traditional Church demands and were not perceived by the Jews as unduly restrictive, onerous, or hostile.

What thus emerges from this four-part examination is the following broad conclusion: The European social realities during the first half of the Middle Ages set a firm foundation for reasonably amicable Christian–Jewish relations. Jews were an established part of a diversified population and were in no way uniquely conspicuous. The polemical exchange between Christians and Jews and the legal liabilities suffered by Jews created a gulf between the two groups, but this gulf was not wide and dangerous. The negative elements in Christian–Jewish relations can be traced largely to ecclesiastical concerns and initiatives. Both the populace at large and the secular authorities seem to have been quite comfortable with the Jewish component in European society.

Against the backdrop of European anti-Semitism sketched out earlier, this portrait of Christian–Jewish relations is significant. The anti-Semitic claim that

---

Jews – at least in Christendom – have regularly been different, recognized as harmful, and persecuted as a result is thoroughly negated by Blumenkranz’s analysis. His reading of the sources available for Jewish life in Europe during the first half of the Middle Ages shows little or no evidence of marked Jewish difference in physical, social, or economic terms, little or no evidence of harm inflicted by Jews on the society around them, and little or no evidence of widespread animosity and persecution. Indeed, the Blumenkranz analysis suggests that, under comfortable social circumstances, Christianity and its teachings need not generate hostility toward Jews. There are to be sure differences between the two faith communities that Blumenkranz portrays effectively, but these differences need not eventuate in hatred and persecution.

Setting the chronological terminus ad quem at 1096 reflects Blumenkranz’s strong conviction that the relatively positive Christian–Jewish relations he depicts did not last into the second half of the Middle Ages. The opening portion of the concluding section of *Juifs et chrétiens* is devoted to summarizing the relatively benign state of Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages, to which the book is devoted. The closing segment of the concluding section highlights the deterioration of European Jewish life during the second half the Middle Ages and attempts to identify factors on the broad European scene that brought about the deleterious changes in Christian–Jewish relations. According to Blumenkranz, these factors involved changes in the Christian majority and included: the growing sense of conflict between the world of Islam and Christendom, which eventually involved the Jews as well; the crusading spirit that evolved out of this sense of conflict, which likewise had negative implications for Christian–Jewish relations; the tightening of relations between Church and State; the feudal system and its evolution into the powerful states of the second half of the Middle Ages.

I would like suggest yet another factor in the deterioration of Christian–Jewish relations during the second half of the Middle Ages, involving the Jewish minority. The small Jewish population of Latin Christendom during the first half of the Middle Ages actually consisted of two quite disparate elements. The larger segment of this Jewish population was found in the south – from the Italian peninsula across to the Iberian peninsula. This was a very old and well established Jewry, with roots that stretched well back into the centuries that preceded the emergence of Christianity. In effect, Blumenkranz’s observations on Jewish economic and social life and on Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the Middle Ages are almost entirely based on the features of Jewish life in this southern sector of Europe.

There was, however, a second segment of European Jewry – newer, smaller, and quite different. Jewish settlement in Europe was confined all through Antiquity and most of the first half of the Middle Ages to the well-developed
areas of the Mediterranean Basin. Jews very rarely made their way into northern Europe, and – when they did – it was largely to trade and not to settle. As signs of vitalization emerged in northern Europe during the late tenth and eleventh centuries, Jews for the first time ventured beyond the earlier perimeters of Jewish settlement and began to migrate into the north. We know little about this process, which almost certainly early on involved small numbers and has left no real evidence.

The venturesome Jews who made these moves encountered much different circumstances from those they left behind. Most significantly, these pioneering Jews were viewed by the Christian majority above all as newcomers, and the reception of newcomers into host societies is never warm. To be sure, there were elements in northern European society that welcomed the new Jewish settlers, especially the rulers of northern Europe, who saw in the Jewish immigrants valuable stimulation for the accelerating economy. The support of the governing authorities of northern Europe was crucial to successful Jewish settlement, but it by no means effaced the broad negativism of the population at large.

The essentially warm Christian–Jewish relations portrayed by Blumenkranz in *Juifs et chrétiens* reflect realities in southern Europe; they do not reflect alternative realities in the rapidly developing north. In the south, the old and established Jewish communities were nicely integrated into their environments and enjoyed the advantages of economic diversification. In the north, the new Jewish communities encountered resistance and hostility, first and foremost because they were perceived as newcomers. That these newcomers were Jews to boot served to exacerbate the resistance. The initial popular resistance in turn forced Jews into limited and problematic sectors of the economy and into dependence on the secular authorities that often raise hackles in the populace and that eventually put the Jews of the north at the mercy of these authorities, both for exorbitant taxation and ultimately for expulsion. I would urge that the altered circumstances of the Jewish minority in northern Europe – along with changes on the majority scene – played a major role in the deterioration of Christian–Jewish relations during the second half of the Middle Ages.\(^\text{13}\)

In any case, the portrait laid out by Bernhard Blumenkranz of relatively positive Christian–Jewish relations during the first half of the European Middle Ages and for the precipitous deterioration of these relatively positive relations very much strengthens the case made by a number of recent scholars who locate the roots of modern anti-Semitism in developments on the majority scene in twelfth-century Europe and in the growing size and importance of the new

\(^{13}\) Again see Chazan, *The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom.*
northern-European Jewry whose origins lay in the remarkable vitalization of the north that began at the turn of the millennium. 14

More broadly, the Blumenkranz analysis in *Juifs et chrétiens* has major implications for the study of Christian–Jewish relations over the ages or – in other terms – for the study of the history of anti-Semitism. Blumenkranz would surely have agreed that core Christian teachings laid a foundation for hostile relations, as argued for example by Parkes and Isaac. However, the potential of these teachings for engendering destructive Christian–Jewish relations was – in Blumenkranz’s view – by no means universally realized. In the Blumenkranz view, the negative potential provided by core Christian teachings was not actualized in Latin Christendom during the first half of the Middle Ages, largely because of structural aspects of majority society and – I would add – the nature of the well entrenched Jewish minority. Only when broad societal circumstances and the nature of the Jewish minority changed early in the second millennium did the negative potential turn into the actuality of fear, hostility, maltreatment, and persecution.

I

THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AND THE JEWS
THE AMBIGUOUS NOTIONS OF JEWISH LEGAL ‘STATUTES’ AND ‘STATUS’ IN BLUMENKRANZ’S WORK

Capucine Nemo-Pekelman

Université de Paris X Nanterre

In 1960, Bernhard Blumenkranz published *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental. 430–1096*, which had been his doctoral thesis – his ‘thèse d’Etat’.1 The book discusses the history of the Jewish populations living in the Western part of the Roman Empire after the collapse of the imperial state and the creation of Romano-Germanic kingdoms. It ends with the period of the First Crusade, in which anti-Jewish pogroms, according to the author, were a key event in the history of the Western Jews. The work covers many aspects, such as theological controversies, economic and social activities, daily Jewish thought and culture, Christian artistic representations of Jews and Judaism, and the political and legal relationships between Jews and Christian authorities. As, all of you, present here, would agree, the originality of Blumenkranz’s analysis was a considerable stimuli to the historical research that followed suit in the divers fields of Jewish Studies. Among his important contributions is a dense and evocative legal history of the Jews, which he presents in the final chapter, entitled ‘La déchéance légale’.2

For Bernhard Blumenkranz, in the church of the Early Middle Ages, there were ‘jurists’ whose discipline, unlike that of the theologians, essentially consisted of imposing rigid categories on a flexible and shifting social reality.3 These ‘jurists’ – in reality, bishops who were assembled in councils – tried to impose anti-Jewish measures on their populations and on the secular authorities, who were much less hostile to the Jewish populations than the bishops were. In particular, early medieval ecclesiastics tried to import the ‘Jewish statute’ of the imperial Roman age into the Romano-barbarian kingdoms. This statute consisted of the two titles

---

3 My reservation towards the use of the word ‘jurists’ stands to the fact that there was not a specialized field in canon law until the end of the 12th Century. About the Juridical science during the Early Middle Age, see A. Wijffels, *Introduction historique au droit. France. Allemagne. Angleterre* (Paris: PUF, 2010), pp. 49–54.

*Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The historiographical legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz*, ed. by Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan, Turnhout, 2015 (RELMIN, 7) pp. @@@–@@@
dedicated to the Jews in the *Theodosian Code*. In doing so, they attempted to bring to fruition projects of ‘Jewish statutes’, projects that were never put into practice, as the Romano-barbarian princes did not include these statutes in their secular law codes (with the notable exception of the Catholic kings of the *Visigoths*). This was because, during the entire period in question, the prevailing legal principle everywhere in Europe was that of the personality of law.4 This legal framework allowed the Jews to preserve their status as Roman citizens, a status that would have been degraded compared to the status of Christians, but, still, one that allowed them to practise their Jewish customs. It was only when the personality of law was substituted with territorial law – a process that took place between the 10th and 11th centuries – that the legal situation of the Jews, which had lost its ‘civic’ foundation, started to become fragile. It was from that moment on, that they were forced to obtain charters of privileges from the Carolingian and Ottonian emperors and from feudal lords. The purpose that the ecclesiastics of the Early Middle Ages had pursued in proposing Jewish statutes was thus attained starting in the High Middle Ages. This new foundation, at first glance favourable since it granted exemptions and privileges, was in reality much less stable and solid than their former civic status. On the one hand the Jews were legally marginalized compared to the rest of the population; on the other hand it made them personally dependent on the sovereign, who could undo these links at any time.

*The Jewish Statutes*

In my opinion, the first interesting aspect of this thesis is the insistence upon the importance of the ‘Jewish statutes’. Blumenkranz claims that the absence of such statutes, which in the Early Middle Ages were simply a proposal by members of the church, was actually an indication that the Jews were being integrated into the legal framework of the period. In contrast, the creation of official Jewish statutes, in the form of charters of privileges in the High Middle Ages, placed the Jews in a separate legal category, comparable to the status of foreigners.

But I do not believe we can any longer plainly accept this analysis, considering what we now know about the roman and medieval legal systems. Let us examine what these Jewish statutes were according to Blumenkranz, and the state of mind that led to their creation during late antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.

The first Jewish statute dates back to the imperial Roman period. Blumenkranz states that chapters 8 and 9 in book 16 of the *Codex Theodosianus*

---

4 On the principle of the personality of law, see Salomon Gutermann, *The principle of the personality of law in the Germanic kingdoms of Western Europe from the fifth to the eleven century* (New York: P. Lange, 1990).
could be described as a legal statute for the Jews. He writes, quote: ‘La masse des quarante-neuf lois, dans le Code Théodosien vont fournir la matière à une espèce de statut des juifs’. At the end of the fifth century the Imperial Power of the Western Empire collapsed and the Latin territories fell under the political control of German chieftains, who created sovereign kingdoms. In Aquitaine, the Visigothic king, Alaric, ordered the creation of a compilation of Roman constitutions and doctrines in 506/507: the *Breviarium Alaricaniun*. In this new collection of legal texts, the imperial constitutions concerning the Jews were no longer located together. They were scattered throughout different titles and chapters of the *Breviarium*: ‘Il importe de constater qu’il n’y a plus de groupement compact de ces lois, qu’il ne peut plus être question d’un “statut”’. All through the period studied by the author of *Juifs et chrétiens*, there was no longer an official statute for the Jews, except once in Spain at the Fourth Council of Toledo. ‘En 633, dix canons du ive concile de Tolède se présentent comme une solution d’ensemble.’ In other regions there were statutes of ecclesiastical origin but those remained at the project stage, the secular power not having validated them. In the Frankish Kingdom, Agobard archbishop of Lyon and Florus, head of the Lyon’s school sent to the Emperor Louis the Pious two proposed statutes: *De coertione iudaeorum* and *De fugiendis contagis iudaerorum* (822–827). The last one was proposed again by Amolo, successor of Agobard, to the new emperor Charles the Bald, but it was never enacted. Later, in 1094, Ivo of Chartres included in his *Decretum* a title containing a statute for the Jews. The date that this collection of canons was written is important, according to Blumenkranz: it was written ‘au lendemain de la croisade d’Espagne, à la veille des croisades proprement dites’.

---

8 Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens*, p. 300.
9 The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages, ed. transl. and comment by A. Linder (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997), pp. 485–90.
What state of mind guided the creation of these texts? For the *Theodosian Code*, it seems likely that when the codifiers of book 16 collected all the imperial constitutions relating to the Jews that had been issued since the reign of Constantine, they did not do so in simple practical terms, devoid of any ideological overtones. Indeed, Book 16 cannot be understood as a simple mechanical compilation, but was purposefully conceived as a work of legal doctrine with Christian orthodox inspiration.\(^\text{13}\) We believe, therefore, that special sections on the Jews were created intentionally, as to deliver a Christian message.\(^\text{14}\) This opinion comes from what we know of the ideological context that resulted in the compilation of the code and of the personality of its authors, and from analysing the contents of the collected imperial laws. As underlined by Lucio di Giovanni, it was decided to compile book 16 after the council of Ephesus and it was conceived apart from the other books of the Code.\(^\text{15}\) Book 16 created three categories of religious enemies: Pagans, Heretics and Jews, taking its model from the Christian literature. The gathering of texts would have followed an ideological purpose: that of imposing a Christian vision of the world divided between Christians on the one hand, and Heretics, Pagans and Jews on the other. We also know that the commission responsible for editing the *Theodosian Code* was led by a certain Martyrius. And lo and behold, one year after the promulgation of the code in Constantinople, this Martyrius had a new imperial law issued, Novel III (31 January 438), which was unequivocally anti-Jewish.\(^\text{16}\) This law summarized, and exacerbated, the most repressive measures that had been taken during the previous century and a half. The author was therefore especially anxious to regulate the position of the Jews in the Empire and made it a personal project. Lastly, an examination of the nature of the imperial laws collected in titles 8 and 9 reveals that they show no thematic unity from the point of view of classical Roman law. We find in these titles economic laws, penal laws, privileges, and tax exemptions. From a strictly logical legal point of view, nothing justified the concentration of these laws into a single place in the *Theodosian Code*. They certainly could have been included in the sections of other chapters dedicated to marriage,


\(^{14}\) We need to distinguish between the long legislative process that runs from the reign of Constantine to the reign of Theodosius the Second, and the specific moment of codification which took place around 430 in Constantinople. Certainly, the constitutions given by the two Chancellories of the Western and the Eastern parts of the Empire did not pursue a single goal and a coherent intellectual purpose. See C. Nemo-Pekelman, *Rome et ses citoyens juifs (IVe–VVe siècles)*, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2010), pp. 13–15.


\(^{16}\) Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*, pp. 333–32.
inheritance, slaves, or curial duties. The only explanation for this concentration seems to be the desire to create a new category in the law of persons, unknown in Roman law: the category of ‘Jews’.

But if the authors of book 16 were really pursuing an agenda to construct a Christian order by creating new legal categories, this enterprise did not have the same signification as it would have had within our modern legal frameworks; Frameworks, resulting from the American and French Revolutions, which proclaim the equality of all citizens before the law. We know that Roman citizenship, even in the Republican period, never had a democratic and egalitarian foundation, unlike Athenian citizenship. The political rights of Roman citizens were always a function of their wealth, in particular. Likewise, in the imperial period, private rights (marriage, property, contracts) and penal law varied, and especially depended on whether the citizens were honestiores, humiliores, or infames. However, numerous individuals and groups in the Empire – civil and military officers, veterans, municipal and curial magistrates, professions, religious associations, cities – benefitted from exemptions or privileges that were very significant exceptions to the principle of equality before the law. There was actually a very large plurality of civic statuses. In such a context, the establishment of new categories of citizens based on religion – Pagan, Heretic, or Jew – was not a substantial innovation from a legal point of view. The *Theodosian Code* did not establish Jewish citizenship in binary opposition with ‘Christian citizenship’, but it did add yet another new variant to the pre-existing mosaic of statuses.

This seems to be even more accurate for the period of the Early Middle Ages. When ecclesiastics tried to impose their projects for Jewish statutes, the issue at hand was not the exclusion of Jews from a homogenous national body. There were multiple Roman civic statutes, and to them were added ethnic statutes. From the time of Charlemagne, each ethnical group – Visigoths, Franks, Saxons, Lombards, etc. – officially enjoyed their own personal law. In the High Middle Ages, the law of persons began to be based on territory, in the more restricted and fragmented sense of the law of the fiefdom or the city. Other customary law was also added to this, which created numerous disparities in the statutes, in particular those that distinguished between privileged knights and men of the church, bourgeois, peasant, and serfs.

In summary, to depict a society legally divided between Jews and Christians starting in the Late Empire, as Bernhard Blumenkranz does, is to forget that the

---

17 Certainly, the social and political realities were different and much more complex. See Cl. Nicolet, *Le métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), pp. 280–414.
19 Gutermann, *The principle of the personality of law*, pp. 27–54.
group formed by second-class citizens was not at all homogenous, and also, it must be said, that the Jewish populations themselves did not all have an identical status in different times and places, even if there were several constants. The author is therefore guilty of the same anachronism that he denounces in the historians who preceded him, by applying modern concepts of the nation-state to an era where these concepts did not yet exist.\(^{20}\) It seems likely to me that by giving such importance to the existence, or non-existence of these Jewish statutes, Blumenkranz – who, we should remember, was writing in the 1960s – was thinking of those that were written before and during the Second World War in European countries under Nazi domination or allied with them. On the anti-Semitic legislation of the Vichy regime, Danièle Lochak remarked:

**Au-delà de leur fonction pratique, les lois raciales remplissent aussi une fonction idéologique en contribuant à imposer une vision du monde partagée en deux races distinctes et inégalés – les Juifs et les Aryens –, et à inculquer l'idée que les juifs ne sont pas des Français comme les autres, ni même des hommes comme les autres.**\(^{21}\)

[Beyond their practical function, the racial laws also perform an ideological function. They contribute to impose a vision of the world divided into two different and uneven races: Jews and Aryans. And they inculcate the idea that the Jews are not French people as the others, nor even men as the others.]

The process of collecting all the laws concerning the Jews in an isolated corpus was a strong indication that they were being legally excluded from the rest of society. In a similar spirit, Bernhard Blumenkranz\(^{22}\) thinks that, concerning the sole Jewish statute that was officially promulgated by the secular authorities in the Early Middle Ages – i.e., the ten canons of the 4\(^{th}\) Council of Toledo (633) – its authors presented it as ‘a comprehensive solution’. As for the proposed statues of ecclesiastical origin, he notes:

**Même s’ils n’ont pas acquis dès notre époque le caractère de règlement d’ordre public, [ils] nous intéressent pourtant à double titre : par l’état d’esprit de leurs auteurs mêmes qu’ils accusent, et par la préparation des conditions futures qu’ils assurent.**

[Even if, in our age, they have not acquired the character of a regulation for the public order, they are nevertheless interesting for us for two reasons: because they reveal the state of mind of the authors, and because they lay the foundation for future conditions.]


\(^{22}\) Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens*, p. 306.
According to Blumenkranz, the Jewish statutes proposed by ecclesiastical authorities were intended to turn the laws concerning the Jews into a separate legal field. They anticipated the feudal period, when the legal status of the Jews depended on charters of privileges, which effectively placed them in the category of marginalized foreigners. But – and this is the main reason for my reservations towards Blumenkranz’s thesis – the creation of Jewish statutes in the Early Middle Ages and High Middle Ages did not necessarily have to result in their legal marginalization and their rejection by the society of the day. We should keep in mind the considerations of Hannah Arendt, which I think are a useful clarification of the difference between the legal culture of the Middle Ages and that of our modern age. In Nazi occupied Europe and in its allied countries, before and during the second world war, Jews suffered legal persecutions which stripped them of their civil rights one by one. The loss of these civil rights, made them stateless persons, a necessary condition before their deportation.23 The medieval phenomenon was obviously in no way comparable, neither in intensity and severity nor in nature, since the creation of Jewish statutes, even degrading ones, was not at all a first step in turning them into foreigners without any rights. While, according to Arendt, in the 20th century, legal marginalization was almost a mechanical step towards statelessness, in the Middle Ages, this legal situation, trivial considering the legal context in general, was perennial and in no way anticipated more serious deprivations in the future. In reality, it would seem that, as numerous authors have shown, the true cut-off should not be fixed at the time of the First Crusade, but much later, between the end of the twelfth century and the thirteenth century, when the papal monarchy asserted itself and established a new, organized and rational Christian legal order which was established through the publication of the decretals. The Jews were explicitly excluded from this legal system.24

23 In the part of Origins of Totalitarianism dedicated to the problem of stateless persons in the twentieth century, Hannah Arendt warns: In order to realize the true implications of statelessness, one need only remember the extreme care of the Nazis, who insisted that all Jews of non-German nationality ‘should be deprived of their citizenship either prior to, or, at the latest, on the day of deportation’ (for German Jews such a decree was not needed, because in the Third Reich there existed a law according to which all Jews who had left the territory-including, of course, those deported to a Polish camp-automatically lost their citizenship). She refers to an order of Hauptssturmführer Dannecker, dated 10 March 1943, and regarding the deportation of 5,000 Jewish French (Nuremberg Documents No. RF 1216. Photostat in the Centre de documentation juive, Paris). See H. Arendt, Origins of Totalitarianism (New York: Harvest Book, 1976), p. 280.

The Jewish-Roman Status

But if, from a legal point of view, the existence of Jewish statutes did not have the effect of marginalizing the Jews from the rest of society as if they were foreigners, could we not nevertheless say that, fundamentally, the measures concerning the Jews were more punitive than those issued for the rest of the population? To answer this question, we must now examine the content of the laws that made their legal status.

As far as the Roman Empire era is concerned, Blumenkranz thought the Jews were Roman citizens, but with a degraded status compared to their Christian neighbours.

We have already mentioned above why the idea of the Roman citizen with full rights was highly questionable, because in Roman law, there were numerous civil statutes. But did all of these measures cited by Blumenkranz place them on the same level as the most vulnerable Roman citizens? We must not allow ourselves to be misled by the cumulative effect produced by these punitive measures, but we should examine these measures one by one, by putting them in their proper context and assessing their precise scope and significance. These measures did not share the same juridical nature, and did not have the same origin nor the same impact. So we should not confuse penal laws, which were likely to affect individual Jews caught in criminal behaviour, with laws that required no individual behaviour and which would have affected Jews collectively.

The first punitive measures were for new crimes created in the early fourth century during the reign of emperor Constantine. The imperial constitution of October 18, 329 imposed penal sanctions on converts to Judaism. A Christian ‘who approaches their nefarious sect and join himself to their conventicles’ now risked criminal lawsuits against him (CTh 16.8.1). The penalty specified in a constitution

25 Blumenkranz, Juifs et chrétiens, p. 295.
of 353 is confiscation of the apostate’s estate (CTh 16.8.7). During this period, Constantine also passed legislation against the *mancipium* of Jewish masters on Christian slaves. After August 13, 339, Jewish masters were forbidden from purchasing Christian slaves (CTh 16.9.2). This law was confirmed under Theodosius (CTh 16.3.5). Jews risked having their slaves confiscated, and if the slaves had been circumcised, the penalty was capital punishment. The last incrimination targeting Jews in particular was created by the chancellery of Theodosius I on March 14, 388. It equated marriage between Jews and Christians with adultery, which was, consequently, punishable by death (CTh 3.7.2). There are also other examples of imperial legislation that establish, not crimes, but punishments to sanction the Jews. This legislation covered ordinary crimes – murder, assault, theft – and, when used to settle cases involving Jews and Christians, turned these crimes into aggravated crimes requiring a more severe penalty. The aforementioned constitution issued by Constantine on October 18, 329 (CTh 16.8.1) established that Jews who stone a member of their own community for converting to Christianity would suffer infamy by being burned. Likewise, Jewish masters who removed valuable female Christian workers from their *textrina* would not be charged a fine, as prescribed by common law, but would be sentenced to death (CTh 16.8.6). Therefore, we can see that certain crimes could be committed only by Jews and that some severe sanctions were to be inflicted only if the criminal was Jewish. These measures were surely of Christian inspiration, since, in line with conciliar canons, they were intended to fight against conversion to Judaism. But on the one hand, we do not know if Jewish proselytizing was a general and widespread phenomenon in this period, and on the other hand they targeted criminal acts and not specifically Jews as such. They affected only those individual Jews who actively decided to convert or circumcise Christians. However, in a way, they placed the entire Jewish population in an uncomfortable position, since these crimes could be denounced by anyone. In this respect, penal laws exposed the Jews to legal harassment by informers, and we know that in some cases, false and defamatory allegations were made against them. But in total, the origin and scope of this penal arsenal were limited.

As for the subsequent degradation of political or public rights that were, in this instance, laws touching the entire Jewish population, this was edicted by the imperial constitutions of 418 and 425 (CTh 16.8.24 and Sirm. 6), and the Novella III of January 31, 438. These laws removed from the Jews certain rights such as the *ius militandi*, the *ius accusandi* and access to the *honores*. But Friedrich Savigny insists that these public rights did not have the same legal nature as the two other public rights: the *ius libertati* and the *ius civitatis*.\(^\text{26}\) These were essen-

tial for an individual to have juridical capacity. They were related only to their ‘existimatio’. That is to say: imposing a degradation of the status dignitatis did not impact the status civitatis. So we should not confuse the two types of rights, which are of dramatically different natures: rights pertaining to Roman citizenship, and rights not linked to citizenship in any way. Furthermore, they affected only a restricted part of the Jewish population, the elites, and a very specific elite, those who aspired to hold imperial offices. Nevertheless in the long term, they probably had damaging effects on the entire Jewish population, since removing elite Jews from access to imperial positions also may have deprived them of valuable links to the sphere of power.

Lastly, an imperial constitution dated February 3, 398 (CTh 2.1.2), refused to give Jewish communal courts the qualification of ‘tribunal’. Jewish judges were considered private arbiters and their sentences had no executive force. But for the authorities, this measure fit in with a general logic, which consisted of claiming a monopoly over judicial matters. Moreover, the episcopal audience itself was affected by a similar decision in the same period.

In summary, because they were aimed at only certain parts of the Jewish population and even then, only at certain specific members of these parts, in our opinion the origins and the scope of these laws appear to have been limited. In any case, they had no substantial effect on the civil status of the Jews, who could continue to enjoy all of their private laws – connubium, property, contracts. The fate of the Jews was in no way comparable to those of infames or other religious enemies of the authorities who followed Nicene Christianity, such as the Manichaeans, the Eunomians, the Montanists, the Protopaschites, and various Trinitarian heresies. Therefore, it is an exaggeration to contrast ‘second-class’ Jewish citizens with Christian citizens ‘the only citizens with full rights’.

Conclusion

I believe we must wield the notion of a ‘Jewish legal statute’ with great precaution. We share Bernhard Blumenkranz analysis that isolating measures concerning the Jews within the Theodosian Code, the Canonical collections of the Early Middle Ages and in the 4th Council of Toledo in specific sections expressed a Christian worldview that separated orthodox Christians from their religious enemies. Nevertheless, taking into account the many legal personal statuses that existed in that era, an era that was oblivious to the modern principle of equality before the law, even if we were to accept the term ‘Jewish Statutes’ as one that would define these legal textual objects, it would not have foretold of future, more grievous, legal degradations. Contrary to the anti-Semite statutes that were elaborated in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century and that aimed at the exclusion
of Jews from the civic body rendering them stateless, the statutes of the Early and High Middle Ages would absolutely not have made the legal status of Jews closer to that of foreigners with no rights.

As a matter of fact, in order to find relevant indications of their eventual juridical degradation, the content of the laws that targeted them and would form their status should be examined. And precisely, as far as the Late Empire is concerned, the criminal laws targeted, directly and indirectly, Jewish proselytism only. They would thus have impacted a limited number of communities in specific regions of the Empire. At the same time, non-penal laws targeting the Jews as a group affected only the Jewish elites, and a very specific one at that, made of those that wished to follow a career in the imperial administration. To sum up, we must not exaggerate the scope of the punitive decisions of the Theodosian code, as in all likelihood the majority of Jews in the Empire could continue to lead the normal life of a Roman citizen, unaware of the existence of these laws.

As far as the Early Middle Ages are concerned, we must insist on the fact that Jews were likely subjects as all were, and that the laws targeting them did not profoundly alter their legal condition. As a matter of fact, too often are the privileges awarded to Jews wrongly confused with Jewish statutes. This error has been criticised for a long time, concerning the early Roman Empire by Tessa Rajak and Miriam Pucci Ben Zeeb, and for the later Empire, by myself. The existence of exemptions and privileges concerning the Jews did not have for effect the creation of a ‘magna carta’ excluding the Jews from the rest of the population, contrary to what has been written by Jean Juster.27 Similarly, concerning the Early Middle Ages, the Carolingian law expert Philippe Depreux, recently wrote that privileges accorded to Jews did not define the norm and that legislation that concerned them blended in the broader normative landscape. Privileges obtained from Charlemagne or Louis the Pious only concerned a small number of Jewish merchants of the Palace, not the whole Jewish population.28 Possibly the same analysis can be applied to the High Middle Ages, taking caution not to apply to earlier periods a situation that may have only characterized the end of the Middle Ages.

Finally, it may be time to revise a historiography well entrenched since the writings of Salo Baron, Hannah Arendt and more recently Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi that identified as one of causes of political and popular anti-judaism a supposed legal marginalization of Jews in the West starting in the Roman era.  

Considerable attention has been given to the fact that the blossoming of the Christian *adversus Judeos* literature coincided with the intellectual, religious, socio-economic and political transformations of the long twelfth century (c. 1050–c. 1215). However, it is equally important to appreciate that the same period witnessed dramatic developments in the field of canon law. The study of medieval canon law remains a highly specialised area of research; nevertheless it is imperative to interconnect research into Christian–Jewish relations with work on the intricacies of canonical material concerning Jews. Although Walter Pakter’s *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews* (1988) was an important step in the right direction, it did not fit the bill. The book contains a wealth of material, but its perspective is primarily a legal one; tabulating legal developments rather than understanding them in their full historical context was, after all, Pakter’s main priority. And, as some reviewers have pointed out, the book can, at times, be seriously unreliable.

Amnon Linder’s rich collection of legal materials and John Gilchrist’s meticulous work on canons concerning Jews in canon law collections between c. 900 and the mid-twelfth century, together with the fine analyses by John Watt, provide far better building blocks for the investigation of the treatment of Jews in canon law texts of the period. Studying this material in conjunction with in-depth knowl-

---

edge of the intellectual, theological and socio-political facets of Christian–Jewish relations will lead to a better understanding of what the texts say, how they were interpreted and what effect they might have had in theory and in practice. For, however, theoretical canon law regulations might have been, the texts themselves reflect the choices canonists made about what to include from the repository of available material on Jews. And many canonists went on to be administrators with wide remits which impinged on concrete relations between Christians and the Jews.

Any study of canonical material on Jews must necessarily take account of Islam because of the existence of many similarities between ecclesiastical rulings on Jews and Muslims. At the same time, it is vital to remember that there was a fundamental difference between the position of Jews and Muslims in medieval Christendom. Theologically, Christians needed Jews; they did not need Muslims. They needed Jews ever since Augustine had formulated his theory that Jews bore witness to Christian truth by safeguarding the books of the Old Testament in which Christians found the prophecies concerning Jesus Christ. Christians used Jews to remind themselves of the Passion Jesus had suffered for their sakes; they used Jewish dispersion to demonstrate the dire consequences of refusing to acknowledge Christ as God and the Messiah. They needed Jews to fulfil St. Paul’s prophecy that at the end of time all Jews would recognise Christ and convert to Christianity. In an era of crusading fervour, Islam was, on the other hand, Christianity’s potent military and religious opponent in the Latin Mediterranean, North Africa and the Middle East.

The first step in any investigation of this nature has to be Gratian’s Decretum, the first comprehensive and systematic synthesis of ecclesiastical material which became the basic medieval handbook for canon law. Through the seminal work by Anders Winroth we now know of the existence of an earlier transient phase in the creation of the Decretum. Whether Gratian himself was responsible for the development of the Decretum or whether other(s) were responsible is still under debate, as is the exact process of the evolution of the second recension.

---

I shall use Gratian 1 and Gratian 2 to distinguish between the first recension of Gratian, as outlined by Winroth in *The Making of Gratian’s Decretum*, and the later much better known recension of Gratian which would have been in circulation by around 1150.¹

*Gratian’s Decretum* was a pedagogical text which was taught, studied and commented on in centres for legal studies, Bologna, and elsewhere. Scholars added their own thoughts to the text as they studied and taught it. These additions or glosses, as they are known, give us an opportunity to gauge how people understood the *Decretum* and reacted to it. In this paper I shall focus on *causa 23* of the second part of Gratian’s *Decretum*, the *causa* which has drawn the attention of so many modern Crusade historians to gauge just how much canonical support there was in the middle of the twelfth century for the new phenomenon of the crusades.⁶ As is well known, *causa 23* is not about the crusades; it addresses difficult questions about the legality of using violence against heretics. The reason I have chosen to focus on this particular *causa* in Gratian is that it contains the well-known ruling *Dispar nimirum* which distinguishes between Muslims, whom Christians may attack, and Jews, who are not to be assaulted, one of the very few rulings concerning Jews which was present in the first recension of the *Decretum*.⁷ The text comes from the letter *Placuit nobis sermo* which Pope Alexander II wrote to the bishops of Spain in 1063 to commend their protection of the Jews against

---


⁷ Winroth gives an appendix listing the contents of the first recension of the *Decretum, Dispar Nimirum*, C. 23, q. 8, c. 11 is listed on page 220. I shall use Winroth’s appendix to determine whether a section of the *Decretum* belongs to the first recension or the later much better known recension of Gratian which would have been in circulation by around 1150 throughout this paper.
French knights who had travelled southwards to fight Islam. I shall analyse this ruling within the context of the whole of causa 23 in order to understand better how and why Gratian included it. This will involve examining other texts in the causa which mention Jews in order to build up as full a picture as possible of how Jews were perceived in this section of the Decretum. The next step will be to find out more about the reception of Gratian’s treatment of Jews in this causa. I propose to make a start on this by examining the relevant entries in the so-called Ordinary Gloss by Johannes Teutonicus (d. 1245), who skilfully absorbed the commentaries of others such as Laurentius Hispanus and Huguccio, into his own. Johannes started work on the Glossa Ordinaria about 1214 and completed it by 1217 or by the close of 1216. It was revised by Bartholomeus of Brescia (d. 1258) in 1240–5 or, as Rudolf Wiegand would have it, around 1234–41 to update it to include references to the Gregorian Decretals of 1234. The Glossa Ordinaria became the standard tool for people consulting Gratian.

As a first port of call I shall consult the Glossa Ordinaria in the on-line version of the 1582 Roman edition of the glossed Decretum. To check the printed gloss for later accretions to the Glossa Ordinaria I shall turn to the remarkable collection of Gratian manuscripts in the library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. One of the Caius manuscripts (MS 6/6) was written in France in the twelfth century and is one of the oldest Gratian manuscripts in England. Causa 23 is, in fact, one of the places where the MS clearly shows the evolvement of the recensions of the Decretum. Vestiges of an older gloss predating the Ordinary

11 I am very grateful to the Master and Fellows of Gonville and Caius College for granting me access to the Gratian manuscripts and rare books in their possession. My particular thanks go to the Fellow Librarian, Professor David Abulafia, the College Librarian, Mr Mark Statham and his staff for the assistance they gave me in this project.
12 Gonville and Caius College, MS 6/6, fol. 176v where q. 8 cc. 4–6, 10 and 15 were added in the margin (cc. 1–3, which are paleae, were omitted). See Winroth, p. 128 for another instance. For the importance Winroth attached to this MS see Project: Editions of the first and second recensions of Gratian’s Decretum at: http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDMQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fydc2.yale.edu%2Fnode%2F553%2Fattachment&ei=SxgzU_7-FnZ7AbxbxGaw&usg=AFQjCNKEKu5DFp.0nxFjD0J-T1-QLgRRKwBQ&sig2=p.9gbc4_gMC_kYv73024Q&bvm=bv.63738703,d.ZGU. (download; accessed 10 February 2015).
Gloss are still visible in the margins of some folios; the older gloss was removed to make room for Bartholomew's revision of the Glossa Ordinaria which seems to have been added to the manuscript in Italy in the fourteenth century. The older gloss is not relevant for what follows. MS 67/34 of the thirteenth century is a sine textu manuscript which contains Johannes Teutonicus's Ordinary Gloss for much of the Decretum, including causa 23 before it was revised by Bartholomew. This will give me the opportunity to see what, if any, differences exist between Johannes's and Bartholomew's commentaries concerning Jews or Muslims in the causa, or to be more precise, the Bartholomew of MS 6/6 (juxtaposed with readings of the Roman edition). The third manuscript (MS 283/676) of the late twelfth century is rarest of all; it contains the glosses of Johannes of Tynemouth and Simon of Southwell and other Anglo-Norman canonists who were lecturing in England about 1188–98. As a whole the gloss gives us a glimpse of how these canonists worked with the material available to them and as such will allow us to gauge how causa 23's statements about Jews and Muslims were received in late twelfth-century England. In what follows I shall use 'Anglo-Norman gloss' to refer to the gloss as a whole; the term 'Anglo-Norman canonists' will only be used when I am citing a signed gloss by one of them and in that case I shall refer to that canonist by name. At this stage I shall not delve into the sources the compilers of the Anglo-Norman gloss or, indeed, Johannes/Bartholomew may have used or shared. That is for a later stage in my investigations. For Gratian's text I shall use the on-line version of Friedberg's 1879 edition created by the Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum.

The second part of the Decretum consists of 36 made-up legal cases through which Gratian explored a full range of issues pertaining to clerics and monks, the organisation of the Church, church institutions, church property, the permissibility of using violence against heretics, marriage, etc. Gratian considered each causa by subdividing it into the questions he thought it raised and proceeded to list

---


under each *quaestio* in separate canons (*capitula*) the pertinent ecclesiastical material to answer it. These canons included papal pronouncements, church council rulings and patristic texts. Gratian presented his own views on the question and his solutions to the contradictions in the materials he had collected in his sayings (*dicta Gratiani*) which he placed strategically among the canons of each *quaestio*. The scholastic nature of his method seems obvious enough. The first part of the *Decretum* consists of 101 Distinctions concerning different kinds of law and the regulations governing clerical offices, ecclesiastical appointments and ordination. The third part, which was not included in the first recension, concerns laws governing the sacraments and the liturgy.\(^{17}\)

The fictitious legal case of *causa* 23 concerns Catholic bishops who have waged war against neighbouring heretical bishops and their flock and have forced them to return to the unity of the Catholic faith. Several heretics have been killed, others have had their own and ecclesiastical goods plundered; others have been imprisoned. For Gratian the case presented questions concerning (1) the sinfulness of waging war; (2) the nature of a just war and in what way the children of Israel waged them; (3) the use of weapons against the injustices done to one’s associates; (4) the allowability of wreaking vengeance; (5) the possibility of it being a sin for judges or officials to put the guilty to death; (6) the outhness of forcing the wicked to be good; (7) the permissibility of robbing heretics of their own goods and those of the Church and the ownership of the alienated goods; and (8) the allowability of bishops or clerics to take up weapons on their own or the pope’s authority or on the command of the emperor.\(^{18}\) Ostensibly, this case has nothing whatsoever to do with Jews, yet the texts which Gratian gathered in response to these eight questions are full of references to biblical and contemporary Jews. One of the eight questions even refers to biblical Jews. All of these references are in addition to the ruling of *Dispar nimrum*. Many of these references appear in the texts Gratian borrowed from Augustine. As for Muslims, question 8 of *causa* 23 contains three of the mere five references to *Sarraceni* in the *Decretum*. All three belong to the first recension. The remaining two mentions of Saracens are in the first part of the *Decretum* in canon 38 of Distinction 50 (first recension) and canon 10 of Distinction 56 (Gratian 2).\(^{19}\) I should hasten to add that at this stage of my research I have not yet been able to make a proper analysis of the number of times the term *pagani* was used in the *Decretum* to refer specifically to Muslims. We shall return to this in due course.\(^{20}\)


\(^{19}\) C. 23 q. 8 c. 7; c. 23 q. 8 d. p. 20; D. 50 c. 48; D. 10 c. 10, ed. Friedberg, coll. 954, 955, 959, 194, 222.

\(^{20}\) David M. Freidenreich refers to 4 mentions of Saracens in the *Decretum*; he posits that in only 4 cases Muslims are signified by a term signifying pagan, see his ‘Muslims in Western Canon Law, 1000–1500’,
To get a broader perspective of the context of the subject matter of *Dispar nimirum* and how it was treated by our glossators, let us start by looking at *Sider rebus*, canon 2 of question 7 of *causa* 23 concerning the allowability of taking away the possessions of heretics. For this canon Gratian used two sections of Augustine’s rebuff to Petilian in which Augustine had argued that if Catholics could be indicted for taking away the goods of heretics then ‘the Jews too could say that they were just and accuse us of wrongdoing because Christians now possess the place where they had impiously reigned. What is shameful then about Catholics holding by the same will of the Lord that which heretics held? To all the wicked and impious that voice of the Lord prevails: “the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a people doing justice”’. The biblical quote was based on the concluding words of Matthew’s version of the parable of the vineyard (Matthew 21:43). Augustine averred that taking away the possessions of heretics had nothing to do with desiring another’s property. No lust was in play when the Jews gained possession of the Promised Land by God’s might, just as no lust was in play because the Church according to God’s words possesses the kingdom where the persecutors of Christ had once ruled.

The role of the Jews in the Augustinian texts which Gratian used through his intermediary source was clearly one of service. The problem of dispossessing heretics did not concern Jews as such; Jews were used by Augustine in these passages to clinch a Christian argument. They were utilised by Gratian in the same role, which in this instance was full of negative imagery. Their portrayal as the persecutors of Christ was, in fact, intensified by the reference to Matthew’s parable in which the husbandmen kill their lord’s son, which was used by exegetes...
such as Bede to claim that Jews were guilty of deliberate deicide. Students and teachers exploring the Decretum for information on the possessions of heretics would willy-nilly have been exposed to this negativity.

But this might well be a twenty-first century reaction to the text which reflects the particular kind of interest scholars nowadays have in the imagery of the ‘other’. To gauge twelfth and thirteenth-century reactions of those who actually studied this canon we now turn to the evidence in the glosses we have chosen to examine for this paper. After Johannes had explained which kinds of goods or possessions (res) were at stake, he homed in on the word impios in the text, the ‘impious’ to whom ‘that voice of the Lord prevails: “the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a people doing justice”’. He wrote that some took the reference to imply that ‘we can legitimately take away the possessions of Jews and Saracens in the understanding that Dispar Nimirum refers to the persons of the Jews and not their goods. But I believe otherwise because the Jews pay tribute and what they have they hold by our will’.

What do we learn from this? The first thing we learn is that the pejorative referencing to Jews which Gratian 1 borrowed from Augustine did not lead Johannes Teutonicus to dwell on the negative image of Jews with which he was presented. What seemed to matter to him was to articulate the difference between Jews and Muslims and to present the relevant supporting legal evidence. This makes perfect sense in the context of this particular causa which dealt specifically with the legality of attacking heretics. Very interesting is that neither Johannes nor Bartholomeus, who did not expand Johannes’s comments, referred to the text we might have thought to be the most obvious one to cite: the Sicut Iudeis, the well-known papal bull of protection for the Jews, first issued by Calixtus II in the 1120’s and included in the Gregorian Decretals (X 5. 6. 9). By the time Johannes was putting his gloss together it had been promulgated by Calixtus II, Eugenius III, Alexander III, Clement III, Celestine III and Innocent III. By the time Bartholomeus updated the Glossa ordinaria it had been promulgated by Honorius III and Gregory IX. John of Wales had included it in his collection of decretals, the so-called Compilatio secunda, which he had assembled by 1212.


twelfth-century papal bull was built on Gregory I’s letter of 598 to the Bishop of Palermo protecting Jews with the well-known opening line: ‘Just as the Jews should not have the freedom to presume anything in their synagogues beyond what is permitted by law, in the same way, they should not suffer any prejudice in those matters granted them.’ The different stances required of Christians towards Jews and Muslims were evidently more important to Johannes/Bartholomeus than the protection of Jews per se.

The Anglo-Norman gloss does not contain a gloss on *impios*; it does, however, offer an alternative reading to *regnaverunt*, the ‘reigning’ which the Jews had done ‘impiously’, which is *repugnaverunt*. This reading would seem to reinforce the negative image of the Jews by accentuating the concept of the opposition of the Jews to Christ.

Jews played a crucial rhetorical role in canon 2 of question 7. Let us now turn to some of the more tangential and oblique references made to Jews which are scattered throughout *causa 23*. There are times in both Gratian 1 and Gratian 2 that biblical Jews are referred to in a neutral way, as for example in canon 2 of *quaestio 2* where Gratian 1 is simply referring to the Children of Israel in an historical way. Much the same is true when Gratian 1 referred to the ‘old people’ as being forced to observe the law through fear of punishments in his opening *dictum* about the issue whether the wicked should be forced to be good. Similarly in Gratian 1’s *dictum* after canon 49 of *quaestio 5* there are a lot of neutral references but also a reference to the Jews being punished by way of other peoples, among them the Romans, for ‘the sin of the death of Christ’. Negative references to Jews abound in both recensions. In canon 1 of *quaestio 1*, Gratian 2 includes the patristic argument that the ‘books of the Jewish histories’ would not have been given by the apostles to the disciples of Christ, who came to teach peace, to be read in churches if the carnal battles therein did not carry the figures of spiritual battles. In canon 2 of question 1 Gratian 1 used the Jews of the New Testament to contrast Jewish violence with the peace of Christ; the coming of Christ is portrayed as destroying the alleged quasi-sanctity of the Jewish priesthood. That this is standard anti-Jewish polemic is obvious enough. Both

Johannes de Phintona in the marginal gloss by Guido de Baysio who composed an extensive commentary on the *Decretum* around 1300 using many different materials from those absorbed in the *Glosa Ordinaria* – see Kenneth Pennington’s, ‘Medieval and Early Modern Jurists: a Bio-Bibliographical’, at http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/1598la-2.htm (accessed 17 February 2015).

26 *JLSEMA*, no. 716, pp. 433–4, quotation from p. 434.
27 Gonville and Caius College MS 283/676, fol. 163ra.
28 C. 23 q. 6 d. a. c. 1, ed. Friedberg, coll. 947.
29 C. 23 q. 5 d. p. c. 49, ed. Friedberg, coll. 945–7.
30 C. 23 q. 1 c. 1, ed. Friedberg, coll. 890.
Gratian 1 and the compiler(s) of Gratian 2 were putting Jews to straightforward theological service. Alleged Jewish carnality was deemed to have made way for Christian spirituality, Judaism was superseded by Christianity, and Jews were manipulated as foils to accentuate Christian virtue. What is interesting is that it was part and parcel of the basic text book of canon law which was disseminated all over Latin Christendom and, especially, that the polemic is found in sections of the *Decretum* which do not concern Jews. Gratian 1’s introductory dictum to *quaestio* 3, for example, which concerned the probity of using violence in response to the injuries against associates, contained a large number of biblical allusions in which New Testament Jews behaved badly towards Christ. 32 Through its inclusion of so much patristic material the *Decretum* would, in fact, seem to have been a particularly good conduit for a wide variety of anti-Jewish theological polemic.

From the work I have done so far, I have the impression that the *Ordinary Gloss* was not particularly interested in the negative imagery in these examples. The gloss on the reference to the princes of the Romans conquering the Jews in Gratian 1’s final dictum of question five is explanatory. It explained that the princes were Vespasian and Titus who ‘destroyed Jerusalem in the forty-second year after the Passion of the Lord’. 33 The Anglo-Norman gloss simply added the names of Titus and Vespasian above the words in the text to identify who the ‘principes Romanorum’ were. 34 From our previous discussion this should actually come as no surprise. This imagery of itself would not have presented the glossators with legal conundrums in need of explanatory notes and solutions. The negative images seems to have been a given which needed no further elucidation. But Gratian 1’s neutral introductory comments in *Quod autem* to question 6 certainly did. 35 Why? Because question 6 concerned the use of force to make the wicked good, and this immediately raised the legal question whether it would be permissible to force Jews to embrace the ‘goodness’ of Christianity. Johannes/Bartholomeus commented that there was no doubt that no one should be compelled to the good which he had not taken upon himself. Johannes referred his readers to *Disciplina* in Distinction 45 of the first part of the *Decretum*, a canon of the first recension consisting of a passage from Gregory the Great’s *Moralia* on the importance of finding the right balance between discipline and compassion. 36 He went on to draw attention to the words in the final section of Gratian’s summing up of question 6 of causa 23 which argued that there was no point in forcing the wicked to

32 C. 23 q. 3 d. a. c. 1, ed. Friedberg, coll. 895–6.
33 C. 23 q. 5 d. p. c. 49, ed. Friedberg, 945–6; MS 67/34 108vb; Bartholomeus adds nothing, 6/6, fol. 174va; Roman edition, col. 1793.
34 MS 283/676, fol. 162ra.
35 C. 23 q. 6 d. a. c. 1, ed. Friedberg, col. 947.
take on a good ‘which they would always be unwilling to bear and would never willingly serve. However, because it was part of human nature to hate what one was not used to and to prefer what one was accustomed to, the wicked should forcefully be restrained from iniquity and encouraged to what was good, so that they would begin to hate evil, as fear of punishment made them unused to it, while what was good became ever sweeter through force of habit’.  

Bartholomeus, however, inserted a sentence after Johannes’s initial statement that nobody should be forced to do the good they had not taken upon themselves which pointed out that one should be forced to the good which one had taken upon oneself. He then repeated Johannes’s reference to Disciplina but this must have been an oversight on his part; the reference clearly should have been to De Iudeis. De Iudeis was the very widely disseminated canon 57 of the Fourth Council of Toledo of 633 which had ruled that Jews might not be forced to convert, but once they had been converted they might not return to Judaism.

It would seem from this that Bartholomeus might have felt that Johannes’s Ordinary Gloss on passages concerning forced conversion would be more complete if Jews were brought into the discussion. This is also the case for the thirty-third canon of question 5, another Augustinian text with the opening words: ‘Ad fidem nullus est cogendus’. Bartholomeus’s updated version of the Ordinary Gloss comments on ‘cogendus’ and referred his readers to De Iudeis. Johannes did not comment on the word and made no reference to De Iudeis in the comments he made on the canon.

Something similar can, I believe, be said about the compiler(s) of Gratian 2 from the additions made to Gratian 1’s Distinction 45. The first part of the Distinction concerned the patience bishops needed to exercise in their pastoral role. De Iudeis was one of the many canons inserted in Gratian 2, as was Qui sincera. Qui sincera was another widely disseminated canon concerning Jews; it was drawn from Gregory the Great’s letter of 602 to the Bishop of Naples which stipulated that Jews should be coaxed to the Christian faith rather than hindered in the practice of their own religion. The compiler(s) of Gratian 2 would seem

---

37 C. 23 q. 6 d. p. c. 4, ed. Friedberg, coll. 949–50.
38 C. 23 q. 6 d. a. c. 1, MS 6/6, fol. 174vb: Quod autem Hic nihil est dubitationis quia ad bonum non susceptum nemo est cogendus. Set ad bonum quod suscepit est cogendus ut 45 distinctio ‘Disciplina’. Magister tamen alter soluit infra ea § ultima: MS 67/34, fol. 108vb: Quod autem Hic nihil est dubitationis quia ad bonum non susceptum nemo est cogendus ut 45 distinctio ‘Disciplina’. It is worth mentioning that Johannes/Bartholomeus refer to canon 3 (vides) of question 6 of causa 23 in their comments on De Iudeis (MS 6/6, fol. 36va; MS 67/34, fol. 16ra). And in the Ordinary Gloss in the Roman edition the reference is to De Iudeis and not Disciplina, Roman edn, col. 1796.
39 D. 45 c. 5, ed. Friedberg, coll. 161–2; JLSEMA, p. 486, no. 840.
40 C. 23 q. 5 c. 33, ed. Friedberg, coll. 919–40.
41 Roman edn, col. 1784.
to have thought that for the sake of completion Distinction 45 needed to include these well-known canons regulating correct episcopal behaviour vis-à-vis Jews. Much the same occurred in Gratian in question 6 of causa 23 with the insertion of *Iam vero* (c. 4) before Gratian’s closing *dictum* to give another example of putting pressure on the wicked to be good. *Iam vero* was a Gregorian text which advised a bishop to reform recalcitrant peasants (rusticus) by increasing their financial burdens. Johannes/Bartholomeus explained in the Ordinary Gloss that these rustics were not heretics whom one was not allowed to tolerate on one’s land; they were those who were incorrigible in another way or they were Jews.43

The Anglo-Norman gloss contains no reference to *De Iudeis* in its comments on *Quod autem* (C. 23 q. 6 d. a. c. 1), but its compilers were even more thorough than Bartholomeus in their deliberations on *Ad fidem* (C. 23 q. 5 c. 33). In its comments on the word ‘fides’ the gloss first refers to *De Iudeis* to emphasise that this concerns faith not yet undertaken. It then refers to C. 1 q. 2 c. 2 *Quam pio* to stress that one should not be attracted to monastic conversion by way of gifts. Turning to rules concerning the future of oblates reaching adulthood it emphasises that there was no value in forced service and refers its readers to C. 20 q. 1 c. 10. The gloss ends up by making plain that once faith had been undertaken it had to be kept by referring to canon 38 of question 4 of causa 23, *Displicet* and the end of *De Iudeis* which spelt out how forced Jewish converts need to remain Christians.44 Again, however important *De Iudeis* was for the course of Christian–Jewish relations, here it functioned as part of an overall attempt to include all relevant legal angles to the question of forcing someone to be good or believe what was deemed to be true.

Something similar can be said for question 4 of causa 23 which was concerned with the allowability of wreaking vengeance. In the *dictum* preceding *Infideles* (C. 23 q. 4 c. 17) Gratian speaks of ‘those who are outside our jurisdiction’ or as Paul put it in 1 Corinthians ‘are without’ (*qui foris sunt* [1 Cor. 5:12, 13]). The Anglo-Norman MS glosses the words ‘non sunt [noster iuris]’ with a reference to *De Iudeis*.45 *Infideles* argued that sharing meals and partaking in conversation

---

43 C. 23 q. 6 c. 4, ed. Friedberg, 949; S. Gregorii Magni, *Registrum epistularum*, Libri I–VII, ed. by D. Norberg, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCS) 140 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 4.16, p. 245. MS 67/14, fol. 108vb: Si hoc caput intelligatur de hereticis contrarium est *Extra i De hereticis Sicut ubi* prohibetur ne aliquis eos teneat in terris suis, vel in domo vel aliquem contractum cum eis faciat. Sed dic quod loquitur de eo qui alias est incorrigibilis vel loquitur de Iudeis prout dixi supra q. 4 c. ultimum. It is worth mentioning that Gregory actually suggested using this kind of method with regard to converting Jews in 592 and 594, see *JLSEMA*, nos 707 and 712 (Manichaeans are mentioned in this letter), pp. 423–4 and 428–9. 44 MS 283/676, fol. 169vb: Suscipiendam ab initio supra 45 ‘De Iudeis’. Sed nec munere attrahendus, supra 1. q. 1 ‘Quam pio’. Quia servicia coacta non placent supra 20. q. 1 ‘Illud’. Secus ex postfacto supra ea q. 4 ‘Displicet’. 45 ‘De Iudeis’ in fine. I am very grateful for Dr Tessa Webber’s help in transcribing this gloss. 45 C. 23 q. 4 d. p. c. 16 and c. 17, ed. Friedberg, coll. 904–5; MS 283/676, fol. 154ra.
with ‘infidels’ should not be avoided because both were means to win them over to Christianity. In the case of the Infideles who were on the inside, ‘rot should be cut off’. Johannes/Bartholomeus and the Anglo-Norman gloss naturally noticed the similarity between this canon and Ad mensam (C. 11 q. 3 c. 24) which was inserted into Gratian 2 in a discussion about relations with excommunicates. It was an opinion by John Chrysostom that Christians might eat with pagans but not with any Christian fornicator, drunk or miser.46 But Johannes/Bartholomeus and the Anglo-Norman gloss seemed primarily to have been interested in solving the contradictions between Infideles and Nullus and Omnes two canons in Causa 28: (C. 28 q. 1 c. 13 and 14) which concerned Christian interaction with Jews.47

Causa 28 was all about the status of marriages between Christian converts and their spouses who did not wish to accompany them to the font. Nullus and Omnes were two of seven canons inserted in Gratian 2 at the point where Gratian 1 was developing Paul’s advice in Corinthians (1 Cor. 7: 13–4) to hold on to an infidel wife if that could lead to her growing towards the faith. The compiler(s) of Gratian 2 clearly felt that it was vital to specify that infideles in this instance did NOT include Jews. To this end a whole new part to the discussion was inserted in Gratian 2 with the heading: ‘Contra is found in the Fourth Council of Toledo (633)’ and canon 63 was cited which spelt out that Jewish wives might not stay with their converted husbands.48 For good measure a dictum was added in Gratian 2 after this canon explaining that this ruling was instituted to prevent a Christian spouse who was trying to save his infidel wife from finding damnation with her. Among the following canons separating Jews from Christians Nullus forbade members of the clergy and the laity to eat the unleavened bread of the Jews, fraternise with Jews, join them in bath houses, send for them in their illnesses or accept medicine from them. It was first promulgated in 691 at the Council ‘In Trullo’ which was convoked by Emperor Justinian II.49 Omnes prohibited the clergy and laity from sharing meals with Jews because it was deemed inappropriate and sacrilegious for Christians to eat food prepared by Jews if Jews deemed food prepared by Christians unclean ‘and thus Christians would start being inferior to Jews’. Omnes was often cited in canonical collections; it was originally promulgated in this form at the Council of Agde of 506.50

---

46 C. 11 q. 3 c. 24, ed. Friedberg, coll. 650–1.
47 C. 28 q. 1 c. 13 and 14, ed. Friedberg, coll. 1087–8.
48 C. 28 q. 1 c. 11, ed. Friedberg, col. 1087; JLSEMA, no. 846, pp. 489–90.
50 JLSEMA, no. 812 and 1224, pp. 467, 672–3. It too was included in Ivo’s Decretum and the Tripartita: Ivo, Decretum, JLSEMA, no. 1224, pp. 672–3; Tripartita 2.18.39, https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/tripartita.html (accessed 17 February 2015), see also the version from the Council of Vannes of c. 465, JLSEMA,
Johannes/Bartholomeus solved the contradiction between *Infideles* in *causa* 23 and *Omnes* and *Nullus* in *causa* 28 by spelling out that *Omnes* and *Nullus* specifically dealt with Jews, while *Infideles* concerned pagans.\(^5\) The Anglo-Norman gloss on *Ad mensam* pointed to the contradiction between it and *Nullus*; one of the comments warned that Jews must be avoided and that ‘today there is no distinction between a Jew and a gentilis.’\(^5\) As part of its extensive treatment of *Nullus* the Anglo-Norman gloss explains why Christians may not eat with Jews by pointing out that ‘Jews used to be more hateful than gentiles but that now they were equally hateful.’\(^5\) The Anglo-Norman gloss includes a long discussion by the English canonist, John of Tynmouth on *Nullus*. For John of Tynmouth the problem of unleavened bread and, indeed, Jewish food generally, was revulsion for what he called ‘Jewish superstition’ and the fact Jews would not eat Christian food indiscriminately. His concern was Jewish adherence to the Law of Moses and close friendships between Christians and Jews. Interestingly, he added that a Christian was allowed to eat unleavened bread if he would otherwise die of hunger. In the same way he could obtain medicine from a Jew to save his life. In fact, Christians could supply medicine to dying Jews as well.\(^5\) Again, we see a legal mind at work here, working out all the eventualities which might occur in interpreting the text in the *Decretum*.

As for the contradiction between *Ad mensam* and *Omnes*, Johannes/Bartholomeus commented on *Ad mensam*: ‘but we cannot eat with Jews as in *Omnes*. But neither is it nowadays permitted to eat with *paganis* because they separate food just as the Jews do.’\(^5\) Johannes/Bartholomeus repeated this

---

52 MS 283/676, fol. 111rb: [...] Item Iudei vitandi sunt 28 q. 2 [sic] ‘Iudei’. Hodie autem non est distinctio Iudei et gentilis.
53 MS 283/676, fol. 184va: solutio magis odiosi erant Iudei quam gentiles hodie autem pariter odiosi sunt.
54 MS 283/676, fol. 184va. This is one of the glosses transcribed in: Kuttner and Rathbone, ‘Anglo-Norman Canonists’, p. 351 (see note 15); Czerwinski, pp. 270–1, pointed to John’s dependency here on Huguccio; on Huguccio see David M. Freidenreich, ‘Sharing Meals with Non-Christians in Canon Law Commentaries, Circa 1160–1260: a Case Study in Legal Development’, *Medieval Encounters*, 14 (2008), pp. 41–77 (pp. 56–57).
55 MS 6/6 fol. 121ra: ad mensam permittimus: ad hoc, ut eos lucrumur ur 23 quæstio 4 infideles. Cum Judeis et non possumus comedere, ut 28 q. 1 omnes. Sed nec hodie cum paganis licet est comedere, cum ipsi discernant cibos sicet Iudei. [...]—MS 67/34, fol. 81vb, line 2 permittimus ad hoc, ut eos lucrumur ur 23 quæstio 4 infideles. Cum Judeis et non possumus comedere, ut 28 q. 1 omnes. Sed nec hodie cum paganis licet comedere, cum et ipsis discernant cibos sicet Iudei. [...]
observation in the gloss on *Omnes* where they used the word ‘gentilium’. Terms used in Medieval Latin for unbelievers varied and often it can be difficult to know precisely what kind of disbelief is being referred to. But in the glosses on *Ad mensam* and *Omnes* it is evident that the glossators are using the terms *paganus* and *gentilis* to signify Muslims, who, after all made distinction among foodstuffs as Jews do by, for example rejecting pork.

The closing sentence of *Omnes* contained the phrase ‘and thus Christians would start being inferior to Jews’. The Anglo-Norman glosses on the word ‘*inferiores*’ are attributed to the Anglo-Norman canonist, Simon of Southwell. One of them referred to canon 26 of the Third Lateran Council which spelt out that Jews should be subjected to Christians. When Johannes/Bartholomew commented on ‘*inferiores*’ they simply referred to *In sancta* (C. 2 q. 7 c. 4) which featured in a section concerning the question whether those in higher orders can be accused by those in lower orders or by laymen. It contained the words: ‘for we know that we have been placed above them by the Lord and not they over us, and just as the greater cannot be judged by the lesser neither can the greater be bound by the lesser because everything that is great stands apart’. It seems to me that Johannes was thinking that these words, which in their original context had nothing whatsoever to do with Jews, expressed well why Christians should not eat with those whose dietary laws contradicted Christian teaching about the supersession of Judaism and the proper relationship between Christians and Jews.

The final sentence of *Infideles* stipulated that when it came to the unbelievers, who are within (*qui intus sunt, id est infidelibus*), their rot should be cut off.

---

56 Ms 6/6 fol. 200vb: Omnes Iudeorum similis et gentilium, cum iam cibos discernant [...]; MS 67/34, Fol 120vb (2 lines from bottom)–121ra: Omnes Iudeorum similis et gentilium, cum iam cibos discernant [...].


59 Ed. Friedberg, coll. 483–4: In sancta Nicena sinodo statutum est, ut nemo anathematizatus in nostra suscipiatur accusatone, nec illi, qui nos in sua accusatione nolunt recipere, cum nos super illos sciamus a Domino constituitos, non illos super nos, et sicut maior non potest a minore iudicari, ita nec culligia, quia rarum est omne quod magnum est. [...].

60 On these canons and a comparison between canonistic treatment of Muslims and Jews see Freidenreich, ‘Sharing Meals’, pp. 47–64. See also his *Foreigners and their Food. Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), and Czerwinski, pp. 164–84.
Johannes’s comment on this is that the Church at times likewise punished the Jews and referred to *Constituit in causa* 17 (C. 17 q. 4 c. 31) as well as, Innocent III’s bull, *Post miserabilem*.61 *Constituit* was canon 65 of the Fourth Council of Toledo (633) which forbade Jews and converts from Judaism from holding public office because it was thought they would misuse their authority to maltreat Christians. Anyone allowing Jews to do this would be guilty of sacrilege. It was one of the canons added in Gratian 2 to question 4 of *causa* 17 joining more than thirty others concerning prohibitions of infringing ecclesiastical privileges and property.62 *Post miserabilem* refers to Innocent III’s bull to Archbishop of Narbonne and others calling for a Crusade which included a section which aimed to protect crusaders from having to pay interest on their loans. As far as Jewish lenders were concerned, Innocent demanded that they remit the usury owed to them. The Pope admonished the lords who had jurisdiction over the Jewish lenders to enforce this.63 It is interesting that Johannes/Bartholomeus brought in the Jews in their consideration of the words ‘qui intus sunt’. It seems to me that it reflected the ambiguous position of Jews in medieval Christian society. Yes, certainly, Jews were *foris*, on the outside, yet, paradoxically, through their service to Christendom they were intimately connected with what was happening *intus*, ‘on the inside’.

Let us now finally turn our attention to *Dispar nimirum*. The text reads: *Dispar nimirum est Iudeorum et Sarracenorum causa*. In illos enim, qui Christianos persecutur, et ex urbibus et propriis sedibus pellunt, iuste pugnatatur; hii ubique servire parati sunt (‘The case of Jews and Muslims is without a doubt different. For against the latter, who persecute Christians and drive them out of their own cities and settlements, one fights justly; the former are prepared to serve everywhere’).64 The text is canon 11 of *causa* 23’s question 8 which asked whether ecclesiastics were permitted to engage in violence on their own authority, or the pope’s or the emperor’s. The issue begged further questions about the permissibility of prelates shedding blood by their own hands or by the hands of laymen at their direction. Saracens come up in canon 7, which was the letter by Pope Leo IV (847–52) to Emperor Louis II in which he urged the people to go to the coast to protect it

---

61 MS 67/34, fol. 106va: Qui intus] Quandoque etiam ludeos punit ecclesia ludeos Extra III de usuris ‘Post miserabilem’ et 7 [sic] q. 4 ‘Constituit’. Johannes gave the so-called *Compilatio Tertia*, the compilation of Innocent III decreets between 1198 and 1209 as the reference for *Post miserabilem*. Bartholomew updated that to the Gregorian Decretals. On the *Compilatio Tertia* see Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, p. 195; MS 6/6, fol. 166va.
62 C. 17 q. 4 c. 31, ed. Friedberg, col. 815; JLSEM 1, pp. 490–1, no. 848.
64 C. 23 q. 8 c. 11, ed. Friedberg, 955; Freidenreich, ‘Muslims in Western Canon Law’, p. 45.
from Saracen attack. Saracens were mentioned again when Gratian referred to this letter and Saracens in his dictum after canon 20. Neither Johannes nor Bartholomeus had anything to say about these two mentions of Muslims. At this point their focus was on questions of papal and imperial authority and the contentious issue of clerical harnessing of violence.65

Before we analyse the glosses on Dispar nimirum it is worth asking ourselves why Gratian chose this canon for his Decretum in the first place. Again, we might be tempted to wonder why he did not choose Sicut Iudeis. Why was Sicut not added to Gratian 2? This time we are referring to Sicut Iudeis in its original Gregorian form. Gregory the Great’s Sicut Iudeis was, after all, the most widely disseminated canon which concerned the protection of Jews in the tenth, eleventh and early twelfth-century canonical collections. Gilchrist’s data demonstrate that it occurred three times more often in the post 1063 collections which pre-dated Gratian than Dispar Nimirum on its own or in its expanded version, Placuit nobis sermo, i.e. the full text of the letter Alexander II sent to the Spanish bishops. None of these collections included both Sicut Iudeis and Dispar Nimirum (Placuit).66

That neither Gratian 1 nor Gratian 2 includes the twelfth-century papal version of Sicut Iudeis fits in with the fact that with one exception the Decretum does not include papal bulls (as distinct from conciliar decisions) beyond the reign of Pascal II (1099–1118).67

Without wishing to get caught up in the minefield of what sources Gratian might have used directly or indirectly, we might find an important clue by looking at the placing of Dispar Nimirum in quaestio 8 and reflecting whence Gratian might have derived his texts. The canons introduced by Gratian 1’s second dictum and preceding canon 11, as well as canon 11 (Dispar) itself and Gratian 1’s canons 12, 13, 14 and 16 are all to be found in the eighth book of the late eleventh/early twelfth-century (?) Panormia, commonly ascribed to Ivo of Chartres.68 The fact that they are listed in the same book of the Panormia, in adjacent, if not consecutive canons, leads one to conjecture that they came to Gratian, as it were, in a ‘Panormian’ cluster.69 The Panormia did not include the Gregorian Sicut Iudeis.70

67 Landau, ‘Gratian’, p. 28; see also Winroth, pp. 136–45.
68 The attribution has been challenged by Christof Rolker in his book Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), see https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/panormia.html (accessed 17 February 2015), where a possible range of dates for the Panormia is given.
70 Gilchrist, ‘The Canonistic Treatment’, p. 106 (Sicut Iudeis was also not included in Ivo’s Decretum or the Tripartita).
This might provide us with a simple technical explanation why Gratian 1 included *Dispar Nimirum*.

However, if we extend our contextual analysis to Gratian 1’s canons 17 and 18 we notice that they appeared in the *Polycarpus*, the canonical collection assembled by Gregory of St Grisogno (c. 1111–13), which we know Gratian used. The *Polycarpus* did include *Sicut Iudeis*.71 We must therefore take on board the strong likelihood that Gratian’s choice of *Dispar Nimirum* was an informed choice and not simply determined by what was available to him in his sources. It is at this point that we need to remember that our fixation on Gregory’s *Sicut Iudeis* has a great deal to do with the fact that it provided the nub of the papal bull Jews so frequently requested in the twelfth and thirteenth century. But *Sicut Iudeis* plainly did not offer what Gratian 1 was looking for. In the context of this part of question 8 of *causa* 23 he needed an up-to-date text which drew out the difference between Muslims and Jews; he was interested in texts which specified permission to perpetrate violence. *Dispar Nimirum* was the perfect fit for his purposes, as it had been for the author of the *Panormia*. Gratian even went so far as to drop the final line of Alexander II’s original letter, *Quemdam etiam episcopum sinagogam eorum destruere volentem cohibuit* (‘And he restrained a certain bishop who wished to destroy their synagogue’). Because Alexander had referred to *beatus Gregorius* in the first part of his letter, the closing sentence of the letter would seem to be an oblique reference to Gregory’s *Sicut*, which the *Panormia* had included.72 Muslims with whom Christians regularly did battle was the issue at this point of *causa* 23, not protection of Jews *per se*. I believe that this is borne out by the fact that *Sicut Iudeis* was also not included in Gratian 2, to which so much extra material had been added to elaborate on topics which would appear not to have been fully covered by Gratian 1.

The Anglo-Norman gloss contains interlinear glosses to *Dispar* to make absolutely sure that it was crystal clear that it was the Saracens who set about attacking Christians and the Jews who did the serving.73 The marginal glosses seem to have

71 The *Collection in Three Books*, which was compiled between 1113 and 1120, and which we know Gratian consulted also contained *Sicut Iudeis*. (The Collection in Three Books depends heavily on the *Polycarpus*). *JLSEMA*, 680–1 and no. 1239, p. 681; Gilchrist, ‘The Canonistic Treatment’, p. 106; Landau, ‘Gratian’, *HMCL*, p. 32; *Collectio canonum trium librorum*, 3.6.1 ed. by Guiseppe Motta, vol. 2 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2005) p. 42.

72 *Panormia*, VIII, 29, https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/panormia.html (accessed 17 February 2015); *JLSEMA* no. 731, pp. 452–3. In the context of this publication it is worth mentioning here that Blumenkranz suggested that it was a copyist who had separated the line from the earlier passage in the papal letter outlining Gregory’s policy protection of Jews. See Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Les Auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les juifs et le judaïsme* (Paris: Mouton, 1961), p. 163 n. 5. It could also be argued that in absence of the whole text of Alexander’s letter in the *Panormia*, Gratian could have been unclear to whom the final sentence alluded. I am grateful to Dr Brett for this insight.

73 MS 283/676, Fol. 163vb: *interlinear* sedibus pellunt: ut Saraceni; hii: Iudei.
had two aims. The first was to expand on the canon’s direction that Muslims and not Jews might be attacked by specifying that this did not run counter to De Iudeis in Distinction 45. The Anglo-Norman gloss, in other words, took great care to specify exactly when using force against Jews was legal and when it was not. This rather than protection of Jews per se seemed to have been the legal issue. The Glossa Ordinaria did not mention De Iudeis in its glosses on Dispar. This makes one wonder whether there might be a connection between the contents of this gloss in Anglo-Norman MS and the pogroms against the Jews which had spilled out of London to East Anglia and York in 1189/90. Further study on the choices the compilers of the Anglo-Norman gloss made from the sources available to them might shed more light on this question.

The second marginal gloss concentrates on the distinction between Muslims and Jews by referring back to canons we have already studied: Ad mensam in causa 11 and Omnes in causa 28. It pointed out that Jews were treated more favourably here than Muslims but less favourably in those two canons. Johannes/Bartholomeus also referred to Ad mensam, but their priority seems to have been to establish greater clarity around the position of Muslims. For they wrote: ‘It seems therefore that if Saracens do not persecute Christians that we cannot assail them for we are even able to eat with them (C. 11 q. 3 Ad mensam). And the law says that we must do no harm to those who conduct themselves quietly (Justinian Code 1. 11. 6). The ruling in the Justinian Code comes from the section concerning pagan sacrifices; this particular law admonished Christians not to abuse their religious authority and harass Jews and Pagans who were behaving peacefully and not attempting anything violent or against the law.

This is very much work in progress. I have only analysed a fraction of Gratian’s Decretum along with the Ordinary Gloss and the Anglo-Norman gloss on the basis of three significant MSS. As yet, I have not yet analysed the sources Johannes, Bartholomeus, and the compilers of the Anglo-Norman gloss might have used and shared. What I have presented of the Caius Anglo-Norman MS is only the start of a large project of analysing the references to Jews and Muslims in the

74 MS 283/676, fol. 163vb: Margin: iuste: Non est contra supra 45 De Iudeis. Notum favorabiores sunt hic Iudei quam Sarraceni alias autem minus favorabiles 11. q. 3 ad mensam 28. q. 1.
75 See note 74.
76 MS 6/6, Fol. 176rb: Dispar persecuntur] Videtur ergo quod si Sarraceni non persequantur Christianos quod non possimus impetere eos nam etiam ad mensam eorum comedere possimus 11. q. iii ad mensam. Et lex dicit quod eis quiete degentibus nulla[m] <est> facere debemus molestia[m] ut C. de sacrifi. pag.: MS 67/34: Fol. 109rb l. 26: Dispar persecuntur] Videtur ergo quod si Sarraceni non persequantur Christianos quod non possimus impetere eos nam etiam ad mensam eorum comedere possimus xi. Q. iii ad mensam. Etiam lex dicit quod eis quiete degentibus nulla[m] facere debemus molestia[m] ut C. de sacrificiis pa. Christianis; Justinian Code, 1. 11. 6, in JLSEMA, p. 300. See also Herde, ‘Christians and Saracens’, pp. 58–61.
gloss as a whole. That being said, it seems to me that on the basis of what I have discovered so far the following preliminary observations can be made.

Our work has demonstrated how important it is not to focus solely on rulings which were geared to Jews. By approaching *causa* 23 from a broad perspective we have been able to demonstrate that Gratian 1 and the compiler(s) of Gratian 2 used Jews through their patristic texts time and again to present their arguments. We have also learned just how often Johannes, Bartholomeus, and the Anglo-Norman gloss referred to Jews in sections which did not concern Jews. Our glossators mentioned Jews for the sake of comprehensiveness; they referred to Jews to make their legal points. Unsurprisingly, it was Jews who were being used in this way, not Muslims; Jews were tolerated in Christian society on account of their utility or service to Christendom. From what I have seen so far it seems to me that apart from the few canons which specifically and unambiguously mentioned Muslims, Muslims were brought into the discussion in conjunction with Jews, as for example in the glosses we have seen on *Ad mensam*, *Nullus* and *Omnes*. To me this makes sense. The position of Muslims under Christian rule bore numerous similarities to that of Jews, but the roles of Judaism and Islam were not the same in Latin Christendom.77

Our work has also indicated the importance of analysing individual canons concerning Jews within the full context of the *Decretum* in order to understand why they were included in the first place and how they were perceived by those who studied and taught the material. We have seen that, notwithstanding the violence which had been perpetrated against the Jewish communities of the Rhineland in 1096, *Dispar Nimirim* seems to have been included in the *Decretum* to distinguish between Muslims and Jews rather than to supply a ruling which specifically protected Jews. This is borne out by the commentaries in the *Glossa Ordinaria* as well as in the Anglo-Norman gloss. More research along these lines should be able to help us understand better why the vast majority of the anti-Jewish canons of the *Decretum* were included in Gratian 2 rather than Gratian 1. Based on the work I have done on disentangling the versions of Distinction 45, question 4 of *causa* 17 and question 1 of *causa* 28 in Gratian 1 and Gratian 2 my preliminary thoughts are that ‘Jewish’ canons were added to Gratian 2 in much the same way that other canons were added, that is in an attempt to include all relevant legal material rather than for any other specific reason.

To be sure, what mattered to compiler(s) of the *Decretum* and, indeed, to the glossators we have considered was Christendom, not Jews. Yet the fact that they felt the need to refer to Jews so abundantly in their work for the sake of comprehensiveness and precision resulted in the dissemination of theological and legal

---

77 See David Freidenreich’s take on this in his ‘Muslims in Western Canon Law’, pp. 42 and 53–63.
material that far, far outweighed the dissemination of even the most popular learned treatises such as Peter Alfonsi’s *Dialogus*. Even more crucially, copies of the *Decretum* and its glosses would have been studied by much broader sections of ecclesiastical and lay society than any theological works concerning the presence of Jews in Christian society, arguably including the extensively disseminated *Ordinary Gloss* of the Bible. What I have presented here is only the first step of a very much larger project, but I hope that I have been able to demonstrate how crucial it is to gain far greater understanding of how and why canon lawyers engaged with Jews as an integral part of their deliberations about the ecclesiastical governance of Latin Christendom.\(^7\)

\(^7\) I owe a great debt to Dr Martin Brett for his very helpful comments on this paper. Any errors are entirely my own responsibility.
SACRED OBJECTS IN JEWISH HANDS. TWO CASE STUDIES*

Birgit Wiedl

Institute for Jewish History in Austria

In 1331, a rumour spread through the small town of Klosterneuburg. A year earlier, a fire that had started in the town and had spread to the monastery towering above the town on a steep hill, had in its wake destroyed a vast part of the church and the adjacent building. 1 While the monastery’s most valued treasure, forty-five twelfth-century fire-gilded, coloured and enamelled panels, had most likely remained unharmed – allegedly, wine had been poured over them to prevent damage – the otherwise extensive damage prompted the provost of the monastery, Stephen of Sierndorf, to commissioned major, and presumably rather costly, reconstruction works. In that course, Provost Stephen had die schön daffl (‘the beautiful panels’) brought to the goldsmiths of Vienna. They not only redid the gilding, but also redesigned the panels according to the provost’s wishes: the panels which had until then been used as the casing for the pulpit, were reworked into a winged altar. 2 Perhaps it was the long absence of the masterpiece from the church, and most likely the high costs of this endeavour that set the citizens’ tongues wagging: To finance his ambitious reconstruction work, the provost had pawned the panels to the Jews, so the vintners in and around Klosterneuburg gossiped. Die hauer clafften, ‘the vintners were yapping’, wrote the chronicle’s author, creating a strong connotation with slanderous talk; ‘and they yapped on in that manner’, the chronicle continues. 3 Although the chronicle

---

* Research for this article was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P24405-G18.
1 The Kleine Klosterneuburger Chronik (‘Small Chronicle of Klosterneuburg’) gives 1322 as the year of the fire, 1330 (and thus 1331 for the reconstruction works) is however more likely, see Floridus Röhrig, Der Verduner Altar, 8th ed. (Wien: Herold, 2004), pp. 19–20.
2 Röhrig, Verduner Altar, pp. 19–21.
is anything but dependable, Jewish involvement in the financing of the reconstruction works is not entirely impossible. Apart from the already flourishing Viennese community not far away, one of the most prestigious Jewish money-lenders in early fourteenth-century Austria, the Jewess Plume, had settled down in Klosterneuburg around 1320. Therefore, even the local Jewish community definitely had the financial capacity to (co-)finance such an endeavour. Yet there is no hint as to any loan having been taken out, or any pawn having been given, or any other involvement having taken place. Furthermore, unlike other monasteries, Klosterneuburg had at that time rather scarce contacts with Jewish money-lenders. Most likely, no actual pawning had ever taken place. Whether the vintners of Klosterneuburg did gossip about it or whether these rumours had been made up by the chronicle’s author(s) is of secondary importance for the topic at hand: it seems that the mere knowledge of high costs, of a considerable amount of money being involved, had caused someone to bring Jews into the equation. At the core of this gossip stood one message: Giving away precious church objects to Jews is bad.

It is unlikely that the writer(s) of the chronicle were referring to – or, rather, making a mockery of – one of the exceptions that officially allowed medieval clergy to resort to pawning liturgical objects: hardship and dire need. The twelfth-century *Decretum Gratiani* states that only ecclesiastical institutions so debt-ridden that they could otherwise not alleviate their financial burden were permitted to sell surplus church articles, and this on condition that they obtain approval of the relevant ecclesiastical authority. If these articles were not sold to another ecclesiastical institution, they had to be melted down before being handed over to laypersons. What, however, is missing from the regulations of the *Decretum* as it

---

1963), pp. 305–06, argues for a fourteenth-century original that would have been written by one or more citizens of Klosterneuburg, but this presumes considerable corruption of large parts of the text.


6 Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, p. 69, nr. 53 (1275), the monastery had pawned a vineyard to the Jewess Dreslinna who possibly lived in Klosterneuburg. Mostly, the monastery profited by buying vineyards and plots of land that were forfeited pledges, see, e.g., Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, I, p. 157, nr. 148, p. 192, nr. 199, p. 214, nr. 235, pp. 226–27, nr. 257.

is from most of the earlier and later collections of canon law, are the Jews. Neither the Decretum (which in addition to the aforementioned dire circumstances listed the liberation of prisoners by means of ransom⁸ as a legitimate reason for selling liturgical objects)⁹ nor, to mention another important instance, the Liber extra (which also allowed the alienation of Church property only in times of distress) list Jews among the potential buyers or pawn-takers. While the Decretum speaks generally of ‘anyone’ (cuilibet) to whom the (melted) objects may be sold, the Liber extra goes into detail: innkeepers, merchants or other laymen, and women are listed as potential business partners.¹⁰ While Jews, however, were missing from official ecclesiastical regulations of the high middle ages, Jörg Müller has pointed out that papal reservations regarding the pledging of church articles to Jews not only existed but were linked to anti-Jewish sentiment in general.¹¹ Already in the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great had explicitly raged against sacred articles being sold to Jews, demanding that the Jew in question returned the articles and the clerics be punished.¹² In the early twelfth century, Petrus Venerabilis cautioned against Jews holding sacred vessels, since, if these vessels suffered horrible


⁹ For an example, see Müller, ‘Verpfändung sakraler Kultgegenstände’, pp. 191–94 (Bishop Hermann of Prague gives five palla in pawn to the Jews of Regensburg to add to the ransom for the Bohemian duke Svatopluk, who was held captive by King Henry V in 1107).

¹⁰ Lists of potential pawntakers that include Jews appear, e.g., in the mid-thirteenth century town statutes of Iglau (Moravia). These state that ‘no merchant, grocer, innkeeper or Jew nor anyone else’ should accept church articles in pawn, nor take them in for safe-keeping, unless ‘with good testimony’ (nisi sub certo testimonio). This clause most likely refers to clear knowledge about the object’s provenance. The punishment meted out for those contravening this regulation was equal for all perpetrators; when more regulations regarding Jews were added later, these focussed entirely on Jewish-Christian encounters of the sexual kind. Hermengild Jireček, Codex iuris Bohemici [CIB], vol. 1: Actataem Prémonsteram continens (Prague: Koher, 1867), p. 100, § XXXIII (de rebus ecclesiae); Johann Adolph Tomaschek, Deutsches Recht in Österreich im dreizehnten Jahrhundert. Auf Grundlage des Stadtrechtes von Iglau (Wien: Tendler, 1859), p. 172, who, interestingly and tellingly, interprets the quite unbiased list of the source (nullus mer- cator, institor, tabernator vel iudeus, edition pp. 1.45 and 314) as ‘these pawnings might have mostly taken place with merchants, grocers, innkeepers and preferably [my emphasis] with Jews’. The paragraph on the punishment was added in the late thirteenth/early fourteenth centuries, see Tomaschek, Deutsches Recht in Österreich, pp. 31 and 1.45. The additions: Jireček, CIB, p. 112; Tomaschek, Deutsches Recht in Österreich, pp. 196–97, with a compilation of similar regulations. See also Müller, ‘Gestolen’ (see note 15), p. 443 fn. 9 (with the additional example of Nördlingen).


treatment at the hand of the Jews, Christ himself would suffer.\textsuperscript{13} Peter, among others,\textsuperscript{14} also linked theological worries about sacred objects with critique of Jewish business in his reproach that the Jews would strive to enrich themselves by buying stolen church objects, an offence for which Christians were hanged, whereas Jews would, on grounds of a ‘very old but truly diabolic law’ [i.e. the Statute of the Market],\textsuperscript{15} not only go unpunished but ‘would be fattened and could revel in luxury’.\textsuperscript{16} About a hundred years later, when Jewish business activities had spread significantly in Western Europe and many regions of the Holy Roman Empire, Pope Alexander IV again connected these two sensitive subjects in his letter to the archbishops and bishops of the Kingdom of France. Not mincing matters, he complained bitterly about clerics who, unable to make a distinction between sacred and profane, dared to pledge these items to Jews. These, as enemies to the Christian faith, would commit horrendous crimes against these pawned objects. He therefore urged the bishops of France to forbid their clerics to pledge any ecclesiastical treasures to Jews – a stance that, as can be safely presumed, he took up not only in regard to the clergy and the Jews of France.\textsuperscript{17}

While early secular legislation occasionally cautioned Jews against accepting items of ecclesiastical provenance,\textsuperscript{18} the secular legislation from the thirteenth

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Robert Chazan, \textit{Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism} (Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1997), p. 51; Shatzmiller, ‘Church Articles’, p. 95.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Shatzmiller, ‘Church Articles’, pp. 95–97 with examples from France; Müller, ‘Verpfändung sakraler Kultgegenstände’, pp. 190–93.
\end{itemize}
century onwards reflected the secular rulers’ main interest in ‘their’ Jews whom they, as their servi camerae, counted among their treasure:19 ‘The rulers’ sole purpose is money’, Rabbi Jacob bar Jechiel put it quite blatantly in the mid-thirteenth century.20 Particularly with the ongoing transition of Imperial rights, among them the right to the Jews (Judenregal), to the territorial rulers,21 these rulers focussed on economic gain through the use of their Jewish subjects, with financial business being their core interest. Secular legislation therefore preoccupied itself mainly with regulating the economic aspects of Jewish-Christian interaction, particularly moneylending and pawn-taking. While the first encompassing imperial privilege for the German Jewry, issued in 1236 by Emperor Frederic II, followed the model of earlier privileges and predominantly stressed the Emperor’s claim to and protection of his servi camere nostre;22 the privilege his Austrian namesake, Duke Frederic II, granted to the Austrian Jews in 1244, dealt in twelve of altogether 31 articles solely with Jewish moneylending and pawn-taking.23 Among these regulations that not only defined the legal basis for the Austrian Jewry but also served as a model for many neighbouring countries,24 vestibus sanguinolentis et madefacti

(‘bloodied and soaked garments’), regardless of their secular or sacred function, were listed as items forbidden to take in pledge. Under King Přemysl Otakar II, they added three significant words – et sacris vestibus, ‘and sacred vestments’ – to the list, but did not enter the ducale legislation on a permanent basis, rather for reasons of dynastic than economic and/or ecclesiastical policy. They do, however, reappear in the territory of today’s Austria in a privilege the bishops of Bamberg granted to the Jews living in their Carinthian possessions. A rather similar, that is, predominantly economic approach is displayed by the various Landrechte of the German-speaking areas. The Sachsenspiegel – perhaps the most influential ‘German’ legal code (Rechtsbuch) – states that ‘if a Jew buys or accepts as a pledge chalices, books, or vestments of a cleric without a warrantor, and if the items are found on him, he shall be punished as a thief.’ Thus in Eike von Repgow’s view,

Anfänge bis zum späten Mittelalter (Darmstadt: Primus, 2001), pp. 139–43, nr. 65 (German translation). On Hungary, see Katalin Szende, ‘Laws, Loans, Literates. Trust in Writing in the Context of Jewish-Christian Contacts in Medieval Hungary’, in: Religious Cohabitation in European Towns (10th to 17th Centuries), Religion and Law in Medieval Christian and Muslim Societies, 3, ed. by Stéphane Boisselier and John Tolan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), pp. 243–271 (pp. 248–50); on Poland, see Jürgen Heyde, Transkulturelle Kommunikation und Verflechtung. Die jüdischen Wirtschaftseliten in Polen vom 14. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert. Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 29 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014, pp. 124–135. 25 In his reconfirmation and extension to Bohemia and Moravia of 1255, Otakar II adopted the article in question as it stood, see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 45–48, nr. 34 (1255); Jindřich Šebánek and Sáša Dušková, Codex diplomaticus et epistolarius regni Bohemiae (CDB), vol. 5, part 1: Indo ab a. MCCLIII usque ad a. MCCLXVI (Olomouc: Univ. Palackiana Olomucensis, 1974), pp. 85–91, nr. 41+ and 41+* (Latin and German); the three words were added in the 1262 reconfirmation (and extension to Styria) in 1262, see Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 51–54, nr. 19 (1262), pp. 61–65, nr. 47 (1268); Šebánek and Dušková, CDB 5/1, pp. 471–75, nr. 316, pp. 137, nr. 566. Brugger, ‘Von der Ansiedlung’, pp. 141–42; Magin, Status der Juden, pp. 355–56. This addition that catered more to the clergy can perhaps be seen in connection with Otakar’s attempts to ‘upgrade’ the Bohemian Bishopric of Olomouc to an archbishopric, see Peter Johanek, ‘Das Wiener Konzil von 1267, der Kardinallegat Guido und die Politik Ottokars II. Přemysl’s in Ottokar-Forschungen = Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich, N. F. 44/45 (1978/79), pp. 312–40 (p. 312). Interestingly, the otherwise very strict regulations of the synod of Vienna from 1267, mostly following and partly exacerbating the regulations of the Lateran IV Council, make no mention of it – it seems to have been considered a mere economic issue. 26 The privilege was reissued in 1277 by King Rudolph I (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 71–73, nr. 56), but although he acted as Holy Roman King, he did so with the clear political intent of acquiring the duchies of Austria and Styria for his family. Thus, the privilege was issued in its version of 1244, in explicit memory of the late Babenberg duke, and without any reference to Otokar with whom Rudolph was already in conflict. This reconfirmation of the 1244 version also meant that the sacred vestments were again missing from the list of banned objects. 27 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 255–57, nr. 102 (an auf pluötges, nasses und durchstoche pflant und an auf kelych und meezgewant, ‘apart from bloodied, soaked, and transpierced pledges, and chalices and sacred vestments’). The privilege was issued for the Jews of Villach but was inserted in a reconfirmation issued at Wolfsberg, the second Bamberg possession that housed a considerably large Jewish community; most likely, the privilege was extended to all of their Carinthian possessions, see Wilhelm Wädl, Geschichte der Juden in Kärnten im Mittelalter. Mit einem Ausblick bis zum Jahre 1867. Das Kärntner Landesarchiv 9 (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Kärntner Landesarchivs, 3rd. ed. 2009), pp. 159–60. 28 See Magin, Status der Juden, pp. 366–72.
only items that were acquired under dubious circumstances are cause for prosecution, regardless of their potential ecclesiastical function.\textsuperscript{29} Other legal codes, for instance the Schwabenspiegel, also specifically mentioned these items – \textit{kelich oder pucher oder garbe oder icht das zu der mess gehört}, ‘chalices or books or vestments or whatever belongs to mass’ – with a tad more to the detriment of the Jews: If the items were proven stolen, the Jew had to return them; if he refused to do so and could not present a warrantor, he would be hanged as a thief.\textsuperscript{30} The overall legitimacy of buying of, or lending money against sacred objects was not questioned; a legally sound transaction between a churchman and a Jew was, if the rules were obeyed, still possible, even if the pawns included sacred objects.\textsuperscript{31} Yet, there are qualifiers. Some authors took a clear anti-Jewish stance: The Schwabenspiegel blamed the Jews for the preferential rights which the kings had, quite against the law (\textit{wider recht}), granted to them,\textsuperscript{32} while the Wiener Stadtrechtsbuch, a private collection of municipal legal customs from the late fourteenth century, stated among its extensive regulations on Jewish pawnbroking that ‘the accursed Jews’ enjoyed much better rights towards the Christians than the Christians towards them, directly referring to the 1244 regulations.\textsuperscript{33} Markus Wenninger and Joseph Shatzmiller have also stressed the importance of the illustrations that accompany

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Lohrmann, ‘Rechtsstellung der Juden’, pp. 88–89.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the paragraph in several copies of the Sachsenspiegel: They show a Jew being hanged (or, in another version, with his hand being chopped off) with a chalice standing next to him. These illustrations lack the verbal qualifier – the possibility to present a warrantor – and merely show a Jew being punished for his crime. The ban on sacred objects as pledges also entered the legal codes of cities, which, in their efforts to gain an extended legal and economic control over the Jews living within their respective ambits, introduced regulations regarding Jewish pawnbroking into their municipal legislation. Although it is perhaps too small a sample to deduce a general proclivity on the part of ecclesiastically-ruled domains, it is worth noting that in Austrian town statutes, the ban on sacred objects as pawns for Jews appear, with one exception, only in towns that were under the rule of an ecclesiastical prince.

It was after the death of a Carinthian bishop, John III of Gurk, that in 1379 a commission, assigned by the papal chancellor, reported on the financial plight of the late bishop. John’s legacy amounted to a meagre 400 florins. John’s steward (procurator generalis), Hans Payer, blamed John’s predecessors who had left debts so high that the annual revenues of the bishopric would not even suffice to cover the interest, and particularly, those who demanded interest rates that were deemed too high – the Jews. Only with the aid of the Austrian dukes who had alleviated the burden of the interest rates had bankruptcy been averted.

Jewish moneylenders, on whom Hans Payer so glibly laid the blame, had indeed been frequented on a quite regular basis by John III’s predecessors, Paul and

35 See Magin, Status der Juden, particularly (but not exclusively) the chapter on the Statute of the Market, pp. 352–99, for banned items, pp. 391–99; for a list of examples of both towns and banned items, see GJ III/3, p. 2184.
38 Kärntner Landesarchiv [County Archives of Carinthia, further: KLA], AUR C 819; edition: Lang, Acta Salzburgo-Aquilejensia, pp. 743–50. Nr. 819, see also Waidl, Juden in Kärnten, pp. 43–44.
39 The Austrian dukes had indeed come to the rescue, albeit at a price: already in 1365, Duke Rudolph IV had acquired John III of the 2,400 florins (capital and interest) that John and his church owed the Jew Mosche of Maribor, grandson of Isserlein. The Duke did so as a recognition of John’s loyal service, but also against the ‘donation’ of 2,000 florins for Rudolph’s construction plans to Saint Stephen’s cathedral. Brugger and Wiedl, Rogesten, II (2010), p. 323, nr. 1117.
John II. Paul of Jägerndorf had ascended to the bishopric of Gurk in 1351 in a quite controversial and extremely costly appointment. In the following years, his need of money did for sure not decrease: as a papal nuncio, particularly for the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg, he was frequently sent on costly missions, and also acted as an emissary for the Austrian dukes on several occasions. These offices and missions, as well as Paul’s rather lavish lifestyle, came with a price, and in 1355, Paul took out a loan of 2613 florins with two of the most prestigious Jewish moneylenders of the time, Mosche of Maribor and his brother Chatschim of Celje. In return, the Bishop pledged – in a rather common formula – all of the church’s possessions. While this is the only diplomatic evidence for Paul’s Jewish credits, his financial situation could not have improved during his eight-year rule: conflavit plurimum aeris alieni, the episcopal catalogue sums up his reign. In
1359, Paul transferred to the Bishopric of Freising; in his stead, the chancellor of duke Rudolph IV, John Ribi of Platzheim-Lenzburg, was made bishop of Gurk – and found the bishopric in total financial disarray. Together with the Provost and canons of Gurk, he proceeded to accuse Paul of severe wrongdoings at the papal court. Paul had sold and mortgaged property that belonged to the bishopric’s mensal revenues, and despite Paul’s claim that he had used the proceeds to the benefit of the Church of Gurk, Pope Innocent VI ordered the Patriarch of Aquileia, Ludovico della Torre, to inquire into this. Innocent’s reaction to the second charge John brought in against his predecessor was not so accommodating. During his tenure, Paul has also pawned a mitre and a crozier ad ipsam ecclesiam spectantes (‘pertaining to this church, expected to be at this church’) to ‘certain Jews’ sub usurarum voragine, ‘against voracious interest rates’. After the interest owed had accrued drastically, Paul had refused – and still continued to do so – to redeem the two items and return them to their rightful owner. Innocent showed no leniency here: Ludovico should make sure that Paul, who had openly (coram nobis) admitted to the pawning of both mitre and crozier, was to immediately fulfil his obligations and restore the church’s sacred objects. Despite the (seemingly inevitable) dig against the usurious Jewish moneylenders, it appears to have been the questionable legitimacy of Paul’s pawning of objects which were not only sacred but belonged to the church’s (and not Paul’s) treasury, as well as Paul’s flat-out refusal to make good for this, that had angered the Pope and had caused him to issue his strict command.


47 Initially, Rudolph had planned to secure the Bishopric of Freising for his Chancellor, but the Hungarian king Louis had intervened in the favour of Paul of Jägerndorf, who transferred from Gurk to Freising (after failing to acquire the See of Aquileia). For this, see Lackner, Hof und Herrschaft, p. 283; Obersteiner, Bischöfen von Gurk, p. 162.


50 The choice of the Patriarch of Aquileia – and not the Archbishop of Salzburg, who was the Bishop of Gurk’s superior – was most likely a political choice: Ludovico della Torre had vied against Paul for the
Despite the promising papal orders though, John II seemed to have relied more on Duke Rudolph IV than on Ludovico della Torre; and not quite a year later, in July 1361, Rudolph acknowledged and confirmed the verdict proposed by ten arbitrators. The list of property and items Paul had to either return or make good for was impressive. As to the only Jewish involvement in this long list of financial transactions, Duke Rudolph ordered John to immediately return the mitre and crozier he had pawned to the Jews. All the money necessary for these recompenses had to come from his private assets. At first, Paul seemed to have succeeded in resisting the execution of the verdict: two years later, he had to promise to Duke Rudolph that he would immediately fulfil the obligations; and another two years later, after Rudolph’s death, his brothers, Dukes Albrecht III and Leopold III, reached a new compromise with the bishop, probably in recognition of his still troubled financial situation. With the help of six noble arbitrators, four of whom had already been involved in 1361, the dukes decided, among many other issues, how to proceed in the matter of Paul’s obligations to Jewish moneylenders. It is from this arbitration that we learn the extent of his encumbrance: Paul owed the staggering amount of 12,451 florins, in capital alone, to several Jewish moneylenders. Albrecht and Leopold demanded that Paul pay 3,500 florins to Chatschim of Celje while they agreed to pay the accrued interest; they promised to assume both capital and interest with Mosche of Maribor, grandson of Isserlein. As for Abrech, who as an inhabitant of Friesach was a subject of the archbishop of Salzburg, the dukes promised Paul to help him get either an extension of payment or a payment in instalments, in addition to moderate interest rates – part of the ‘help from the Austrian dukes’ the Patriarchy of Aquileia only a few months prior, and had gained the seat through Pope Innocent’s support. He had to redeem three castles, several villages as well as houses and fortifications from their respective mortgages; repay provost, canons, and subjects of Gurk for the money he had loaned from them and recompense them for any losses they suffered as his guarantors hintz kristen oder juden, ‘towards Christians and Jews'; recompense the episcopal treasury for the revenues he had collected but used for himself; and return the silverware he had borrowed. This would not be the last time Paul would be at odds with Duke Rudolph: in 1364, he thanked pope Urban V for his intervention in his dispute with the Austrian duke who had, presumably because of Paul’s refusal to side with the duke in his war against Bavaria, sequestrated property of Freising, see Lang, Acta Salzburgo-Aquilejensia, p. 558, nr. 790b (1364). The better part of the arbitration deals with the various properties Paul had pawned to Christians, mostly other noblemen, but also decides how to proceed with silverware, household items, and garment as well as manuscripts, ledgers, and charters that had been found by the pawntakers in the various castles and housings and that belonged to the bishopric. The better part of the arbitration deals with the various properties Paul had pawned to Christians, mostly other noblemen, but also decides how to proceed with silverware, household items, and garment as well as manuscripts, ledgers, and charters that had been found by the pawntakers in the various castles and housings and that belonged to the bishopric. The better part of the arbitration deals with the various properties Paul had pawned to Christians, mostly other noblemen, but also decides how to proceed with silverware, household items, and garment as well as manuscripts, ledgers, and charters that had been found by the pawntakers in the various castles and housings and that belonged to the bishopric.
Bishop’s steward was referring to in 1379? Of the mitre and the crozier, however, there is no mention in the arbitration, which might allow one to speculate that Paul had, in the meantime, actually succeeded in returning it. Around the same time, the papal investigation came to a conclusion too: Four jurists of the papal chapel decided in a legal opinion that a bishop who takes out monetary loans and pawns immovable property belonging to the mensal revenues without the sanction of his superior and without the consent of his canons, would bear every financial responsibility even if he has transferred to another bishopric in the meantime; his successor may not be held accountable. Although the opinion is anonymized, naming the two main protagonists as P. and J., and avoids any mention of the name of the bishopric, it is evident who and what is being referred to. Interestingly and tellingly, what is missing from the list of Paul’s misdoings are his Jewish business partners. Thus the point of contention was neither the Jewish loans (these are not mentioned), nor the sacred objects (these are not mentioned either), but that Paul had pawned and/or given away the church’s property without any prior agreement, either from his superior or from his canons. The legitimacy itself however of giving away mitre and crozier in pawn – which the jurists must have known about since it was one of the main charges brought in against Paul by John – seems not to have been questioned. It would have been fine, it seems, had it but been executed properly, meaning with prior consent.

Like Paul, his successor John II of Platzheim was in permanent need of money, particularly due to his many political, diplomatic, and military duties and offices in the service of the Austrian dukes. Among other income sources, he too took out loans with most of the prosperous Jewish moneylenders of the time. Yet, he approached the matter with more caution, perhaps having learned from Paul’s

---

56 The Austrian dukes interfered with the nobility’s debts on occasion: on the one hand, they could thus assert and demonstrate their sovereignty over the Jews, and the abovementioned example shows the different level of influence they were able to exert: Only Mosche of Maribor was an immediate subject of the dukes, while Chatschim of Celje had been given as a fief to the Counts of Celje in 1362 (Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, II, pp. 334–35, nr. 1140 (Paul) and nr. 1141 (Albrecht)).

57 KLA, AUR C 4831; Lang, Acta Salzburgo-Aquilejensia, p. 500, nr. 687.2 (brief summary).

58 He was Austrian chancellor, Steward of Anterior Austria, and Captain (Hauptmann; Latin: Capitaneus) of Carinthia, see Lackner, Hof und Herrschaft, pp. 283–84. In addition to the financial burdens these offices came with, John had to pay 1,060 florins appointment tax to the papal court, see Wädl, Juden in Kärnten, p. 42.
disastrous conduct. His closest business partner was der erber und weiser, unser lieber freunt David der Steuzze, ‘the honourable and wise, our dear friend David Steuss’, to whom he pawned houses and jewellery (and whose claims he had annulled by ducal order in 1370, see Figure 1).59 However, when John, in his support of Rudolph IV’s war against Ludovico della Torre, had to raise 6,000 florins and therefore pawned some of the bishopric’s mensal revenues, he took several precautions. Not only did he secure the Provost, Dean, and chapter’s willen und gunst (‘knowledge and grace’) beforehand and had them confirm it in writing, but actually pawned part of the revenues to them. The Jewish moneylender, Häslein of Friesach, was only involved through two middlemen: two citizens of Straßburg60 had obtained (gewunnen) the loan of 500 florins for John, and it was to them, and not to Häslein, that he pawned the corresponding part of the revenues.61 At least to one of his middleman, the procedures of a Jewish loan must have been familiar: Hans Payer, the same who had in 1355 stood bailsman for bishop Paul on his loan with Mosche and Chatschim, and who in 1379 accused the Jews of being pivotal to the bishopric’s financial disaster.


60 Straßburg in Carinthia, about 40 kilometres north of Klagenfurt; the Straßburg castle was the seat of the bishops of Gurk until 1787.

The accounting of these transactions proved to be quite complicated: in 1367, John of Platzheim had already transferred to the bishopric of Brixen, yet his obligations remained, at least partly. Before leaving for Brixen, he had paid 160 florins to Häslein, and for the rest, Häslein had received a new debt instrument, albeit not from John himself, but from the Provost, Dean and chapter of Gurk, and the two Straßburg citizens who had acted as middlemen six years earlier. Yet the rest of the obligations had remained with the Bishopric of Gurk and its new sovereign, John III, der die vorgenant geltschuld als ein nachkom des obgenant unsers kanzler gelten sol (‘who should, as a successor to our aforementioned chancellor [John of Platzheim], pay the aforementioned debts’). Since Albrecht III himself was indebted with John III, he struck a deal with the new bishop: the accumulated
interest for the six-year-old loan (the amount of which is not stated) was offset by Duke Albrecht against John III’s claims of 400 florins he had spent on his mission to Avignon in ducal service. While Albrecht would settle the interest, though, John III was committed to the payment of the remaining 340 florins, which he should clear within a year’s time. The initial pawning of the mensal revenues was not mentioned, neither was the legitimacy of Häslein’s claims questioned: Should John fail to meet his obligations, Häslein had the right to demand interest again and hold both John III and the Church of Gurk accountable.62

Is it possible to identify the Jews Paul had pawned the sacred objects to?63 There were several Jewish moneylenders active in the duchy of Carinthia and its neighbouring countries in mid-fourteenth century; and with many of them, Paul had had (documented) business contact: Abrech of Friesach, Mosche and Chatschim of Maribor/Celje, Mosche of Maribor, grandson of Isserlein, and Isserlein of Friesach (albeit the latter being no prestigious moneylender himself, but a brother to Häslein who was second to none at the height of his activities). We know of his loan of 2,613 florins, a sum that would for sure have merited a truly valuable collateral (or two),64 yet the charter only cites the standard formula ‘all of his [i.e., Bishop Paul’s] and his church’s possessions’. Some time before 1360, Count Frederic of Cilli had stood bail for 780 florins that Paul had borrowed, obviously at one stroke, from a group of Jewish businessmen (Chatschim of Celje, Mosche, grandson of Isserlein, and Isserlein of Friesach).65 This was yet another sum that would have called for a precious pawn. It is tempting to identify the ‘certain Jews’ who, according to John’s complaint, held mitre and crozier in pawn, with two or more of these Jews; however, such an identification would stand on more than shaky ground.

Equally questionable is, however, whether the Jewish moneylenders actually, literally, held mitre and crozier; whether these objects were de facto handed over to them; or whether they were deposited with Christians. Private laypersons handed over jewellery with religious connotation, such as cross pendants or rosaries, without qualms, at least none of the spiritual sort,66 and it is beyond

---

doubt that Jews did take pledges of all kinds home into their dwellings.\textsuperscript{67} Yet in addition to (and quite certainly in connection with) the aforementioned reservations of ecclesiastical authors who suspected the Jews of maltreating sacred objects handed over to them, a mandatory deposition of pawned sacred objects, particularly books, with Christians appears in several legal regulations: The fourteenth-century \textit{Meißener Rechtsbuch} as well as the statutes of Augsburg and Goslar demand that Jews who accept sacred objects in pledge deposit them with Christians, and even hand them over in public.\textsuperscript{68} Jörg Müller has provided several examples of books that had indeed been placed with Christians, such as the books that the Dominicans of Bern had pawned to Jews but deposited with the aldermen of the city.\textsuperscript{69} In a perhaps related context, the town statutes of Jihlava caution not only those who take sacred objects in pawn against accepting objects of dubious provenance, but apply the same regulations to those who take them in for safe-keeping (\textit{ad servandum recipiat; czu halden nemen}), suggesting a responsibility of the depositary for both the legitimacy of the preceding transaction and the ‘safety’ of the objects.\textsuperscript{70}

Books were frequently listed among items that could, or should not, be given in pawn. Precious manuscripts were offered as a potential collateral for a loan in everyday business reality, and despite reservations from the rabbinical authorities, Jews did quite frequently accept them.\textsuperscript{71} Some time before the year 1263, a singularly precious bible, which is today referred to as the Admonter Riesenbibel ('Giant Bible of Admont', see Figures 2 and 3), or Gutkeled-Bible (after the presumed donator),\textsuperscript{72} had been pledged to a Jewish moneylender. The bible was in

\textsuperscript{67} Shatzmiller, \textit{Cultural Exchange}, p. 55, sees these pledges as an essential contribution ‘to the shaping of their [i.e. the Jews’] aesthetic sensitivity’.


\textsuperscript{70} Jireček, \textit{CIB}, p. 100; Tomasek, \textit{Deutsches Recht in Österreich}, p. 245 and 314, with further examples.


\textsuperscript{72} The bible (today: Austrian National Library, Vienna, Cod. ser. nov. 2701) can be traced as being in use at the monastery of Csatár shortly after it had been written in Salzburg in the mid-twelfth century and had quite probably been given to the monastery by its founder, Martin, a member of the Gutkeled family; on fol. 3r, relics of the altar of Saint Peter at Csatár are listed. See Andreas Fingernagel, \textit{Die Admonter Riesenbibel} (Wien, ÖNB, Cod. Ser. n. 2701 and 2702), Codices Illuminati, I, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: Reihe A, Die Handschriften, Autographen- und Nachlass-Sammlung, I (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 2001), particularly pp. 9–11 and 14–16; Wiedl, ‘Jüdisch-christliche Geschäftsurkunden’, pp. 449–50.
possessed by the Hungarian monastery of St. Peter at Csatár, a small institution founded by the influential and prominent family of Gutkeled. The family, which still was the monastery’s patron at that time, obviously had easy access to the monastery’s valuables, and one of their members, Vitus, had agreed with his relatives given in pawn the two tomes of the bible to the Jew Farkas of Eisenburg/Vasvár.

Unlike in the case of the mitre and crozier, the Jewish pawn-taker is not only mentioned by name but can quite safely be further identified. Appearing from 1255 onward under the Latin (Lublin), Hungarian (Farkas) and German (Wölfel) version of the same name, Wölfel, the Jew Lublin was one of, if not the most prestigious Jew within the Kingdom of Hungary and the Duchies of Austria and Styria. Lublin’s family had strong ties to the Hungarian court: His father Henel had been comes camere of King Bela IV; Lublin as well as his brothers Nekelo and Oltmann remained closely connected with the royal financial administration, acting as tax farmers of the “Thirtieth” and owners of estates. Unlike Henel and Oltmann (who only appear in Hungary), Lublin and Nekelo also had ties to the Duchy of Austria: in 1257, they appear as comites camere of the Austrian Duke (and Bohemian King) Premysl Otakar. The high status of the two brothers can also be illustrated by their use of a seal.

73 Alexander Beider, Ashkenazic Given Names: Their Origins, Structure, Pronunciation, and Migrations (Bergenfield, NJ: Avotaynu Inc., 2001), pp. 437–40, where Lublin/Wölfel/Farkas is given as an example p. 438; see also Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 57–58, nn. 43, pp. 65–66, no. 48 (Wölfel) and pp. 50–51, no. 38 (Lublin), all three times with his brother Nekelo.

74 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 65–66, no. 48; Nora Berend, At the Gate of Christendom. Jews, Muslims and ‘Pagans’ in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000–c. 1300 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 124, 126–27 and 130–32. The Thirtieth (tricesima) was a customs duty paid to the Hungarian queen; the collection of this revenue was frequently farmed out.

75 They owned several estates in Hungary such as the castle of Komárom and adjacent properties which they had inherited from their father Henel and had later handed over to the king in lieu of debts they had accumulated during their (or their father’s) involvement in the royal fisc. The transaction is somewhat unclear: the three brothers signed over the castle to King Bela IV in 1265 (because of their debts to the royal fisc ex administracione camere), and signed it over a second time (?) in 1268 to Queen Mary (because of 800 marks they owed her for their lease of the Thirtieth), see Berend, Gate of Christendom, p. 131, fn. 105; Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 57–58, no. 43, pp. 65–66, no. 48 and pp. 67–68, no. 51. 

76 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 50–51, no. 38.

77 Lublin and Nekelo corroborated the charter of 1257, which settled their dispute with the Bishop of Freising over fiefs around Vienna to which both parties laid claim, with their shared seal; unfortunately, the seal is missing today; Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien (Austrian State Archives, Vienna), AUR 1357 II 18. Daniel M. Friedenberg, Medieval Jewish Seals from Europe (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), pp. 290–92 and 323–24, misinterprets, among other grave errors, Lublin’s office as comes camere as a noble title (‘Count Lublin’). The common means of corroboration for charters issued by Jews were the Jews’ respective signatures, often accompanied with the seal of the Jewish Judge, a Christian responsible for Jewish-christian legal interaction; Jewish seals are rarely documented in the ashkenazic region and were only used in interaction with Christian business partners, see Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, ‘… und ander frume leute genuch, paide christen und juden. Quellen zur christlich-jüdischen Interaktion im
Fig. 2 Admonter Riesenbibel (Giant Bible of Admont), 12th century, Austrian National Library, Cod. series nova Cod. 2701, fol. 206r: Vision of the Prophet Ezechiel.
The sum for which the bible had been pawned is unclear: Vitus, after failing to redeem the bible, had to assign several properties to Csatár to recompense the monks for their loss, and the charter that confirmed the transfer of several properties to the monastery speaks of seventy marks for which Vitus had pawned the bible to Lublin. A note on the inner cover of the first of the two volumes, however, mentions the sum of twentyfour and a half marks (see Figure 3). The note gives detail about the terms of repayment: Vitus had to pay back the loan in three rates on three fixed dates. Furthermore, if Vitus did not repay within the agreed time, Lubin had the right to claim the bible back and dispose of it as he wished.\footnote{Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten}, I, p. 55, no. 40. Berend, \textit{Gate of Christendom}, p. 118, presumes either accrued interest (since it is unknown for how long the bible had been pawned) or additional loans.}

But had Lublin really been handed over the two precious (and heavy) volumes? The wording of the note, \textit{reddentur}, 'give back', suggests the bible had not been surrendered to Lublin himself; the aforementioned charter gives a hint as to where it might have been brought to. The abbot of another Hungarian monastery, Zalavár, confirmed the transfer of Vitus’ property but was otherwise uninvolved in the transaction. This suggests that despite Lublin’s unchallenged rights to either repayment or the collateral, the bible had not actually been handed over to him but had been deposited at Zalavar.

What had raised the problem was, quite similar to the Gurk case, not so much the pawning itself but the failure (or unwillingness) of the debtor to redeem the pawn. By losing a part of the monastery’s property, Vitus had as clearly overstepped his authority as a patron of Csatár as Paul had his as a bishop, and had to pay for it – and it is highly likely that he would have had to recompense the monastery likewise had he lost the bible to a Christian creditor, or had he failed to redeem another pledge. Two things were never questioned: the legitimacy of the bible being pledged to a Jew, and Lublin’s claim to it. The note in the inner cover matter-of-factly lists the conditions and arrangements, without any hints at reservations or misgivings. Notes concerning, or even by Jewish pawntakers have been discovered in quite a number of Christian ‘sacred’ books.\footnote{Shatzmiller, \textit{Cultural Exchange}, pp. 25–26.} Yet the case seemed to have been remarkable enough to be commemorated: Nora Berend has brought attention to a little-known text that has the Hungarian King Andreas III intervene on behalf of the monastery.\footnote{Berend, \textit{Gate of Christendom}, pp. 118–19.} Unfortunately, all but a few fragments have survived of the
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\bibitem{Berend} Berend, \textit{Gate of Christendom}, p. 118, presupposes either accrued interest (since it is unknown for how long the bible had been pawned) or additional loans.
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former manuscript, which in its original form had been a compilation for teaching purposes.\footnote{All that is left is a double page and a few strips of parchment, which were used as the cover and folds of a manuscript from 1421, from which they were removed in 1971. The fragments are now Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien (Austrian National Library, Vienna), Cod. Ser. n. 14,458. Hermann Menhardt, Verzeichnis der altdeutschen literarischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, vols I-III, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für deutsche Sprache und Literatur, 13: 1–1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960–1961), I (1960), pp. 325–26 (on the 1421 manuscript Cod. 2815, on the fragments p. 326).} This means that the context in which the case of the pawned bible was
presented is now lost to us. In the relevant fragment, it is however the Abbot of the monastery himself who pawns the (single) book, and there is no suggestion of either illegitimacy of this transaction, or of the Jew not receiving the book in person.82

These had been times of extreme poverty, violence and pillaging, and so it had been for the sake of mere survival, so the Bohemian abbot Peter of Zittau explained in his *Chronicon Aulae Regiae*, that the monks of Sedlec had sold their mobile goods and pawned their treasure to the Jews, accepting out of need voracious interest rates.83 Since the monks were, according to Peter, acting out of sheer necessity, out of the need to subsist and buy aliments, they were acting on the only permissible ground to give in pawn the most precious of their valuables. The Jews however, even if they were not at the core of the monks’ hardship, were at least an essential contributor to their plight. They had, literally, cashed in on the brothers’ situation, demanding their (customary) rapaciously high interest rates: *sub usurarum voragine*, these same ‘voracious interest rates’ that both Bishop John in his quest to get mitre and crozier back, and steward Hans Payer in his effort to shift the blame had referred to. Yet had they in fact? We may wonder. Both of these accounts stem from papal diction. Bishop John’s charges are only recorded in the papal mandate, and Hans Payer’s statement was rendered in the report to the papal chancellor. The Bishop’s wrongdoings, which had provoked the inquest to begin with, had, at least in the papal reports, successfully been projected on the Jews: By demanding their usual rapacious interest rates, they had caused the affair to spiral out of control.

SMOKE IN THE CHAPEL: JEWS AND ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTIONS IN AND AROUND VIENNA DURING THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY*

Eveline Brugger
Institute for Jewish History in Austria

The theological stance of the Austrian clergy towards the Jews has been a topic of research for a long time; more recently, the number of studies on economic contacts between Jews and ecclesiastical institutions (especially in the context of moneylending) has also increased. This article will therefore focus on another, less frequently addressed perspective on the relations between Viennese Jews and members of the clergy, namely on those interactions that were the result of everyday situations and during which matters of religion were not necessarily the primary concern of the involved parties. Thus, it will attempt to add another aspect to the information drawn from theological treatises and historiographic texts written by members of the clergy – because those sources tell us very little about the ‘normality’ of everyday life, especially during a time when the Jews in and around the city of Vienna were living in relative peace among the Christian majority.

Based on a generous privilege by Duke Friedrich II which defined their legal status in 1244, the Austrian Jews had enjoyed peace and growing prosperity during most of the thirteenth century. The first half of the fourteenth century

---

* Research for this article was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P24404-G18.
brought about the first major persecutions of Jews in the duchy of Austria – first on a local scale, for instance the murder of ten Jews after an alleged host desecration in the town of Korneuburg near Vienna in 1305. In 1338, another accusation of host desecration in the small Lower Austrian town of Pulkau triggered the first persecution that went beyond the local scope; it affected Jews in several dozen towns of Lower Austria as well as in the neighbouring countries of Bohemia and Moravia. None of these persecutions were instigated by a higher secular or ecclesiastical authority, even though the alleged host desecrations led to a significant amount of theological debate and the creation of several pilgrimage sites. The Jewish community of Vienna – the biggest and most important community in the duchy of Austria – remained safe from the Pulkau persecution, but at a price: the citizenry of Vienna forced the Jewish community to accept a severe reduction of interest rates on Jewish loans for Viennese citizens in return for protection.

For the rest of the fourteenth century, the Jews of Vienna remained mostly safe from violent persecution, even though economic pressure on them was growing. While the Habsburg dukes did not (yet) go back on their promise of protection, they increasingly regarded their Jewish subjects as a source of income that...
could be exploited at will. At the same time, municipal authorities tried to gain greater influence over ‘their’ Jews, although the strong ducal authority made sure that these attempts never went very far in Austria. Municipal legal texts from the second half of the fourteenth century sometimes contain open hostility towards Jews. The most frequently quoted example is the *Wiener Stadtbuch*, a private Viennese collection of municipal legal customs, which commented the Statute of the Market (granted to the Austrian Jews by the aforementioned ducal privilege in 1244 to protect Jewish pawnbrokers in case they unknowingly accepted stolen goods as pledges) with the complaint that ‘die verfluchten juden vil pezzer recht habent gegen den christen denn die christen gegen den juden’ (‘the accursed Jews have much better rights towards the Christians than the Christians have towards the Jews’).  

However, neither these developments nor the increase in ecclesiastical anti-Jewish rhetoric seem to have had much immediate impact on Jewish-Christian relations in Vienna. Jewish settlement was concentrated in the Jewish quarter around today’s Judenplatz, but Jewish house ownership can be traced in other parts of the city as well, and sources on Jewish business transactions are more numerous than ever before during the last decades of the fourteenth century. This type of sources also provides a considerable part of our information on everyday Jewish-Christian interaction, although in order to analyse the relations between Jews and Christians in general, and between Jews and the clergy in particular,
we need to look further than to sources documenting moneylending alone.\textsuperscript{10} When, for example, the Bishop of Brixen and Austrian chancellor, Johann von Platzheim, addressed the Viennese Jew David Steuss as ‘der erber und weiser, unser lieber freunt David der Steuzze’ (‘the honourable and wise [man], our dear friend David Steuss’) in a business charter in 1364, it can hardly be considered a typical example. At that time, David Steuss was by far the richest and most important Jewish moneylender – not only in Vienna, but in the entire duchy of Austria – and Johann von Platzheim was so heavily in debt that he would probably have gone to great lengths to avoid losing David Steuss as a creditor.\textsuperscript{11} It is certain that David Steuss, too, profited from the association with the influential chancellor, but their business contacts represent the absolute elite of the Austrian clergy and the Viennese Jewry respectively, and give us no insights into the way clerics and Jews interacted on a daily basis.

The fact that these two groups interacted in the first place is evident from the source material, especially from the sources pertaining to land and house ownership in and around the city, and to the various rents and levies that had to be paid by the holders of these properties. There is ample evidence for Jews as tenants of church-owned estates, or paying rent charges from their houses to monastic institutions.

A significant portion of the plots of land in and around the city of Vienna were under ecclesiastical – often monastic – lordship,\textsuperscript{12} so it is not surprising that Jewish tenants frequently came into contact with clerical land lords or land ladies. In 1359, the Jew Isserl of Ödenburg and his wife Nechel sold a house that had come into their possession as an unredeemed pledge for a loan. Since the house, situated next to the nunnery of St. Agnes an der Himmelspforte, was under


the Grundherrschaft (lordship or, in this case, ladyship over a piece of land) of the monastery, the new Jewish owners could sell it only ‘mit der grundvrowen hand’, i.e., with the consent of Priorress Katharina von Leis. The prioress also sealed the deed of sale together with the Jewish judge of Vienna.13 The Jewish judge (a Christian municipal official) was involved because part of his duty was to seal documents on behalf of the Jews, since most Jews did not use seals themselves.14 The corroboration of a sale with the seal of the person who held lordship over the specific piece of land (Grundherr), however, was the general practice, and it obviously made no difference that the sellers were Jews.

Before the use of land registers became more common towards the end of the fourteenth century, we often only learn of a house or a plot of land being in Jewish possession at the point when it was sold as a forfeited pledge. However, that does not mean that Jews were forced to resell land quickly, or that they only came into its possession in the form of unredeemed pledges. When the Jewish widow Zema and her cousin Scheftlein, both from the Lower Austrian town of Bruck an der Leitha, sold a vineyard that was under the lordship of St Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna in 1377, the deed of sale stated explicitly that Zema had bought the vineyard with her own money.15 The transaction was made with the consent of the Provost of St Stephen’s as Bergherr (holder of the lordship over the vineyard), and the formulas used in the charter are exactly the same that were used for similar transactions between Christians, whether the object of purchase was under ecclesiastical or secular lordship.

Such comparisons are crucial because an exclusive focus on sources concerning Jews has led to misapprehensions in the past, such as Ignaz Schwarz’ conclusion (published in 1913, but adopted by a considerable number of later works) that Viennese Jews were forbidden from owning property outside the Jewish quarter and only got a temporary right of disposal over unredeemed land pledges so they could resell them.16 The charters Schwarz cited to back up this claim do indeed

---

grant the new Jewish owner the right to resell the pledge, but only because it was a part of the common formula of 'an die gewer setzen', i.e., granting full right of ownership – the same formula that was used if the new owner was a Christian.\textsuperscript{17} Even joint possession by Jews and Christians was possible: in 1380, a Christian couple and the aforementioned Isserl of Ödenburg sold a house and adjacent vineyard outside the Widmertor city gate with the consent of their Grundherr (lord over that land), the chaplain of the Viennese castle chapel. The three of them stated that they had held the objects of purchase in Burgrechtsgewer, and all three of them guaranteed the transfer of their rights to the house and vineyard to the new (Christian) owners.\textsuperscript{18}

It should be noted that while the Viennese clergy seem to have made no distinction between Jewish and Christian tenants, the same was not true everywhere in the duchy of Austria during the fourteenth century. From in and around the city of Krems, which housed the second largest Jewish community after Vienna, come several documented cases of individual clergymen or monasteries (never laypeople) selling or renting out houses or vineyards on condition that the new owners or tenants could resell or re-lease the plots only to Christians, not to Jews. This seems to have been specific to the region around Krems, even though most ecclesiastic owners who used this stipulation were not local themselves.\textsuperscript{19} So far, no such case has been found for Vienna.

Even more numerous than Jews living under ecclesiastical lordship in Vienna were Viennese Jews paying rent charges to ecclesiastical institutions. Rent charges

\textsuperscript{17} Schwarz cites the charter summaries published in Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien II: Regesten aus dem Archive der Stadt Wien II: Verzeichnis der Originalurkunden des Städtischen Archives 1412–1457, ed. by Karl Uhlirz (Wien: Verlag des Alterthums-Vereines, 1900), p. 3, no. 1917 and 1919 to back up his theory. The full text of the formula can only be found in the originals: Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv (Municipal Archives of Vienna), Hauptarchiv-Urkunden no. 1917 and 1919. In the second case cited by Schwarz (Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien, II/1, p. 3, no. 1966, 1971 and 1976), the charters mainly focus on confirming the Jewish creditor’s right to resell the pledge in order to protect the buyers from any remaining third-party claims (especially from the original debtor’s heirs), which became common practice during the late fourteenth century. Nowhere does the full text of the charters (Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, Hauptarchiv-Urkunden no. 1966, 1971 and 1976) indicate that the new Jewish owner was under obligation to resell. In charter no. 1976, the Jew Hocz even used the exact same formula to transfer the ownership of the former pledge – including the right to resell – to the Christian buyer that had earlier been used in charter no. 1966 to grant Hocz himself the same right.

\textsuperscript{18} Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, p. 306, no. 1653.

\textsuperscript{19} Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, p. 59, no. 1229 (seller: Deacon Friedrich of Krems); pp. 109–10, no. 1320–1321 (steward of the monastery of Admont in Krems); pp. 167–68, no. 1412 (monastery of Reichersberg), p. 180, no. 1431 (monastery of Gleink), p. 181, no. 1433 (monastery of Lambach); Diözesanarchiv St. Pölten (Archives of the Diocese St. Pölten), Uk. 1401 XII 08 (chaplain Hans Stadler of Stein). However, not all property transactions by ecclesiastical owners in and around Krems contained an anti-Jewish clause. See for example Steiermärkisches Landesarchiv (Styrian Provincial Archives), AUR 38, 66: in this charter, the steward of Admont in Krems grants the new owners the explicit right to resell the house to anyone.
could be owned independently from the ownership of the house or plot for which they were owed, and were frequently in the possession of monasteries. It was not uncommon at all among Christians to endow a monastery with the rent on a Jewish house. For example, the prominent Viennese citizen Pilgrim von Poigen donated a total of five pounds rent charges to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz in 1294.20 One pound was from the house of the Jew Pendit, located right next to the ‘schulhof der juden’, the yard next to the synagogue, which incidentally constitutes the first known mention of today’s Judenplatz.21 The monastery collected the rent charge until 1379, when the abbot allowed the Jew Rötel of Klosterneuburg, who owned the house at the time, to redeem it for a one-time payment of eight pounds.22

Even clergymen had no qualms about donating revenues from Jewish property. In 1339, Jans Sture, chaplain of the Corpus Christi Altar at St Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna, endowed his altar with a number of revenues for the salvation of his soul. Among those pious donations was a rent of one pound from a vineyard in today’s thirteenth district of Vienna (located outside the city at the time), which was owned by the Jew Lesir, and another rent of eight pounds from the house of the Jew David. The charter also mentions that another rent of fifteen shillings from David’s house was owed to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz.23

Even Jewish owners, such as the Jew Freudel of Perchtoldsdorf near Vienna who sold a vineyard to a citizen from Perchtoldsdorf in 1372, openly declared those Seelgeräte, i.e., rent charges donated for the salvation of one’s soul, that were due from their property – at least in their German-language charters, while Freudel would probably have used a different term in a Hebrew document, where he could be sure he would not be understood by Christians.24 In the German bill of sale that he issued, Freudel noted that a yearly payment of one and a half buckets of wine zu Seelgerät from the vineyard was due to the nuns of St. Theobald in Vienna. It had obviously been donated by a prior Christian owner of the vineyard, but Freudel too had to pay it while the vineyard was in his possession.25

20 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, I, pp. 88–89, no. 81.
21 Lohrmann, Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter, pp. 95–99.
24 Most of the business charters issued by Austrian Jews during the fourteenth century were written in German, although it was common to add the issuer’s and/or the witnesses’ Hebrew signatures as confirmation under Jewish law. Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, ‘…und ander frume leute genuch, paide christen und juden. Quellen zur christlich-jüdischen Interaktion im Spätmittelalter’, in Räume und Wege. Jüdische Geschichte im Alten Reich 1300–1800. Colloquia Augustana, 25, ed. by Rolf Kießling and others (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2007), pp. 285–305 (p. 294).
There are plenty of such examples from fourteenth-century Vienna. A comparison with similar transactions devoid of Jewish involvement shows that there was no difference between the rent charges due from Jewish houses or plots and those paid from Christian property.

In 1360, Duke Rudolf IV tried to ease the financial burden on Viennese house owners by granting them the right to redeem their yearly rent charges by means of a one-time payment of eight pounds per pound rent charge. He ordered all beneficiaries of rent charges, ecclesiastical or secular as well as Jews, to allow the redemption. The inclusion of Jews in that list was no mere formality, since Jews appear in the sources not only as payers of rent charges, but also as beneficiaries. In some cases, a single person could be both: in 1370, the Provost of St. Pölten (Lower Austria) and his convent allowed the aforementioned David Steuss to redeem a rent charge of four pounds on his house in Vienna through a payment of thirty-two pounds in accordance with the late Duke Rudolf’s order. Nine years later, David Steuss’ steward Chisel took the Christian owner of a vineyard in Mayerling near Vienna to court before an official of the monastery of Klosterneuburg because the Burgrecht of one pound per year, which David Steuss was owed from the vineyard, had not been paid in six years. The verdict transferred the vineyard into the possession of David Steuss, as it was common when owners failed to pay the rent charges. However, Steuss still had to pay off the Jew Seligman, steward to the widow of the Viennese rabbi Tenichel, who also had a claim to the vineyard because of a debt the former owner had failed to pay back.

The redemption of rent charges did not always go as smoothly as in the case of David Steuss and the provost of St. Pölten. In 1383, the Jew Heschlein turned to the Viennese city council for help with a Burgrecht of one pound on his house in the Jewish quarter, which the Teutonic Order who owned it would not allow him to redeem. In accordance with Duke Rudolf’s decree, the city council allowed Heschlein to redeem the rent charge for the designated payment of eight pounds. In the same year, the Jew Isserlein, son of Aron of Klosterneuburg, quarrelled with a chaplain at St. Agnes’ about a Burgrecht of two pounds from his house in the Jewish quarter. Again, the matter was decided by a secular authority, the Hubmeister (a ducal official), who decided that Isserlein only had to pay one pound Burgrecht, which he was subsequently allowed to redeem at the usual rate.

---

27 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, pp. 96–97, no. 1102.
29 Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien, III/1, p. 148, no. 1486.
30 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, pp. 357–58, no. 1742.
Among the sources pertaining to house and land ownership, or to the profits drawn from it, court documents make up a significant percentage. This is not limited to interactions between Jews and the clergy, of course, and the sources do not indicate that members of the clergy were more likely to take Jews than Christians to court (or vice versa), but lawsuits between Jews and clergymen were not rare either. If the object in question was situated in the city, the case usually went before the city council or the Bürgerschranne, a municipal court presided by the city judge. Such was the case with the suit that the Jew Hebel of Vienna filed against the Commander of the Teutonic Order in 1368. Hebel had bought a house in the Jewish quarter from the Order, but later was faced with a claim from the mayor of Vienna that two pounds of Burgrecht were due from the house. Hebel wanted the Teutonic Order to reimburse him because every seller had to guarantee that the object they sold was free from encumbrances not mentioned in the deed of sale. However, the court stated that according to Viennese municipal law, such a guaranty was valid only for a year and a day. According to his own testimony, Hebel had owned the house for eight years before the mayor had raised his claim. For that reason, Hebel’s demand for reimbursement was dismissed.31

Some cases involving Jews were decided by a municipal court presided jointly by the city judge and the Jewish judge.32 Jakob Poll, chaplain of the Ottenheim chapel in Vienna’s City Hall, took the Jew Merchlein, son of Nachman of Salzburg, before such a court in 1351 because of unpaid levies from a house in the Jewish quarter, which had belonged to Merchlein’s late grandfather, and which was under the lordship of Jakob’s chapel. The charter issued by Merchlein about the matter states that Jakob Poll declared before the court that he would forgive the outstanding payments and give up his claim to the house because Merchlein and ‘other people, Christians as well as Jews’, had pleaded with him. In return, Merchlein promised to pay the levies from now on; if he failed to do so, the Jewish judge would take pledges out of Merchlein’s movable property in order to satisfy the claimant. Merchlein probably owed this extremely favourable ruling to ducal interference – he promised in his charter not to appeal to the ducal court in the matter, which was not a standard formula for this type of document and suggests that he might have been in a position to have the city’s verdict overturned by the

31 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, p. 58, no. 1228.
32 This is not to be confused with the Judengericht (‘Jewish court’), a ‘mixed’ municipal court consisting of Christian and Jewish assessors and presided by the Jewish judge. Sources documenting the existence of such a court are extremely rare in Austria, and can mostly be found in the neighbouring duchy of Styria. However, when Duke Rudolf IV reformed the Viennese judiciary in 1361, the charter he issued explicitly mentioned the Viennese Judengericht as an existing institution that would be allowed to continue. Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, II, p. 261, no. 992; Brugger, ‘Von der Ansiedlung bis zur Vertreibung’, p. 150; Wiedl, ‘Jews and the City’, p. 290, note 77.
duke. In addition, a ducal official sealed the charter instead of the city’s Jewish judge, thus emphasizing the duke’s authority over the Jews living in the city.33

On other occasions, Chaplain Jakob Poll was a lot less forgiving. In the course of his long tenure, he started legal quarrels with a number of his neighbours; while most of the chaplain’s opponents were Christians, Merchlein found himself among them in 1373. This time, Jakob Poll took Merchlein to court before the city council because Merchlein had built a kitchen in the courtyard of his house, which was situated adjacent to Jakob Poll’s house and to the Ottenheim chapel. Also, Merchlein had allegedly built a new chimney, which was so low that the smoke couldn’t rise over the rooftops. Instead, the smoke and ‘unrainer gesmach’ (‘unclean smell’) from Merchlein’s kitchen wafted through a window and into Jakob’s house. According to the claimant, the smoke and bad smells were even noticeable in the chapel during early morning mass. After an inspection by two members of the city council, Merchlein was ordered to make the chimney higher in order to keep the smoke out of the chapel, and to remove the kitchen and refrain from building another ‘hearth or fireplace or kitchen’ in his courtyard that might damage Jakob’s house or chapel.34

It is interesting to note that the charter issued about the decision does not address the matter of religion at all, even though Merchlein’s actions could easily have been construed as an attempt to violate the sanctity of the chapel. Maybe the remark about the ‘unclean smell’, which most likely came directly from the claimant, was a dig at the Jewish neighbour considering that uncleanliness and bad smells were well-known stereotypes in anti-Jewish rhetoric, both ecclesiastical and secular: the odor iudaicus appears as a trope in Christian theological texts from late Antiquity onwards,35 and jibes against the Jews’ ‘stankes und unglouben’ (‘stench and unbelief’) can be found in late-thirteenth-century Austrian satirical poems.36 Based on similar disputes about bad odours from the windows of Jewish houses that allegedly bothered Christian churchgoers, Gunnar Mikosch

33 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, II, p. 117, no. 687.
34 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, p. 173, no. 1421.
has postulated that the real issue behind such conflicts was visibility and the creation (or destruction) of exclusive Christian or Jewish spaces.\textsuperscript{37} Formally, though, the Viennese city council treated the matter as nothing more than a dispute between neighbours.\textsuperscript{38} Those were frequent enough in the cramped housing situation inside the city walls, and there seems to have been no special consideration for the chapel as a Christian sacred space.\textsuperscript{39} Likewise, the council’s decision in the matter was pragmatic: Merchlein was ordered to remove or adapt his offending structural measures (which, the charter states, he had undertaken without authorisation), but that seems to have been the end of the matter, and there is no mention of any further consequences for him. Nor did the council take Jakob Poll’s claim at face value – the decision was made based on the report of two inspectors who had found the chaplain’s claim to be factually correct. It is of course possible that anti-Jewish bias influenced the inspectors’ report, but at least as far as legal procedures were concerned, Merchlein might just as well have been one of the Christian neighbours Jakob Poll was quarrelling with.

Merchlein’s case is not the only neighbourly dispute between Jews and members of the clergy in fourteenth-century Vienna. These disputes reflect the most immediate kind of contact, that between people who live right next to each other. While Jewish authorities were well aware of the risks inherent in such proximity (as illustrated by admonitions to be cautious with religious ceremonies that could be seen or at least heard by the Christian neighbours),\textsuperscript{40} the conflicts documented in the surviving records from fourteenth-century Vienna were usually mundane in nature. One of the conflicts that had to be resolved by the city council was a quarrel between the Teutonic Order, represented by the Order’s Austrian Landkomtur (Bailli) and the Commander of Vienna, and the Jew Hessman, son of Baruch. Again, the object of dispute was a small courtyard, which was situated behind the Jew’s house and part of a bathhouse in the possession of the Order.

\textsuperscript{39} The situation might have been different if the window in question had led directly into the chapel instead of the chaplain’s house, since windows which created a direct line of sight towards the other religion’s sacred spaces could be considered problematic by both ecclesiastical and Jewish authorities. Laqua, ‘Nähe und Distanz’, pp. 84–85; Mikosch, ‘Zeichen, Bilder, Codes’, pp. 43–44.
seems that both parties wanted to build inside the courtyard, because the settle-
ment allowed each of them to build and use one storey, the Order on the ground
floor and the Jew on top of that. Besides, Hessman had to build his own latrine in the courtyard. The settlement is very specific on the technical details, and also emphasizes that Hessman had to empty out the latrine through his own house and not through the Order’s property. The strict separation between Jewish and Christian calls of nature seems like a logical counterpart to the infamous Church regulation, propagated in Austria (to little avail) by the canons of the so-called Council of Vienna in 1267, that prohibited Jews and Christians from eating and drinking together. However, the placement and use of latrines and cesspits was a frequent cause of neighbourly quarrels that was by no means limited to Jews and members of the clergy.

Things went even further in another, somewhat similar case of neighbour-
ly troubles in 1380, this time outside the city of Vienna in the nearby town of Klosterneuburg, which housed a small, but prosperous Jewish community with close ties to Vienna. Again, the matter came before a secular authority: the du-
cal steward decided about a complaint lodged by the Augustinian monastery of Klosterneuburg against a Jewish house situated between the synagogue and the monastery’s Obleihaus, where the administration of the monastery’s revenues was situated. The Jewish house belonged to the aforementioned David Steuss, whose family hailed from Klosterneuburg. Reasons for the complaint were once more a latrine, which had been built too closely to the wall of the Obleihaus, and the water that ran from the courtyard of Steuss’ house into the courtyard of the Obleihaus through a hole in the wall. This was obviously no small mat-
ter – the charter issued by the ducal steward states that David Steuss not only appeared in court himself, he was also accompanied by the entire Jewish com-
munity of Klosterneuburg, although it is likely that this should be understood as ‘all representatives of the community’. Both parties agreed to name three arbiters each, whose ruling would be binding for everyone. All six arbiters were from Klosterneuburg; the Jewish party, too, chose three Christian arbiters, which is not that surprising considering that the entire Jewish community of the town was involved in the quarrel. They chose the current Jewish judge of Klosterneuburg

41 The charter uses the term ‘hewsel’ (literally: ‘little house’), which rarely appears in this specific mean-
ing in medieval texts, but is still in use as a rather coarse dialect term for ‘toilet’ in Austria and Bavaria until today. Johann Andreas Schmeller, Bayerisches Wörterbuch, vol. I (München: Rudolf Oldenbourg, 2nd ed. 1872), col. 1177.
42 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, p. 251, no. 1559.
45 Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, pp. 307–08, no. 1656.
and his predecessor; their third arbiter was the monastery’s cellarer, who had ties to David Steuss that went back to Steuss’ successful lawsuit about a vineyard in Mayerling the year before.46

The arbiters decided that the Jews would be allowed to keep their latrine where it was, but would have to build a wall around it so it could no longer damage the wall of the Obleihaus. The rainwater dripping from the roof into the courtyard of the Jewish house would still be allowed to flow through the wall and the courtyard of the Obleihaus; however, the Jews must not pour anything else into the water, be it filth (the charter uses the term ‘unflot’, which can also mean excrement), kitchen scraps or blood. If they were caught doing it anyway, they would have to divert the water so it would no longer run through the Obleihaus.

The mention of blood stands out in this list, because it suggests that the Jewish community of Klosterneuburg used David Steuss’ house as a slaughterhouse for kosher butchering, which would also explain why the entire Jewish community was involved in the case.47 The term ‘trankch’ for kitchen scraps indicates that the Jewish inhabitants might have used the water to dispose of those leftovers that Christians used for Sautrank, pig swill, which of course was not open to Jews as a way of ‘recycling’. It is not entirely clear from the wording of the charter whether the Jews had actually poured anything into the water until then. If they had, the monastery’s main interest was obviously in no longer having sewage flowing through their courtyard. If, however, this clause was just a precaution the monastery considered necessary, it would constitute a rather peculiar expansion to otherwise common regulations concerning the drainage of wastewater in contracts between neighbours,48 indicating not only a basic knowledge of Jewish religious customs (which was a given considering the close cohabitation),49 but also a certain mistrust towards the Jews’ handling of the unavoidable by-products. It may be tempting to speculate that such ideas could have been influenced by the anti-Jewish accusation of well-poisoning which had been propagated (albeit mostly through secular channels) during the period of the Black Plague several decades earlier.50 A persecution of the Jews in Krems in 1349 had – according to monastic sources – been triggered by such accusations. However, the Krems persecution had been the only outbreak of anti-Jewish violence in Austria during

---

48 Laqua, ‘Nähe und Distanz’, p. 78. When David Steuss purchased part of a house in Vienna from a Christian couple in 1372, the deed of sale contained detailed regulations concerning gutters and the drainage of rainwater as well as the positioning and the ventilation of the latrine, but did not mention sewage or any other kind of waste products in the water: Brugger and Wiedl, Regesten, III, pp. 153–54, no. 1189.
the time of the Plague because Duke Albrecht had punished the citizens most severely for it.\footnote{Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten}, II, pp. 97–98, no. 646–47. In order to assess the importance of Duke Albrecht’s protection of the Austrian Jews, it is essential to keep in mind that the massive outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence in the Holy Roman Empire during the time of the Plague, especially in the later stages, were premeditated persecutions instigated by municipal authorities or even territorial rulers, not spontaneous attacks carried out by a fearful or traumatised mob. Jörg Müller, ‘Eretz gezerah – ‘Land of Persecution’: Pogroms against the Jews in the \textit{regnum Teutonicum} from c. 1280 to 1350’, in \textit{The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries)}, ed. by Christoph Cluse (Turnhout; Brepols, 2004), pp. 145–60 (pp. 156–57); Graus, \textit{Pest – Geißler – Judenmorde}, pp. 62–61.} Furthermore, the concept of Jewish well-poisoning had repeatedly been refuted not only by secular, but also by Church authorities as well as by ecclesiastic authors, some of them specifically referring to Austria.\footnote{Chazan, \textit{Jews of Medieval Western Christendom}, p. 196; Chazan, \textit{Reassessing Jewish Life}, p. 177. Although he explicitly stated that he did not mean to defend the Jews, Konrad von Megenberg pointed out in his Book of Nature how the Viennese Jewry had been so heavily affected by the Plague that it became necessary to enlarge the Jewish cemetery and that it would have been very stupid of them to bring that kind of catastrophe upon themselves by poisoning the wells: Brugger and Wiedl, \textit{Regesten}, II, pp. 100–01, no. 650.} Therefore, even though it is safe to assume that both the representatives of the Klosterneuburg monastery as well as the secular officials were familiar with the polemical linkage of Jews to contaminated water, there is no evidence of any direct influence on the handling of the case. Although the monastery’s motivation for demanding the aforementioned provision remains unclear, the charter itself treats the matter as nothing more than another boundary dispute between neighbours with no discernible religious implications.

Although charters and register entries were not a common vehicle for polemics in general, it is still noteworthy that the sources documenting everyday interaction between Jews and the clergy display a mostly pragmatic approach. Although the vast majority of these texts were written by Christians, even descriptions of conflicts were usually free from open hostility. In view of these findings, Jonathan Elukin’s postulation of a ‘pragmatic tolerance and stability of relations between Jews and Christians’, which ‘balanced the violence and pressure against Jews’, although made for the period after 1492, seems to apply to fourteenth-century Vienna as well.\footnote{Elukin, \textit{Living Together, Living Apart}, pp. 123.} However, on the rare occasions that the aforementioned sources do mention violence against Jews, it is treated with the same kind of pragmatism, as can be seen in a charter issued by the priest Andreas von Muthmannsdorf in 1376 about a rent charge of four pounds on a Jewish house that was to be donated to endow a Mass. The rent charge had yielded only half of the usual redemption sum because the house had been damaged by fire ‘ze der zeit do man di juden gemainlich angegriffen het’ (‘during the times the Jews had been universally
attacked’), and had subsequently fallen into ruin. The Christian donor made sure to obtain a sealed document from the Jewish judge to prove the loss of value.\(^54\)

We know of no general persecution of Jews in Vienna that would fit into this timeframe. However, several Christian narrative sources mention mass abductions by order of the Austrian dukes, who took wealthy Jews captive to extort ransom, during the 1370ies.\(^55\) The narrative sources recording these extortions are not very detailed and sometimes contradictory;\(^56\) therefore, the remark in the aforementioned charter constitutes a rare indicator that they were accompanied by massive physical violence, even though the charter’s issuer was only concerned about the financial loss that resulted from it.

Still, the overall impression the charters leave us with is that relations between Jews and members of the clergy were part of the everyday normality for both parties in fourteenth-century Vienna. This is consistent with Benjamin Laqua’s recently-published findings for several cities in Southern and Central Germany.\(^57\) While charters are highly formalised and therefore hardly ever lend themselves to an analysis of the emotions of the involved parties, they still depict a way of interacting that is a far cry from the theological rhetoric of the time. This conclusion does not negate or even qualify the impact of said rhetoric,\(^58\) although it should be noted that it was its influence on the Austrian duke, not on the populace, which eventually led to the annihilation of Vienna’s entire Jewish community.


\(^56\) The exact chronology remains unclear; Christian historiographic sources put the extortions into the years 1370, 1371, or 1377: Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 116–17, no. 1330, pp. 138–39, no. 1368, pp. 245–46, no. 1550. The Hebrew rapport by Joseph Ha-Kohen also gives the year as 1371 (5131), see Karin Almbladh, *Joseph Ha-Kohen, Sefer ‘Emeq ha-Bakha (The Vale of Tears) with the chronicle of the anonymous Corrector. Introduction, critical edition and comments. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia*, 5 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1981), p. 50. However, the text was written in the sixteenth century and confines the events with those surrounding the ‘Vienna Gesera’, the persecution and expulsion of Austrian Jews in 1420/21. The same kind of confusion seems to be at the root of the claim made by the *Fragmentum historicum de quattuor Albertis Austrie* that the dukes also tried to coax the Jews into converting: Brugger and Wiedl, *Regesten*, III, pp. 116–17, no. 1330. There is no other record of ducal pressure towards conversion in fourteenth-century Austria, while forced conversions played a major role during the Gesera, see Lohrmann, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*, pp. 159–61.

\(^57\) Laqua, ‘Nähe und Distanz’, p. 87, 91.

in the course of the Gesera in 1420/21. Instead, it adds another facet that also should be taken into account when trying to reconstruct the circumstances of fourteenth-century Jewish life.

II

CONVERSION AND PROSELYTISM
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In his article ‘Jüdische und christliche Konvertiten im jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgespräch des Mittelalters’, published in German in 1966, Bernhard Blumenkranz recalls the situation of the Jews who had been forcefully baptised in Visigothic Spain around the year 800:

Und wie wenn der anfängliche Zwang bei der Zuführung zum Christentum nicht genügt hätte, so kam nun auch noch die polizeimäßige Überwachung und Bespitzelung und alle anderen Ausnahmege setze für diese Neukristen hinzu [...] [and as if the original coercion involved in their steering to Christianity had not been enough, it was now followed by police-like surveillance and spying as well as all other extraordinary laws for New Christians [...]1]

More than 40 years later, Benjamin Scheller (Berlin) researched the fate of those Jews and their descendants who, in the Kingdom of Naples, after severe persecution, were coerced to conversion in 1292. This involved more than 20 Jewish communities, particularly in the Apulian seaport of Trani. Scheller noted that all the members of that socio-religious group had been marked or stigmatised for 200 years with the label neofiti (neophytes), christiani novi or christiani novelli (new Christians). Although some of them played an active and even leading role in the administration of the city and in the whole kingdom, they had continued to live in a special quarter (Iudayaca, Guidecca), and had had to face accusations of heresy. In three waves, 1495 (accompanied by a pogrom), again in 1510, and finally in 1514, these non boni christiani (not-good Christians) were forced to leave southern Italy together with the Jews.2

Basic questions

The first question which I would like to answer in this paper relates to the status of those Jews who were forcefully baptised during the Viennese Geserah of 1420/21: Did they remain stigmatised as converts – in a ‘Semantik der Differenz’, as Scheller calls it. Did they live separate lives from the ‘old Christians’? Did they marry exclusively within their secluded group? Were they subject to special rights and restrictions? Were they mistrusted in terms of the reliability of their Christianity, and were they continuously considered heirs to the murderers of Christ (as had been noted by Jonathan Elukin using English sources)? What can be said about the integration and affiliation of those New Christians when looking at Austrian sources after 1421? Where did they live and whom did they get married to?

In his famous 1988 book, Pest, Geissler und Judenmorde, Frantisek Graus answered quite straightforwardly my second question: ‘Economically, the New Christian was often faced with ruin’ (‘Ökonomisch stand der ,neue Christ’ oft vor dem Nichts’). But this statement still leaves much open: What kind of new living conditions were the converts confronted with? Directly after a voluntary conversion, the baptised would lose the inheritance of Jewish parents, and therefore any basis for a new life. During the Geserah, the forcefully baptised were even more confronted with that fact insofar as the entire Jewish population had been dispossessed of its assets, which had been confiscated by duke Albrecht V. The prohibition on taking interest ‘amongst brethren’ – in this case amongst Christians and New Christians – required the converts to search for a new source of income. Do the sources provide us with information on a second career as Christians? And a related issue: were the converts given access to schools, education, skilled crafts, trades and offices?

---

3 Scheller, Stadt der Neuchristen, p. 311.
Methodologically, one pragmatic issue is how our target population can be identified as such within the sources: the first name does not give any indication regarding religious affiliation. Baptised Jews had Christian standard names such as Matthias or Caspar, Daniel or Johannes (John), Paul, Thomas, Michael and also Jakob, Barbara, Elisabeth, Katharina or Magdalena. Almost never do they have bynames such as Jud, Judeus, Judenkopf or similar. All these bynames present in the university registers from the middle of the fifteenth century yet apparently refer to ‘old’ Christians. As early as 1136, the ‘Traditionskodex’ of the Klosterneuburg monastery mentions an Ernœstus iudeus, at a time when there was not any Jewish settlement in Austria. Neither an apparently ‘Jewish’ byname, nor the new name of a baptised Jew can be expected to give any indication concerning a religious identity that may have left behind. Nor is it to be assumed that names such as Unglaub (‘infidel’) or Wucherlein (‘small usurer’) – both of them are taken from the University register from the 1440ies – refer to Jews. Even Rudpertus Taufkind (‘godchild’) from Salzburg was not of Jewish origin and baptised as a child, as one might think, but came from a long-established Christian patrician family in Salzburg. His ancestor Konrad Taufkind was the first mayor mentioned by name (1370–1374) there. The derivation of his name is not known.

Baptised Jews and Jewesses can thus only be identified by the following unambiguous denominations in the sources I used: quondam iudeus, iudeus baptizatus, vormals judin gewesen (‘formerly Jewess’), neukrist (‘New Christian’), tauffer jud (‘baptised Jew’) and neophytus, neofitus or neofita/neofita, with the same suffix employed for males as well. Those identifiers have to be searched for, and unfortunately they have only rarely been included in the indexes of editions, which requires a precise and detailed search in our many sources.

10 Ibid., p. 195: Rudpertus Taufkind de Salzburga (sub dato 1450 October 15, natio Rhenensium).
12 See also Scheller, Stadt der Neukristen, 313–23.
Historical Background: the Viennese Geserah 1420/21

In order to give a time-line for the individual fates discussed below, a short overview of the events of the Viennese Geserah is necessary:

In a climate of growing hostility, and following a financial and political crisis which was mainly the result of the costs for the Hussite Wars and the planned wedding of Duke Albrecht V with the Emperor’s daughter Elisabeth,¹³ the Jewish population in Vienna and Lower Austria was arrested on May 23rd, 1420 on the orders of the Duke; it was then forced to convert under threat of death. According to the Kleine Klosterneuburger Chronik (‘Small Chronicle of Klosterneuburg’), written after 1428 and covering the time between 1322 and 1428), ettlich (‘numerous’) were baptised but among those, ettlich in turn reconverted to Judaism. They were then – according to this Chronicle, here our sole source – burnt to death as renegades. In September 1420, 800 destitute Jews were put on rafts on the river Danube and were left to drift downstream. Most of them were received partly in Hungary and partly – as will be shown later – in Pressburg/Bratislava. Many eventually reached Moravia or Bohemia. Once the Albrecht V had returned, in defeat, from Hussite Wars, wealthy Jews and Jewesses were tortured in order to reveal the hiding places of their treasures and to accept baptism – a fact that was reported by the Yiddish text Winer gesere as well as by the theologian and Rektor of the University, Thomas Ebendorfer. His Chronica Austriae also mentions that some older people committed suicide rather than convert to Christianity. The ritual suicide le-kiddush ha-shem of a group of Jewish prisoners in the synagogue is described in much detail and with many topoi in the Winer gesere. In Jewish as well as Christian reports, the burning at the stake of between 210 (as reported by the Winer gesere) and 240 Jews and Jewesses (as noted by the Klosterneuburger Chronik) took place at Erdberger Lände in today’s third district of Vienna. The execution was followed with considerable attendance and interest by the Christian population. Politically, this ‘cold-bloodedly organised political murder’ (Michael Toch¹⁴) was justified by the alleged collaboration of Jews with the Hussite enemy even though such a crime would have had to be punished with expulsion and not with execution. The burning at the stake was justified with reference to a Host desecration in Enns that had allegedly taken place years


before, and had astonishingly not been revealed earlier. The eviction and murder was then followed by an ‘eternal’ prohibition of settlement, which was upheld in Vienna for about 150 years.\(^{15}\)

**Individual Fates of Baptised Jews**

We cannot say for sure how many forced baptisms took place in the course of the Viennese Geserah. As already mentioned, the *Kleine Klosterneuburger Chronik* noted *ettlich* (‘numerous’) converts\(^{16}\) in 1420, while the *Winer gesere* gives the impression of numerous affected people without mentioning numbers. An anonymous chronicle (the *Anonymi Viennensis Breve Chronicon Austriacum*) mentions *irer vil* (‘many of those’) baptised.\(^{17}\) In contrast to the already mentioned case of Trani (Apulia), however, the Viennese baptised cannot be apprehended as a group and can only be grasped individually after a detailed search or by chance.

To anticipate our results, one can find 28 New Christians, identified by name or as anonymous individuals. Seventeen of them are men – of which four or five are German students at the University of Vienna – four are women and seven are children or youths. 22 of them were definitely baptised in due course of the Geserah. It is unclear whether the rare occurrence of female ‘New Christians’ is due to the Jewesses’ stronger fidelity to their beliefs. Even though the *Winer gesere* states that more women than men (110 as against 90) were among the victims, the lower representation in communal sources is connected to their legal status. It is mostly the husbands who were the actors in property transactions. Their wives were only mentioned by their first names and without further description. I am aware of the fact that we cannot pull valid statistics from the limited number of 28. The context does, however, allow for some conclusions due to comments and their context.

---


Baptised Women

Hanna, called Peltlin, being the widow of Peltl of Salzburg – he died before 1401 – ran her own lending business and owned a house in Vienna. Her daughter Lea apparently accepted baptism in 1420/21, but we do not know what happened to her second daughter Schöndl, a moneylender like her mother; no further information has been passed down. Being a Christian, Elisabeth/Lea did not inherit her mother’s house at Kurrentgasse 12. She was, however, given a possibly better house as a present by Albrecht V in April 1422 at Wipplingerstraße 12 (corner Stoß im Himmel). She can be identified as the new owner without any doubt: Elspeth die Newchristin, etwann genant Lea, der Peltlin Judin tochter, hat gevangen nucz und gewer ains hauß, gelegen in der Wildbercherstrass ze Wienn. (‘Elspeth the New Christian, earlier called Lea, daughter of the Jewess Peltlin, has won the profit and use of a house located on Wildbercherstrass [today 1st district, Wipplingerstraße] in Vienna’).

The source mentions neither a husband nor any children, nor do we know anything about her mother’s fate. Maybe Hanna died during the persecution, because as late as in August 1420, during the imprisonment of the wealthy Jews

---


21 Her house was sold by Albrecht V to Jakob Strättinger and Magdalen, Schwarz, Das Wiener Ghetto, p. 95 nr. 405A (sub dato 1424 May 26).

22 The entry in the land register in Schwarz, Das Wiener Ghetto, p. 86 nr. 383D (sub dato 1422 April 29) and Geyer-Sailer, Urkunden, p. 530 nr. 1774 (sub dato 1422 April 29).
of Vienna, she confirmed the payment of a Viennese burgher’s debt.\textsuperscript{23} The New Christian Elisabeth did not live in isolation but received a house in an area that already had Christian neighbours in the days of the Viennese Jewish quarter. Before the Viennese Geserah, the building had belonged to Rabbi Meisterl, who is mentioned in the Winer gesere as having been subjected to torture.\textsuperscript{24}

The second baptised Jewess named in the Kleine Klosterneuburger Chronik had a similar fate:

\textit{Ein judin zu Closterneuburg liess sich tauffen und wardt genant Barbara, hat vorher zu der ehe den Schebelein juden gehabt, die nam darnach zu der ehe Niclasen den Lueger eines erbarn burgers sun, da derselb starb, da nam sie Niclasen den Lister eines burgers sun von Presburg.}

[A Jewess at Klosterneuburg accepted baptism and was named Barbara; beforehand she had been married to the Jew Schebelein, afterwards she took Niclas den Lueger, who was the son of an honourable burgher, as husband. When he died, she took Niclas den Lister, son of a burgher from Pressburg/Bratislava as husband.\textsuperscript{25}]

We do not learn the Jewish name of this woman, nor did her husband Schebelein leave any trace in the sources according to today’s knowledge.\textsuperscript{26} It is remarkable, though, that she could immediately marry into the Christian bourgeoisie even though she brought with her three – also baptised – children. The latter are recorded in a different context. In November 1430, Barbara drew up a charter together with her children Thomas and Kathrei, and also in the name of their minor brother Jakob. They sold that half of their house on Nidern Markt\textsuperscript{27} which Albrecht V had given them because all four of them – Barbara and her three children – had converted to Christianity. The previous owner had been the Jew Lewein.\textsuperscript{28} The charter describes the procedure as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Goldmann, \textit{Die Wiener Geserah}, pp. 127–28.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Lohrmann, ‘Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Klosterneuburg’, p. 220, mentions a certain Manusch, son of a Scheblein, who granted numerous small loans of approximately 10 pounds around the year 1400. But Manusch was a bit too old to be Barbara’s son.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Lohrmann, ‘Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Klosterneuburg’, p. 219, mentions a house owned by Jews in 1389 on nider Markt.
\end{itemize}
Das Haus gab uns unser genediger Herr am Ersten so wir alle vier egenannt die heiligen tauff haben empfahen und abgetreten haben vom Judischen Irrsal,\textsuperscript{29} auf den heiligen kristenleuchen glauben wir uns bechennt haben […]\textsuperscript{[…]}

Our gracious Lord gave us the house immediately after all four of us had received holy baptism and had abjured the Jewish heresy \textit{sic}, we avowed ourselves to the holy Christian faith […]\textsuperscript{[…]}

Barbara’s story was known in Klosterneuburg and seemed to the chronicler worth retelling. His account, however, only contains factual information (about the baptism and the two marriages), but no moral or even religious judgment. It can be assumed that Barbara had already had contact with Christian customers while being the wife of Scheblein – and that maybe her second husband, \textit{Niklas der Lueger}, had been amongst them. Further, she was immediately integrated into Christian society socially as well as topographically. We do not know anything about the fate of Scheblein. Maybe he had already died before 1420, and his widow with her three children had then looked for safety among Christians.

The two women ended up coming off well from the catastrophe. But of course the context – violence and fear of death – renders irrelevant any discussion as to whether Lea or Barbara’s baptisms had been forced or voluntary.

Baptised Children

Barbara’s charter relates to the fate of her baptised Jewish children. The 1244 \textit{Judenordnung} (ordinance which regulated the Jewish status), which Albrecht V had confirmed, had punished the abduction of Jewish children as theft: \textit{Item si aliquis vel aliqua puerum iudei abducserit, ut fur volumus condempnetur} (‘Likewise, if any man or woman should kidnap a Jewish child we wish that he be punished as a thief.’)\textsuperscript{30} Canon law either categorically prohibited the forced baptism of children


or debated it as controversial.\(^{31}\) Even Pope Martin V, who, in a letter dated January 1\(^{st}\), 1421, prohibited under the threat of excommunication any forced baptism in general and the baptism of Jewish children below the age of 12 against the will of their parents,\(^{32}\) did not prevent Albrecht V from abducting Jewish children and having them baptised. The ducale measure not only aimed at the salvation of the children’s lives but predominantly at the salvation of their souls. Albrecht’s radical position in 1420/21 was consistent with the prevailing doctrine of his time. The theological faculty of the University of Vienna had already solidified its conviction that after forced baptism the religious belief and Christian faith, and with it the dogmas that could not be cognitively grasped, would eventually sink in and settle: ‘Unless you believe, you shall not understand...’ – thus the Viennese theologian Heinrich von Langenstein cited Augustin’s *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis*, referring to (but not citing literally) Isaiah 7. 9. Michael Shank used this scriptural verse as title for his famous book in 1988.\(^{33}\)

What happened to the abducted Jewish children? We have in the abbot Martin von Leibitz a relatively ‘objective’ eyewitness of the burnings in March 12, 1421; he answered this question – *quid de parvulis iudeorum?* – in his *Senatorium*. The answer was structured like a dialogue between a *senex* and a *juvenis* and stated the following: ‘The children were spared the burning at the stake; some were handed over to monasteries where they were more useful than the others. Two of those saved children are even now priresses at the nunneries of Himmelpfort and Sankt Magdalena.’\(^{34}\)

---


33 Michael H. Shank, ‘*Unless You Believe, You Shall Not Understand*’. *Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 139–89. Actually, this is not Isaiah’s correct verse; the translation of the King James Bible says: ‘If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established.’

I think we can accept this information as a fact, in particular as both nunneries are precisely named: the Premonstratensian nunnery of *St. Agnes an der Himmelpforte* and the nunnery of *Sankt Magdalena vor dem Schottentor* (today near the main building of the university), governed in accordance with the Augustinian rules. Ignaz Schwarz, whose still valuable monograph *Das Wiener Ghetto* was published in 1909, already considered this information as valuable fact and tried to find out the names of those two women based on these two nunneries’ sources. He assumed – according to the knowledge available at the time – that Martin von Leibitz had still been alive in the 1470s, and he did find two prioresses for that time frame. However, Martin had already died in 1464, which made a certain Magdalena the only abbess of St. Agnes known by name – she was abbess between 1444 and 1463. The fact that Magdalena is not given the byname of a baptised Jewess in any of the documents does not mean that the conclusion drawn is wrong. For the nunnery *Sankt Magdalena vor dem Schottentor* and for the period concerned, no names of abbesses have been passed down to us.

My colleague Eveline Brugger (St. Pölten) has brought to my attention a highly informative document bearing on the fate of baptised children. It describes a procedure that was certainly not uncommon: In March 1421, Provost Erhart at the Canons regular of St. Augustine, St. Andrä an der Traisen, confirmed the receipt of 50 pounds of Viennese Pfennig from Duke Albrecht V which the boy Matthias was to receive at the time of his coming of age. In January 1430 – maybe at the time of his 18th birthday, maybe earlier – Mathias New Kristen von Herzogenbuerkch puertig (‘New Christian born in Herzogenburg’) confirmed that the provosts of the Convent of St. Andrä an der Traisen had liepleich inngehabt und in kristenleichen gelauben getzogen haben (‘lovingly looked after him and educated him in the Christian faith’) and had let him attend school to his

benefit and honour. Matthias had used for, and invested for various ventures the 50 pounds of his *gnedigen Herrn* (’honoured Lord’) the Duke, plus other endowment (*vertigung*); he confirmed vis-à-vis the provost that he was not owed anything anymore.40 Therefore it was not only the convent that had been responsible for Matthias’ upbringing and livelihood, but also Albrecht V, the very same man who had presumably murdered his parents and had most certainly taken away from them ‘their only child, their property and their home country’ – as put in a nutshell by Eveline Brugger.41

**The Rabbi’s Son**

The only thing that we hear about the little son of a famous rabbi and victim of the Geserah – namely Rabbi Aron Blümlein, grandson of Israel of Krems and uncle of Rabbi Isserlein of Wiener Neustadt – comes from a Hebrew source, a responsum by Maharil of Mainz (*d.* 1427).42 A certain Chaver Shimon asked him whether an inheritance of 3 florins from Aron Blümlein could be passed on, as titled, to his son-in-law, Rabbi Murklein of Marburg (Maribor), and to other heirs or whether ‘his son who is amongst the goyim’ (*beno she-bein ba-goyim*) would have to be taken into consideration, too. Maharil decided that the inheritance could be paid out as Aron’s son had been ‘forced in his childhood’ (*be-tinokiut ne’enass*, i.e. forced baptism); he was therefore a ‘full Jew who had been taken prisoner by the goyim and had spent all his days in error (or: in unknown and unaware sin, *be-shogeg*).’ Thirteen years had passed since then – the responsum therefore dates to 1434 – and the boy had come of age to fulfil the commandments but had not returned in a ritual of atonement. Therefore, the money should be given to Rabbi Murklein for his yeshiva and he would pass it on to the Gabbai, the custodian of the alms (*Zedaka*) for poor *Bachurim*, Talmud students. The legal situation is thus somewhat ambiguous; while the forcefully baptised son is not entitled to an inheritance, the other heirs are to donate the money to a holy cause. Another baptised child, the ‘daughter of Lemlein hahkan’ (‘the sage Lemlein’) is also mentioned in the responsum; she is ‘with the goyim and it is unknown what happened to her’.43

---

43 Maharil, *She’elot u-Teshuvot he-hadashot*, pp. 234–35 nr. 166 (p. 234).
How did New Christians Make a Living?

‘[…] it is unknown what happened to her’. Maharil’s statement touches upon my second question: How did the New Christians earn money and which professional possibilities were open to them? The sources are not very helpful as they do not always mention the individuals’ professions. In August 1422, Jakob von Steyr, der pechb (‘the baker’), burgher of Vienna, and his wife Anna sold a house to dem erbern maister Gabrieln dem Newkristen (‘the honourable master Gabriel, the New Christian’) and his wife Anna and their heirs for the price of 45 pounds Pfennige. Apart from the term ‘New Christian’, the two attributes ‘honourable’ and ‘master’ are interesting. They are not at all discriminating but rather a sign of appreciation as a bourgeois business partner; unfortunately we do not know which trade Gabriel was working in. We also do not know whether his wife Anna was a baptised Jewess, too.

When looking at the entries in the land charge register for December 1435, the pattern repeats itself: Leupold Leyttesperger and his wife Anna sold their house at the Rotenturm in Vienna for 315 pounds Pfennige dem erbern Nicodemus dem Neuenkrissten (‘to the honourable Nicodemus the New Christian’) and his heirs. The extremely high amount points to a particularly grand building. A small academic side-remark: Rudolf Geyer and Leopold Sailer, neither of them Jews, listed the two Newkristen in the register of their edition of 1931 amongst the Jews and not the Christians. Friedrich Pobenberger, alias Moyses der Vorsprech (an official at law court), was a third and seemingly well-integrated baptised Jew who set up his last will in 1427. The testament of Friedrich’s wife from 1429 further hardens the assumption that he had been a convert, for Ignaz Schwarz pointed out that she granted ainem Newn Kristen genant Jeronimus, den sie erczogen hat (‘a New Christian called Jeronimus whom she had brought up’) 20 pound Pfennige.

We can only make assumptions about this family: was Jeronimus the biological son of Friedrich alias Moses? Was his wife also a baptised Jewess or had Friedrich married a Christian after his baptism? Regarding the fate of Jewish children this entry only discloses that they could not only be handed over to monasteries but also to private individuals for further education. A search in testaments with an eye to such aspects would certainly be worthwhile. We do

44 On the same day, master Gabriel the New Christian in Vienna and his wedded wife Ann (‘Maister Gabriel der Newkristen ze Wienn und Ann sein hausfraw’) sold two pound burgage tenure of this house to the nunnery of the Sisters of St. Clare; Geyer, Sailer, *Urkunden*, p. 533 nr. 1781 (sub dato: 1422 August 12) und 533 nr. 1782, same day.
not know the time of marriage but we can assume that the former Jew Friedrich had participated in the upbringing of Jeronimus – his Christianity seemed solid enough to educate a baptised Jewish child. There is no hint of mistrust in the strength of belief and reliability of the convert.

New Christians at the Viennese University

Of all things, we notice an absence of prejudice against New Christians within one of the leading institutions that propagated anti-Judaism in the late Middle Ages, the University of Vienna. A prime example for climbing its career ladder is Paulus de Mellico, Paul of Melk, a New Christian. He was Canon of St. Stephan in 1451, Dean in 1460 and 61, Vice Chancellor of the University in 1465 and Rector in 1451, 1457, 1461 and 1471.\(^49\) Up until now, as the records and registers of the Faculty of Arts for the years 1416–45 had yet not been edited, researchers had hardly noticed Paul of Melk’s Jewish origins. Among the numerous entries of his name within the registers and files of the University, only one refers to him as a neophitus. He is noted as baccalaureus at the Faculty of Arts in the winter semester of 1427: Paulus neophitus de mellico.\(^50\) For all subsequent entries his former religion is irrelevant. It is noteworthy that Paulus de Mellico had a byname – that of Leubman. This could refer to a Jewish name widely found in Austria, Lebman. There is even evidence to a Leubman, son of Josef, in Mödling – a small town south of Vienna – for the years between 1405 and 1408. This man worked as a money lender and could be considered to be Paul’s father.\(^51\) The scribes of the University register rarely noted the cognomen Leubman, but in those cases where Paul himself wrote the minutes of the faculty sittings, he always included it – decanatus primus magistri Pauli Lewbman de Mellico. During two further periods of office as dean, he jotted them down similarly.\(^52\) Was this a form of commemoration to his Jewish father who had maybe been murdered in the Geserah? This is something we do not know. Paulus de Mellico died on January 22, 1479 – he must

---

\(^{49}\) Die Akten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wien (1396–1508), ed. by Paul Uiblein, Vol. 2 (Vienna: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft Österreichs, 1978), p. 689. Uiblein writes that Paulus ‘was designated as neophitus quite often; this is not the case, the denomination neophitus just shows up in 1427, when Paul only was baccalaureus, see the next remark.

\(^{50}\) University Archive Vienna (UAW), Ph 7: Liber secundus actorum Facultatis artium 1416–1443, fol. 88r, 2. entry, 2. line. I heartfully thank Martin Wagendorfer (Munich) for this information! See the online database ‘Wiener Artistenregister’ 1416–1447, Acta Facultatis Artium II (UAW cod. Ph 7), Nr. 3333–9262, by Thomas Maisel, Ingrid Matschinegg and Andreas Bracher, online: https://fedora.phaidra.univie.ac.at/fedora/get/o:217/bdef:Container/get/AFA2%20nr%203233%20bis%209262.pdf (accessed 16. Nov. 2014), p. 57 (sub dato 1427 I, 22.7.1427), 5116, b-1.

\(^{51}\) Geyer-Sailer, Urkunden, Register, p. 601: eight entries on Leubman, son of Joseph from Mödling.

\(^{52}\) Die Akten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wien (1396–1508), vol. 2, pp. 252, 257, 266.
therefore have been around 20 years old at the time of his entry in the university; further, he may have been baptised as a youth and educated at Melk Abbey.

Another chance find confirms Paul's Jewish origin: In August 1438, Empress Elisabeth, wife of Albrecht V – at this time already Emperor Albrecht II – instructed the mayor and council of Pressburg/Bratislava to hand over to our getreun lieben Meister Paulus de Melliko (‘truthful dear master Paulus de Melliko’) his Muhme (i.e. his aunt), ‘a Jewess and her Jewish child’ upon personal conveyance of her letter.53 Nothing is known about the further fate of woman and child but we can assume that they were not allowed to keep their Jewish faith with Paulus in Vienna.

The repeated election of Paulus for rector as egregius vir, excellent man,54 allows us to assume a perfect integration within the academic and theological world and high esteem for him as a person. Careers like these can be found among New Christians in Spain, who were, however, often torn between the chance to reach highest positions and the religious mistrust against them.55 If a careful conclusion may be drawn from the topics of Paul’s intellectual production – the study of which I am not qualified for – he might have been one among the particularly devoted and eager converts: amongst his works we find one about the planetary configuration and – maybe not coincidentally – a commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews and on Good Friday.56 The Austrian National Library’s catalogue of manuscripts contains a number of codices which Paulus Leubman de Mellico had presented to the Collectium ducale, the first house of the University of Vienna, and to the Rosenburse, a student hall and centre in Vienna.57 Among them there is a theological collection, written by Thomas Ebendorfer.58 Like Paulus Leubman, Thomas Ebendorfer, who had died 15 years earlier in 1464, several times had been

53 Municipal Archives Bratislava (Mesto Bratislava), Listiny ć 1082. Many thanks to Eveline Brugger for this information! The Register of this document in: Eduard Marie Fürst von Lichnowsky and Ernst Birk, Geschichte des Hauses Habsburg, Vol. 5: Vom Regierungsantritt Herzog Albrecht IV. bis zum Tode König Albrecht II. (Vienna: Schaumburg, 1841), p. CCCXLVI nr. 4004 (sub dato 1438 August 27).
56 Joseph Aschbach, Geschichte der Wiener Universität im ersten Jahrhundert ihres Bestehens. Festschrift zu ihrer fünfhundertjährigen Gründungsfeier (Vienna: Verlag der K. K. Universität, 1865), pp. 558–60, but he is not mentioning Paul as a ‘neophitus’, and his dates concerning Paul’s university career are not exact.
58 Austrian National Library, Cod. 4954 Han.
dean of the Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna. It is most probable
that the two scholars knew each other very well. But we cannot prove that Paulus
was the neophitus who helped Ebendorfer to translate the Hebrew anti-Christian
concoction Toldot Yeshu. Our sources speak of Ebendorfer cuiusdam Neophiti in
hebraea lingua satis periti fretus auxilio (‘relying on the help of a certain neophite
who had a great expertise in the Hebrew language’). But the man’s name is never
mentioned.59 In consideration of Paul’s catholic piety, this assumption is not to
be ruled out.

Paul is, however, not the only neophitus who enrolled between the late 1420ies
and the 1450s at that University. I would like to thank Martin Wagendorfer
(Munich), who is currently indexing the medieval University acts and registers
and who called my attention to one Augustinus neophitus in 1427, to another
Augustinus quondam neophitus in 1439, and to one Johannes Judeus baptisatus
already in 1416.60

The registers of the Faculty of Medicine, which Sonia Horn analysed for her
doctoral thesis, have brought out additional reference to baptised Jews – a fact
that is in itself not surprising as Jewish doctors were part of any medieval town’s
landscape. Already four months after the Geserah, on July 31st, 1421, the Faculty
of Medicine had to deal with a certain Caspar, iudeum baptisatum, who had been
working as doctor without its approbation.61 Caspar cited Albrecht V’s permis-
sion, who actually avowed himself to be his advocate at the faculty. The dispute
wore on until January 1423, and it not clear how it turned out. Caspar – also once
referred to as Caspar neophitus – is however not listed amongst the authorized
doctors.62 We cannot make out whether Caspar lacked the required knowledge,

59 Das jüdische Leben Jesu – Toldot Jeschu. Die älteste lateinische Übersetzung in den Falsitates Judeorum
von Thomas Ebendorfer, ed. by Brigitta Callsen, Manuela Niesner and others, Veröffentlichungen des
Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung (Vienna-Munich: Böhlau, 2003), p. 88; Krauss, Die
Wiener Geserah, p. 140.

60 University Archive Vienna (UAW) Ph. 7: Libr secundus actorum Facultatis artium 1416–1443, fol. 88r, 3rd line (Augustus neophitus de Wienna 1427/28), fol. 141r, 8th line (Augustinus quondam neophitus 1439), fol. 2r (Johannes Judeus baptisatus 1416). The last two bynames are not to be found in online
database ‘Wiener Arstenregister’ 1416–1447, only Augustus neophitus de Wienna, p. 57 (sub dato 1427
I, 22.7.1427), 517, b-2.

61 UAW, Cod. Med. 1.1, Acta Facultatis Medicae Universitatis Vindobonensis I 1399–1435, ed. by SONIA HORN
Sonia Horn, ‘Examiniert und approbiert. Die Wiener medizinische Fakultät und nicht-akademische
Heilkundige in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit’ (unpubl. doctoral thesis, University of Vienna, 2001,
Nov. 2014), pp. 73–5 (Caspar).

62 See the first edition of Cod. Med. 1.1, Acta faculatis medicae universitatis Vindobonensis I 1399–1435,
ed. by Karl Schrauf (Vienna: Verlag des medicinischen Doctorencollegiums, 1894), pp. 95–101. See also
pp. 46, 48, 52–3, 94.
whether the faculty did not want to admit further competition, or whether his Jewish origin was the reason for the rejection. We do know for sure, though, that Albrecht V entered into a power game with the University for the sake of Caspar, thereby causing the neophiti to become what Jews had been before – pawns between two forces. Whether Caspar was Albrecht’s ‘personal physician’ as claimed by Samuel Krauss – is not proven.  

Two further baptised empirici (‘doctors practicing without the Medical Faculty’s approbation’) kept the faculty busy. We know of one empiricus omnino illiteratus (‘a practicing student fully lacking in letters’), who obviously did not speak any Latin in August 1438. We have also one Johann Gabriel baptizatus, who failed his exam in July 1442 and complained that he had been examined too harshly. The latter clearly did not leave Vienna, for in May 1451 he received another summons to the faculty. From the 1450s onwards, a number of students from the ‘Rhenish nation’ – from Günzburg, Worms, and Passau – matriculated at the university and were referred to as neophiti.

Some Failed Lives

Among the baptised Jews in Austria there were certainly also some who failed to succeed in their new lives. Yet we only hear of those if they came in conflict with the law. One infamous example is the tauft christjud (‘baptised Christian Jew’) Hans Veyol who accepted baptism numerous times in order to get hold of the baptism gifts, who deceived and denounced others and eventually was condemned to die in Regensburg by drowning. Begging and travelling baptised Jewesses were successful as fortune tellers. This has allowed Rudolf Glanz to refer to the entire baptism of Jews as a ‘new, spivvy sector of industry’, which resulted in a reversal of order, as Christian beggars could pretend they were converted Jews.

63 Krauss, Die Wiener Geserah, p. 142.
Conclusion

In contrast to other episodes of forced conversion, like in Spain or Southern Italy, the Austrian Jews were neither stigmatised nor excluded. They were integrated in the city of Vienna and its community or in smaller towns like Klosterneuburg. After one generation, their Jewish origin was not visible anymore. What connects all those individual fates after the Geserah is not only the baptism following a violent – or at least life-endangering – situation but also the positive attention Albrecht V gave them. Albrecht V, who went down in history as a brutal murderer and persecutor of Jews, supported baptised children, women and men by granting them alimentary pensions, gifts of money and houses. In addition, he tried to intervene – as was the case with Caspar – to their advantage. It is possible that he acted with the intention to follow canon law, and to therefore return to the baptised Jews the heritage of their evicted and murdered parents.68 Under his rule, a Paulus de Mellico, also a protégé of Albrecht’s wife Elisabeth, was able to rise to highest honours and be elected rector numerous times.

Those friendly measures towards New Christians reveal the burning of Austrian Jews to have been even more drastically motivated by religion than scholarship has up until now assumed. Obviously, Albrecht V’s primary motives were neither political nor financial. He fought against Jews only as long as they persisted in their religious ‘error’. Once they had become Christians, they stood under his personal protection. It seems that c. 1420 Judaism was no longer considered to be a specific religion, but only a deviation from the Christian faith, a heresy which could only be atoned for with death by fire.

This thesis is confirmed by a charter which was published by Franz Kurz in 1835. This remarkable text has therefore been known for more than 150 years, yet has not been analysed until now. On September 27th, 1421 Jakob of Krems, etwann genant ysekel jud – ‘formerly known as Jew Isak’ – confessed that he had been incarcerated in Krems (an hour west of Vienna) because he had admitted without torture that he was planning to leave the Christian faith and to return to the ‘Jewish and heretical faith’. He had therefore ‘forfeited life and soul’. ‘With God’s mercy’ – also towards his wife and children – the judge and council of Krems released him under the condition that Jakob swore an oath to remain from now on true to Christianity and not accept another faith.69 They followed the

Schwabenspiegel, which stated that a recidivist convert was to be forced to remain true to the Christian faith by secular and clerical courts or sentenced to death by fire. It is very likely that Isak-Jakob’s family was well-known to the council of Krems, a city which along with Vienna and Wiener Neustadt held one of the three oldest Jewish communities in Medieval Austria.

This charter gives a solid base to the note in the Kleine Klosterneuburger Chronik that ‘numerous’ people who had wanted to return to Judaism were burnt to death. As postulated by Pope Clement VI in his 1267 encyclical turbato corde, relapsi such as heretics were to be punished by burning at the stake. Jews were presented to the Inquisition if they supported these reconverts, received them in the Jewish community or refused their denunciation. They were subject to the same criteria as those Christians who supported heretics. From the late thirteenth century onwards – and in particular during the Hussite rebellion – the identification of Jews with Christian heretics can also be noticed in Ashkenaz. The last step to actual burnings of Jews for reasons of faith was not so wide any more. Numerous legal opinions (responsa) from the 1420s to the 1460s, owed to the like of Israel Isserlein, Israel Bruna, Jakob Weil and Maharil, concerned themselves with the problem of forced converts, their wives and children, and those ready for atonement. Rabbi Isserlein, who had lost his mother and his uncle Aron Blümlein in the Geserah and whose little cousin had been forced to baptism, passed down to us a strict ritual of atonement in accordance with the tradition of the Chasside Ashkenaz, a small, but influential group of Rhenish scholars and pietists of the thirteenth century. Whether he dared impose it on an atonement-willing apostate has not been recorded.

‘Urfehlde’ is followed by an extensive declaration of oath of truce. In spite of the correct transcription of the document, Kurz interpreted it as him having confessed under torture.

70 Magin, ‘Wie es umb der iuden recht stet’, p. 175.
The archivist of Bouches du Rhône department had noticed in 1927 the not inconsiderable role played by a certain Jacques Turelli as a witness in the matter of the Jews that left their native Marseilles in great numbers for Sardinia in 1486: the members of the town council were uneasy about this semi-clandestine departure of well-off Jews who took their belongings away with them; Turelli had been required to give evidence, give names, appraise the value of their possessions; he had suggested that 200 people might have departed and identified about ten individuals, four of whom had left with their respective families.

This took place after the death of king René, in the County of Provence that had become French in 1481, and where the situation of Jews would soon deteriorate. The deadly riot that had taken place in Arles two years before, in June 1484 – a Hebrew testimony of which has subsisted, (a fragment of the Torah that escaped the sacking of the synagogue which is being studied today by Elodie Attia) had caused a number of Jews to leave Arles and Tarascon, fleeing from such ‘din and turmoil’ (as these documents say) to seek refuge in Marseilles, Aix and Pertuis.

Hence a number of Jews in Marseilles, sensing perils cropping up, embarked in little groups for the shores of Sardinia, resuming the coral route their elders had once taken, after realizing all their resources. The town council authorities did not like this regular flow of wealthy Jews departing, and consequently required Jacques Turelli to inform them. The archivist Raoul Busquet, who published this document in 1927, had made this naïve yet logical remark: ‘As if the Marseilles Jews had taken Jacques Turelli in their confidence!’

1 My thanks to Pierre Saint-Yves, professor retired, for translating this article into English.


Why then did the town council make this demand of Jacques Turelli? My research has allowed me to give two answers. First of all, thanks to the publishing in 1991, in the records of a symposium held in Pau, of a document dated the year 1466 recording his election to the office of collecting the tallia judeorum, heavy on the Jews of Marseilles. As a collector of their taxes Jacques Turelli was in a position to know the state of their property.

Second, Jacques Turelli was a neofitus: in the Marseilles archives, the first mention of his conversion and Jewish identity is dated October 8th, 1460: his former name was Cregut Bonet. The notarized document recording this information recalls the ‘time when Jacques Turelli was a Jew and acted in his own name as well as in the name and place of the other Jews, i.e the rank and file of the Marseilles Jewry’. Thus are we entitled to assume that this olim judeus was bound to know his former fellow Jews.

So is it that eight decades later we can answer ‘yes’ to the archivist’s question: yes, Jacques Turelli ‘did share the secrets of his fellow-Jews of Marseilles’: he was once one of them, we can therefore assume that he knew them well; having besides levied and collected their taxes, he had a perfect knowledge of their resources and possessions.

Let me say lastly – this is the “icing on the cake” – that I had come across this information in the studies of a specialist on Nostradamus, Edgar Leroy, where Turelli was mentioned as the famous physician and astrologer’s great-grandfather on the maternal side; yet no mention whatever was made of his former Jewish identity, although Raoul Busquet, he again, pointed out in 1950, without adding any more details, that Jacques Turelli actually was a neophyte. I reproduce below the genealogical sketch I began to outline in my book ‘Jews and neophytes’ in Provence (2001).

This article provides new elements in the story of Jacques Turelli and consequently in the family background of Nostradamus: a wider, more precise light on

---

5 A.D. Marseille, 391 E 60, f°119, 8 octobre 1460.
7 Edgar Leroy, Nostradamus. Ses origines, sa vie, son œuvre (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, 1972 and Marseille, 1999); Leroy published a number of articles on Nostradamus starting in 1960 in Provence Historique.
8 Raoul Busquet, Nostradamus, sa famille, son secret, 1950, p. 18.
Nostradamus’ maternal ancestors of Jewish origin. The fact is that I have found, in the Marseilles notaries’ records, the traces of five marriages: the marriage of Jacques Turelli himself in 1460, and that of four of his children, one of whom was Béatrice, the physician-astrologer’s grandmother.

The Maternal Jewish Ancestry of Nostradamus

Edgar Leroy had not succeeded in tracing this Jewish maternal ancestry. He had indeed spotted in the archives of Comtat-Venaissin the great-grandfather Davin de Carcassonne d’Avignon who had become the converted Arnauton de Velorgues (Velorgues in the ‘department’ Vaucluse, district of Avignon), his son Gui Gassonnet, whose New Christian name was Pierre de Nostredame, and the grandson Jacques de Nostredames, father of the famous Michel (our Nostradamus).

René de Saint-Rémy had been his stumbling-block. He had even presumed him converted, yet without proof:

Where did these Saint-Rémy originate from, in particular that physician Jean, who was the authentic grandfather of Michel Nostradamus? One is inclined to think that he belonged to the Jewish race, and that he or his father on converting had adopted the name of the town where they had been baptized. In truth, one knows exactly nothing, for lack of documents.

In spite of Raoul Busquet’s fleeting mention of neophyte Jacques Turelli, Leroy had not asked himself any further question about Jacques Turelli and his daughter Béatrice, writing on page 29 of his book on Nostradamus (published in 1972):

The maternal ancestry of Nostradamus has proved less easy to trace in the archives of the region. All that I have been able to find out about the famous astrologer’s mother is hardly more than her name. She was Renée, probably a Christian, the grand-daughter of Jean de Saint-Rémy, a physician and officer of the aforesaid town, and the daughter of René and Béatrice Toureil.

Following Leroy, Armand Lunel, in 1975, also wrote of the absence of evidence on the maternal line of Nostradamus’ family: ‘The astronomer Nostradamus, this illustrious Provençal whom Frédéric Mistral placed on the same rank as Queen Jeanne and the Roi René was, through his paternal ancestry, a half-Jew’. Here again, the progress of research has allowed us to gain ground. The answers were

---

scattered and lay – unexplored until today – sleeping in the ancient archives of Marseilles.

I. The Marriage of Jacques Turelli Himself

On May 28, 1460 in Marseilles ‘l’assignation de dot avec reconnaissance’ (the commitment to provide a dowry) was registered ‘for Ysabella, wife of Jaco Turelli from Marseilles’. It is said here that ‘in the presence of the Holy mother Church, following the orthodox celebration’, the marriage between Jaco Turelli ‘filium exoticum’ or ‘foreign son’ of honest Bernard Turelli, a master joiner (a shipbuilding trade) or shipwright of the city of Marseilles on the one hand, and ‘Ysabella, newly baptized into the catholic faith and having forsaken the Mosaic law on the other’, has been celebrated and consummated.

This is the first time a neophyte has been mentioned in these words. The word neophyte is generally sufficient to place the olim judeus, nunc christianus. ‘Foreign son’ instead of adopted son? Or of godson? The scribe wrote ‘regnantam’ when one should say regeneratam, to mean that Ysabelle had been ‘regenerated’ in the baptismal font. It looks indeed as if Ysabelle had been converted only recently: because her parents had probably remained Jews, she was the one that provided a dowry to herself, agreeing to give her husband a trousseau (raupis et vestibus), as well as gold, silver coral and mother-of pearl jewels, the whole dowry being worth 200 florins. Thanks to this contract, the first mention of Jacques Turelli’s conversion, which I had noticed, proving without the least ambiguity his manifest conversion and neophyte identity on October 8, 1460, can be advanced to May of the same year, i.e. six months before.

II. The Marriage of Béatrice Turelli, the Daughter of Jacques

Sixteen years later, a notarial deed, registered toward the end of the year 1476, describes the union of his daughter Béatrice. It is said that on December 27, 1476, a marriage was celebrated and consummated between René de Saint-Rémy, a ‘mule-driver’ (or conveyor), one of the king’s panetiers, son of maître Jean de Saint-Rémy, physician and ‘mule-driver of the fruit’, and Béatrice, daughter of Jacques Turelli and Ysabelle, a married couple from Marseilles.

The dowry amounted to 200 florins granted by Jacques, to be paid up in the following way: 100 florins within the coming fortnight, 33 florins and 4 and a half ‘gros’ of salt the next year, and so on every year till the 100 florins were paid up. He

---

11 Ad Marseille, 351 E 794, f°s 155–156v, 28 mai 1460.
12 Ad Marseille, 373 E 55, f°s 293v–294, 27 décembre 1476.
13 The officers keeping and distributing bread at the sovereign’s court.
pledged to provide for his daughter for three years, and also for the children she
would bring up according to the condition of their persons. He also pledged to 
assume responsibility for the géspı́ne, i.e. the 40-day period following childbirth,
when the mother entertains visitors. This sum corresponds to the average of the
Jewish dowries of the time. J. Turelli could afford to pay within a fortnight: he
had enough liquid assets. Besides, being able to provide for his daughter’s needs
(and her children to be born during the next three years) testifies to his comfort-
able income.

On the other side, Jean de Saint-Rémy (father, and 'legal administrator' of his
son René) was not outdone; in the absence of the latter, in the presence of the
notary and of the father-in-law Jacques Turelli, on the same day, December 27, he
carried out a donatio inter vivos of one half of all his properties; as to him, as long
as he lived, he would enjoy the usufruct of the other half. In case Jacques Turelli
should not wish (God forbid!) to support and feed in his house the couple René
and his wife Béatrice, in this case, and only in this case, he would grant them, as a
donation inter vivos, the whole of the 200 florins, to be handed over in the form of
movables or real estate, following the assessment of two trustworthy friends, who
would furthermore assess the trousseau (vestes et jocalibus) to be returned.14 Two
months later, on February 21, 1477, Jacques Turelli was formally acquitted, and
Béatrice his daughter15 acknowledged the dowry: René de Saint-Rémy, Jacques’
son-in-law, declared he had been granted the sum of 78 florins, to be deducted
from the dowry.

It seems –thanks to the notaries of Tarascon (according to Leroy) – that an
argument arose, about two years later (July 10, 1477), opposing Jacques Turelli
de Marseilles to maître Jean de Saint-Rémy, father and administrator of René’s
property, about the restitution of Béatrice’s dowry. In order to fix the amount of
this restitution, whose reason is not mentioned (the death of Béatrice?), experts
were chosen, who concluded that Jean should give Turelli 55 florins, eventually
reduced to 50 florins in the terms of an amicable settlement. Edgar Leroy, who
mentions the names of these experts, Marbotin de Provence and Pierre de Ribiers,
did not know they were neophytes.

Pierre de Ribiers belonged to the Jewish lineage of the Botarellis of Marseilles.
I have written about his sister Boniaqua, wife of Salamias,16 and about all their
lineage of influential leaders of the community. Pierre (formerly Salves Botarelli)

14 Donacio propter nupcias inter vivos pro Reynerio de Sancto Remigio (f° 294).
15 Quitancia pro Jacobo Turelli et recognicio pro Beatrice eius filia (f° 295v).
16 Danièle Iancu-Agou, « Autour du testament d’une Juive marseillaise (1480), Marseille, revue mu-
Tableau III on the « Famille Salamias – Botarelli ». 
had, too, converted early, toward 1460, becoming king René’s broker, embarking on galleons to go and indulge the monarch’s expensive tastes, providing him with precious materials and rare spices. I had already underlined, in Jews and Neophytes (2001), the fact that Jacques Turelli and Pierre de Ribiers were close to each other. Not only were they both precocious neophytes, they had moreover become partners in January 1461, pledging themselves on that occasion ‘never to venture in any dice or cards or any other table game’, on pain of paying 25 florins (one half being paid to the royal tax officers). As for Marbotin de Provence, he used to be the Jew Vidal Salmie from Tarascon, who had converted about 1467–68.¹⁷

Maitre Jean de Saint-Rémy offered later, after the death of his son René, to his grand-daughter Renée (the mother of Nostradamus), on her wedding day, May 14, 1495, when she married Jacques de Nostredame, the following property:¹⁸ a house with an enclosed garden in ‘the rue du Viguier in Saint- Rémy, well-furnished’ (*cum omnia et singula bona mobilia domus ustensilia*); a cottage with its meadows, vineyards and uncultivated lands, other meadows, a tile kiln and a *scobilia* (a place for rubbish) with an orchard, in a dead end: lastly a tile kiln with a house facing uncultivated fields, the mountain and the Orgon path. One should keep in mind the fact we are here in Nostradamus’ parents’ house.

In case of premature death, Renée was to get 100 florins and Jaume 50. Jean de Saint-Rémy, as long as he lived, meant to remain the usufructuary of all that he gave to his grand-daughter, and to live himself and his wife Silletta with the young married couple, ‘remaining always most respectfully submissive’. On his side Jaume de Nostredame promised 150 florins in ready money and 50 in furniture and house utensils before Michaelmas (September 29). This deed was registered in Avignon, in the house of Blanche, second wife and widow of Pierre de Nostredame.

Later on, after the birth of Michel in 1503, his father Jacques, ‘a merchant of the town of Saint-Rémy’ (later a ‘notary’) sold, with Jean de Laudun junior, twelve cows,¹⁹ for the sum of 100 florins. Just for the record, Jean de Laudun junior was the great-nephew of Régine Abram de Draguignan. In other words, all the neophytes of Provence were acquainted with one another, saw a lot of one another, traded with one another, and got married to one another, thus building up together a perfectly codified network.

---


III. Here We Meet Again Marbotin de Provence

Who got married to Jacques Turelli’s son (who bore his father’s first name and surname) but?... Marbotin’s daughter! The date was November 28, 1476.20 This is the content of an official ‘writ of summons for granting Bartholoméa of Provence a dowry’, registered in Marseilles on November 28, 1476 and concerning the marriage between Jacques Turelli, son of Jacques and Ysabelle (one month before his sister Béatrice’s wedding) and Bartholoméa de Provence, daughter of Marbotin de Provence and Hugone, a married couple from Marseilles. The dowry amounted to 300 florins, 200 of which were in silver. So, when Marbotin de Provence was required in 1479 ‘as an expert’ in the matter of refunding the dowry that Béatrice, daughter of Jacques, had been granted, he was an expert related to the Turellis, since he had been for over two years the father-in-law of Jacques Turelli’s son. Kinship and family interests were quick to get closely intertwined.

IV. Marriage between Douce Turelli and Aymeric Malespine d’Aix. 31 May 1486

In a document found in Marseilles,21 written in the usual tedious phraseology, it is said that, after the marriage was concluded, ‘following the bridegroom’s word’ between the discreet man (juvenem) Aymeric de Malespina from the city of Aix and the honest maid Doussone, daughter of the discreet man Jacques Turelli and Isabelle, from Marseilles, the rite of pledge or ‘dation des corps’ took place according to the Christian custom, before the Church.

Jacques Turelli endowed his daughter with 250 florins, as follows: 100 florins in dresses and jewels valued by two mutual friends on both sides, + 50 florins on the same day; then 50 florins by forthcoming Eastertide, and lastly the remaining 50 florins by Easter of the following year, in cash, not in valued property. Jacques Turelli committed himself to accommodating and feeding the young couple in his own house, ‘eating the same bread and drinking the same wine’, at his expense, for four full years, on the basis of 25 florins a year, which 100 florins (25 × 4) Aymeric should acknowledge as dowry to his wife and promise to refund it should the dowry be returned. Should either spouse die (‘God forbid!’), before the end of the 4-year term, Jacques Turelli couldn’t claim restitution of more money than was used when these alimenta were granted on the basis of 25 florins a year. Aymeric agreed to give his wife 100 more florins: if he happened to die (‘God forbid!’) these 100 florins would come back to her, should she wish to remarry (ut ipsa Dulsona melius collocare posserit in matrimonio); if she were to die first, he would

20 A.D. Marseille, 373 E 55, f° 443, 28 novembre 1476.
21 A.D. Marseille, 380 E 6, f°s 174v°-177, 31 mai 1486. Extensoire. Dotis constitutio pro Esmeriqo de Malespina.
get back 50 florins. Aymeric took a solemn oath on the holy Gospels. The deed was registered in Marseilles, in the afore-mentioned Jacques Turelli’s orchard, in the borough of Saint-Louis, outside the walls of Marseilles but nearby, in the presence of three witnesses (a cobbler, and a builder from Marseilles, and a merchant from Salon).

V. Marriage of Françoise Turelli to Simon Nicolay d’Arles, July-November 1496

Two ‘reconnaissances de dot’ (deeds acknowledging the granting of a dowry) were registered in Aix for Françoise Turelli, daughter of discreet gentleman Turelli, a merchant of Marseilles. The first one is dated July 23, 1496: the son in law was Simon Nicolay d’Arles. 70 florins were given, to be deduced from the dowry assigned at the time of the marriage (and registered by maître Guilhem Genesterii of Salon, ‘on the day and year herein mentioned’).

The second one was registered on November 14 of the same year, by the notary Guillaume Fabre d’Hyères: Simon Nicolay d’Arles received from his father-in-law Jacques Turelli, in deduction and second settlement of his wife’s dowry: 87 florins. If we can’t know the total amount of the dowry, we know that it amounted at least to 157 florins and probably exceeded that sum.

This is the Substance of the Five Hitherto Unpublished Marriage Contracts We Have Analyzed above

It clearly appears that Jacques Turelli, who had converted in the peaceful days of king René, carefully organized the marriages of his children within the narrow, ‘emerging’ sphere of the Provence neophytes. From Saint-Rémy to Tarascon, Arles or Aix, he drew from the reserve of freshly converted fellow Jews of Provence, for the best possible matches, to build up and interlace the future of his kinship. Having in 1460 made up his mind and come to the decision of converting, he had instantly married a converted bride who brought him a fine 200 florin dowry. Known then as a ‘pauper’ in his original community, he would never draw anything but material profit, rising as early as 1466 to the position of ‘collector tallia judeorum’, strengthening his influence and status, playing twenty years later, in 1486, the part of mediator or negotiator with the Marseilles town council, when his former fellow Jews decided to leave Provence. His name appears again in the Aix notarial archives in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, when he had become solicitor (‘procureur’) of the ‘seigneur de Marignane’, René Cossa, and of

22 AD Aix, 309 E 530, f°339, 23 juillet 1496. Reconnaissances dotis honeste filie Francisce Turelli, filie discreti viri Jacobi Turelli, mercator Massiliensis.
23 AD Aix, 309 E 530, f°590, 14 novembre 1496, notaire Guillaume Fabre d’Hyères.
the ‘holy monasteries’ of Saints Claire and Paule of Marseilles. He expended more
and more energy then, getting involved in the taxes weighing on Jews who were
on the point of being evicted, or on others threatened with the liquidation of their
property, or with the sale of their property even to Jacques himself, 24 suspected
of taking advantage of the situation to draw substantial personal profits. Raoul
Busquet didn’t hesitate to write that ‘in 1486, he might have busied himself with
stripping his former fellow Jews to the profit of Honorat Forbin’s clan.’ 25

Succeeding anyway in tracing the marriage contracts of his four children, be-
sides his own, has been for us a godsend which now allows one to break into the
very fabric of his family; three of them were registered in Marseilles; they bring
to light the fact that the three daughters all made excellent matches. Already
regarding the son, the first to get married, the chosen bride, Bartholoméa, was
the daughter of Marbotin de Provence, who gave her a not insignificant dowry of
300 florins. These neophytes from Tarascon were quick to find their place in the
world of the influential ‘New Christians’ in the Provence of King René: we possess
(regarding the year 151126) the will left by Marbotin’s son, Elzear de Provence (ex-
Crescas Vitalis from Marseilles), who converted later than his father (and, being
subject in 1512 to the tax on neophytes, had to pay 150 florins), and chose then to
be buried in the Couvent des Carmes in Aix; a genealogical sketch I drew on their
kinship in ‘Les Mêlanges Nabon’ shows here again how marriages were organized
and carefully managed in the strict neophyte sphere of influence. 27

There was a strong feeling of solidarity, and a community spirit, at work, as-
serting itself more and more. The links with the Jewish past, far from dissolving,
got strengthened. Not only was the group obviously coherent, but they rose to
prominence: the Provençals of Marseilles were ennobled in 1586.

Béatrice, married one month later to René de Saint-Rémy, became nothing
less than the grandmother of the famous Michel de Nostredame (1503–1566),
since her daughter, married in 1495 to Jacques de Nostredame (who was taxed
in 1512 for 200 florins) gave birth to the famous physician and astrologer. Here
we find ourselves extremely close to the family archives, and to the private life of
an illustrious family of the ancient Comté de Provence and of French Provence,
which Frédéric Mistral did not hesitate to rank along Queen Jeanne and King
René. In the heart of this lineage, part and parcel of the Provençal culture, whose

25 Raoul Busquet, Nostradamus, sa famille et son secret, ..., op. cit., p. 18.
26 See Juifs et néophytes, ..., op. cit., pp. 272 & ff.
27 Danièle Iancu-Agou, « les ‘Nouveaux Chrestiens’ de Provence: la nouvelle liste de 1512 des Archives
départementales de Marseille », in L’écriture de l’Histoire juive. Mêlanges en l’honneur de Gérard Nabon,
Prosopographiques).
unilateral conversion started from the middle of the fifteenth century, Jean,\textsuperscript{28} the astrologer’s brother and the grandson of neophytes, was to become the historian of Provence (he was the author of ‘Les vies des plus célèbres et anciens poètes provençaux’, Lyons, 1575), whose research was to be resumed by his nephew César (son of Michel) in his monumental edition of 1614 (Histoire et Chronique de Provence, Lyons). It’s worth noting that, if they somewhat embellished the history of their family by failing to mention the Jewish past of the paternal branch in Comtat, and of the maternal branch in Marseilles, they nonetheless show how brilliantly their lineage illustrates Provençal humanism, being the flourishing outcome of an exemplary lineage, always eager for social integration. These are indeed the few major characters who set examples for future collective attitudes, being the heralds of future changes.

Béatrice’s sister, Douce or Doussone, married ten years later, in 1486, Aymeric de Malespine; this marriage contract reveals that Aymeric forsook his Jewish faith three years sooner than we had thought, since I had discovered the first mention of his conversion as dating from the year 1489. A former Jew, called Astruc Jacob, he was to build up a large fortune trading in cloth and woolens, exporting his goods as far as Piedmont. Here again, the file is a thick one: I have published the will of Aymeric’s mother, Tholsana Jacob, a widow who remained Jewish till 1501, the year when she ‘rejoined’ her son in the new Christian religion, calling herself henceforth Honorate de Malespine; Aymeric’s wills (1505) are available too; they were twice revised in 1513, revealing considerable wealth, record figures like those that can be found in the Aix oligarchy: 1200 florins for his daughter’s dowry, nothing less than 14,000 florins bequeathed to his two under-age sons, for whom he was already contemplating priesthood. Aymeric was ennobled in 1519 (the enclosed coat-of arms, dated from December, 18, 1519, is shown in the ‘Lettre d’anoblissement’ I quoted in ‘Juifs and neophytes’) and became ‘seigneur de Montjustin’ in 1523. His cursus honorum is exemplary.

It is worth drawing attention to the fact that, if Aymeric was not mentioned in the ‘fiscal lists’ of 1512, the tax on neophytes, to which all his fellow neophytes were submitted, nevertheless caught up with him: a notarial deed from Aix, dated April 8, 1513,\textsuperscript{29} says he was required to come to terms with a commission of four converted citizens of note that had been set up on the occasion, with the aim of making him pay his contribution, ‘considering he had been a Christian for a longer time’. He agreed to make a not insignificant gift of 300 florins.

\textsuperscript{28} Jean-Yves Casanova, Historiographie et littérature au xvi\textsuperscript{e} siècle en Provence. L’œuvre de Jean de Nostredame, Thèse pour le Doctorat ès lettres (Montpellier : Université Paul Valéry, octobre 1990).
\textsuperscript{29} AD Aix, 509 E 425, f° 238, notaire Imbert Borrilli. Quittance pour Aymeric de Malespine, marchand d’Aix.
As to the last daughter to be married, Françoise Turelli, it is noteworthy to specify that Simon Nicolay d’Arles was the son of the neophyte physician Jean Nicolay. Françoise in 1496 joined the cream of the local medical elites, the family of a particularly well-read physician from Arles who had converted to Christianity about 1464–1465; her father-in-law was not any ordinary physician: he was once called ‘maitre Crescas Vidal Ferrier’ before becoming Jean Nicolaï; the inventory made after his death on March 20, 1483, reveals the possession of a quite considerable scholarly library, with 35 Latin titles, mostly concerned with medicine, among which we find: Aristotle, four Galens, three Avicennas, works from the Salerno medical school (Nicholas Praepositus, Platearius), the Montpellier school (Guy de Chauliac, Arnaud de Villeneuve with the Treaty on wines translated by Bonjudas Nathan of Arles, the eldest of the famous learned lineage, subject of the article in this volume by Ram ben Shalom), Isaac Israéli (‘le Traité sur les Fièvres’).

Simon was under-age at the time of the inventory; he became his sole legatee (and was taxed too in 1512 for 40 florins). It was at that time that he married the daughter of Jacques Turelli, who had become by then powerful and influent, not only in the narrow world of the neophytes, but also in the global society of the ‘Crestiens d’ancienneté’ of Provence, a province that had become French for already fifteen years.

While their ex-fellow Jews were made to leave Provence following the expulsion edicts of the years 1493–96, 1500–1501 (unless, of course, they should consent to forsake their Jewish faith) these people, who had converted and duly paid their taxes as neophytes in 1512, were all people who were about to rise to prominence, people who were called to rub shoulders with those whose fortunes were being built up in the same way as their own. Piecing together today the marriages of the olim judei of the years 1460–70 shows how porous may be the lineages of neophytes closely knit together by a common past and a common fate; it helps us to trace almost all the neophytes of the time, under the reign of René d’Anjou. This little world of the ‘autrefois juifs’ belonged to the microcosm of the neoﬁti or ‘neophytes’ of Provence, who were not yet so many in the years 1460–1475.

---


merely a group of ‘peripheral’ converted people living on the fringe of their original group, just outside the more or less shut-off areas left to their former fellow-Jews.  

Their sense of sharing the same identity was extremely strong; it testifies, if need be, to the intensely tight links that the descendants kept between one another. We discover ‘crossed’ marriages between the families of neophytes: medicine had often served as a lever to their fathers, who had been highly cultivated and experienced practitioners. One has the feeling that they knew how to use those of them who had a better social position to ensure better integration into the Provençal society.

Their alliance strategy is fascinating and owed nothing to chance. Groups closely woven into networks were set up over the whole Provençal area, building on the borders, on the fringes of Jewish communities, a small ‘neophyte’ galaxy called to assert itself more and more into a strong, coherent community. It spread out, as if the affair had been negotiated with quasi-methodical, perfect care, creating a closely-knit network which was at the same time matrimonial, economical and cultural. We can see neophytes’ children getting married at the first generation to other neophytes’ children, in a world tightly woven together and having extremely powerful common Jewish roots: such a strategy at work tends to show that the neophytes leant on one another to define their place in society.

Jacques Turelli, maternal grandfather of the famous ‘mage ou mège de Salon’, Nostradamus, whose general figure remained blurred, and in any case little known in his Jewish past, having as early as 1460 forsaken his condition of judeus, of a rather humble man who had converted at the same time as his contemporary Pierre de Ribiers, king René’s broker, together with almost all his children’s fathers-in-law, he made the bet that he would eventually merge into the Provençal society, and won it; with this end in view, he thus built up around his closest relatives, matrimonial alliances within the narrow, closed network of neophytes that was being formed and beginning to take shape. These were really matrimonial strategies, thanks to which one can approach the intimacy of family groups sticking together, and which reveal a world made accessible through notarial archives.

Out of this Judeo-Provençal stock, a most fertile soil, the new neophyte plants gave the best of their potential, and offered the best possible élites, the élites of the intellectual and commercial world, as well as of the world of law if one thinks of Régine Abram de Draguignan who became a neofita at the same period, in 1472, and whose heir Accurse de Lione, grand-son of her brother physician maître Jacob

---

Massip Abram, converting meanwhile under the name of Raymond de Cipières, entered the Parliament of Provence as early as 1525.

Following the example of the Nostredames, who had become prominent symbols of Provençal cultural success, the Ortigues d’Apt, stemming from Jean Hortie, ex-Salomon de Beauchaper who had converted before 1481 (whose daughter Isabelle was married to the son of Marbotin de Provence. Their small world remained tightly tied up), supplied toward the end of the sixteenth century a poet, ‘gentilhomme d’Apt’, as he liked to be called, considered as one of the best Christian poets of his time.

One might as well say that the Jews of Provence, once they had become converts, gave to the land where they had been born, the land where so many of their ancestors lay buried, a number of enlightened key figures able to be the avant-garde of an outstanding and flourishing ‘intelligentsia’. Their ‘success story’ may have been the consequence of many different elements: the excitement of intellectual research so dear to their former faith, the traditional cultural practice of their elders, the quest of honors suddenly available, the role of philosophy and rationalism, the consideration of the hardships afflicting Jews, the disappointed messianic expectation seeking new hopes in Christianity, all these factors have probably played their part in the behavior of some cultivated marginal circles of the Provençal Jewish society, which, we may add, on another, much smaller scale, was not so far from that of the Jewish elites in Aragon.

Could one say though, that conversion was the way to success? In any case, before the death of king René, although there was no threat of exile, each community supplied two or three conversions. It is true that, after the County was united to the Kingdom and the general atmosphere grew heavier, in the long term, the Jews that wished to be able to remain in Provence after August 1501 had eventually no other choice than conversion. There is yet the example of a ‘relatively precocious’ exiled individual who made a success of his exile while remaining a Jew; he was the first husband of Régine, Bonet (Astrug) de Lattes, from Aix; after the breaking off of his first marriage in 1472, he turned to medicine and became the leader of his community of Aix en Provence before finally leaving, first, in the 1490’s for Comtat, then for Italy, for Rome, where his success was breathtaking, making him all at once the physician of two popes (Alexander VI, Jules II); He was quoted by Rabelais, and was also a renowned astronomer visited by Charles de Bovelles, the disciple of Lefèvre d’Etaples.

However, the neophytes of Provence – about one thousand individuals- were not in fact very numerous, with their new names (Danjou, d’Entrecasteaux, Roquebrune), surnames sweetly smelling of lavender rather than of the scents of Judæa (as Jules Bauer had said with different words in 1905, questioning the truthfulness of the 1512 Lists: ‘Their List of names – a great many of which have a particle of nobility (“de”),- referred less to a list of people originating from a
ghetto than to the armorial of ancient Provençal nobility’), these neophytes became integrated rather easily, their small number making their insertion all the smoother; there is no possible comparison with their Spanish counterparts, submitted to the harshness of the Inquisition, or to the massacres of 1506 in Portugal.

And if, for the ‘last-minute converted’, those of September 1501, the ascension was to be quite logically slower, to become noticeable only toward the middle of the sixteenth century, for example with the Estiennes (formerly Gabriel-Cohen and later Estienne d’Orves), on the other hand for the neophytes of the mid-fifteenth century, those who lived at the time of King René (the Danjous, or the Orgons de Pertuis, the Citranis or Provençals from Apt, our Turellis from Marseilles, the famous Nostredames), the examples of social ascension took place, quite naturally, earlier, and were for some of them, unquestionable, if not extraordinary.

It appears, at the conclusion of this study, that this marginal society of neophytes, with their most famous representative, whose life long remained vague, or obscure, is revealed more and more clearly now, thanks to archival work. One century has been necessary to achieve this aim, since the new research carried out by baron du Roure who had initiated the investigation at the end of the nineteenth century; the questions asked by Jules Bauer at the beginning of the twentieth century; the essential work done by Raoul Busquet about the end of the Marseilles Jewish community (1930) and about Nostradamus, His Family, His Secret (1950); Edgar Leroy’ specialized studies of the famous astrologer (1946–1972); Lhez’ work on the neophytes (1966) and on “The paternal ancestors of Michel de Nostradamus” (1968); Armand Lunel’s assessments (1966), and lastly my own, carried out at the offices of the notaries of Aix, and also at those of Marseilles, together with the connections that I managed to ascertain between the Christian surnames of 300 converted Jews (200 from Aix and 100 from Provence) and their former Jewish names (2001). This shows how, from one link to another, researchers and historians can reinforce and broaden the chain of knowledge.

1913–2013: one century has elapsed since the birth of Bernhard Blumenkranz; 1948–2013, sixty-five years since his first publications in French (his first publication in 1946, in German, was his thesis about Augustine’s preaching, re-published in 1973 by the Études augustiniennes). We remember here his heritage and salute the memory of a historian who was in France, with Georges Vajda, (who was born in Budapest) an icon of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ or ‘science of Judaism’,

as well as the man that renovated modern Jewish Studies. The truth is that he has gained followers, and this symposium attests to it quite abundantly. Let the ‘new School’ of the 21st century carry on with the work, enriching our knowledge, and making fruitful the legacy left by this pioneer from Vienna, Bernhard Blumenkranz.
THE EPISTLE OF RABBI SAMUEL DE FEZ, WHAT KIND OF A NEW STRATEGY AGAINST JUDAISM?

Claire Soussen
Université de Cergy-Pontoise

Introduction

The text I want to focus on with this article is not a recently discovered one, it is on the contrary well-known, often referred to but not so frequently quoted. The text is the so-called Epistola Rabbi Samuelis de Fes (quam scripsit ad Rabbi Isaac magistrum Synagogue) supposedly written in the end of the eleventh century. Bernard Blumenkranz himself analyzed it, questioning its veracity, especially its date of composition and its real author. He devoted the better part of his article on Alphonsus Bonihominis in the Encyclopaedia Judaica to the Epistola, as the text was said to be a translation from Arabic to Latin by Frater Alphonsus, a Spanish Dominican in the first part of the fourteenth century. And this, the date of the translation of the opus, and moreover the person of its translator, is precisely one of the numerous reasons why the text is so interesting, raising many questions. It deserves a close analysis and an examination from different points of view. The superposition or confusion of times concerning its redaction and the questions about its authorship make of it a very precious document, and a very rich source of information on the context and more precisely, on the quality of the relations between Jews and Christians at the beginning of the fourteenth century. It also


2 In fact we could state that 3 periods of time are at stake with the Epistola: the supposed time of its composition: the eleventh century, the supposed time of its translation and in fact real composition: the first part of fourteenth century; and the time of its success or dissemination: the second half of the fourteenth and the fifteenth century. About the matter of dissemination, see Ora Limor, art. cit., pp. 177–79, more than 300 copies of the Epistola were produced till the end of the Middle Ages.

Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The historiographical legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz, ed. by Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan, Turnhout, 2015 (RELMIN, 7) pp. 1@1@–1@1@ © BREPOLSPUBLISHERS DOI 10.1484/M.RELMIN-EB.5.108442
informs us, in an indirect way, of the representations that the religious minority and majority had in mind one against the other. Presented as a correspondence between two persons, two Jewish scholars, it opens in fact a window on the whole society of the fourteenth century. If nowadays most scholars think that the text was not written by a Jew, but rather by a Christian apologist, a close analysis of the shape and the content of the document reveal how rich and subtle this opus is and justifies the statement of Preachers of the end of the Middle Ages who consider it as the most effective tool to convert the Jews.

The angle I will adopt to analyze the Epistola is the following: I wonder in what way Rabbi Samuel’s Epistola reflects the new strategy adopted by polemicists against Judaism from the second half of the thirteenth century, and how it renews the genre of medieval polemics.

I. New Polemics, Devices and Methods

Historians have long demonstrated that the art of polemics was renewed during the thirteenth century in different ways. Among them is the importance of language, that is the use of references in Hebrew or at least of quotations from the Old Testament in controversial arguments. Polemicists also insist on the necessity of effectiveness so that the disputes have a favorable result, that is the conversion of the religious adversary. Among the new aspects of Christian polemics, various devices are also used to persuade the Jews, of which we have a perfect example with the so-called Epistola of Rabbi Samuel.

1. A Forgery

Christian polemicists had from the beginning used forgeries in their apologetics against the Jews. The so-called Adversus Iudaeos dialogues were usually inven-

---

3 It is interesting to note that the editor of the text in the Patrologiae Latinae, vol. 149, col. 335–68, reprint of the edition of 1853, introduces Rabbi Samuel as born in Fes and converted to Christianity in 1085 in Toledo.

4 For example, Gui Terré, BnF, MSS lat, 16523, Sequitur aliqua quaestio determinata ab eodem: Utrum principalis articulus fidei nostre, scilicet quod ponit Trinitatem in unitate essencie possit probari contra iudeos per scripturas receptas ab eis? fol. 83r: ‘Et ideo translatio necessaria est ad disputandum cum iudeis [...]

5 For example, at the same period, Nicolas of Lyra, BnF, MSS lat, 3644, Questions disputate per Nicolaum de Lyra contra Hebraeos, fol. 1r: ‘Respondeo hic sunt duo videnda principaliter, primum est que sint scripturae a iudeis recepte, secundum est utrum product per illas scripturas aprobari possint efficaci probatione’.

6 See Ibidem fol. 3r: ‘[…] per eas possimus contra eum efficaciter arguere’.

6 Among an enormous bibliography: Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds, Contra Iudaeos. Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christian and Jews, Tübingen, Mohr, 1996; and more recently Sébastien Morlet, Olivier Munnich and Bernard Pouderon eds, Les dialogues Adversus Judaeos. Permanences et
tions of their Christian authors, even if some specialists may have wondered if they did not reflect real controversies. It may have been the case, at least for the arguments of which we know that they had always been disputed (The Messiah as both God and human, the truth of the Trinity, or the Jews’ unfaithfulness), but the most popular and influential of these texts are carefully-constructed literary works. Our text is not a dialogue but is presented as the translation of an old letter, *Epistola*, by a Moroccan rabbi, Samuel of Fes, to a Jewish authority of his time, Rabbi Isaac of Sijilmasa. The letter is in fact a disguised polemical work. Of particular interest are the multiple devices it uses to persuade the Jews. Its real author is quite surely Alphonsus Bonihominis (Alfonso Buenhombre), who introduces himself as the translator of the opus. Doing so, he proves to be very clever, or at least very tactical and concerned with efficiency. He knows that the classical polemics is not successful, so he uses other ways to make it more convincing. Whereas famous theorists and polemicists of his time produce more classical works, like Ramon Lull with his *Liber de Gentili et tribus sapientibus* or Nicolas of Lyra’s *Questiones disputatae contra Iudaeos*, Alphonsus Bonihominis presents his polemical work in the form of a letter. Doing so he produces a very subtle composition, mixing times and themes. In the different manuscripts or editions of the text the subtitle mentioned is: *Raby Samuelis tractatus indicans errorem judaeorum circa observantiam legis Mosaicae, et venturum Messiahm, quem expectant.* Then comes the following precision about the translator: ‘Reverendo Patre Magistro Alphonso Bonohomine Hispano ordinis predicato. Circa annum 1339 ex Arabico in latinum translatum’.

In the introductory chapter of the letter, Alphonsus introduces himself and his work, elaborating the literary conditions of his composition (or supposed translation): conscious of his weakness he wants to help his order in its task and offers what he can: ‘Libellum hunc antiquissimum, qui nuper devenit ad manus meas et fuit in antea tot temporibus occultatus, nova translatione de Arabico in Latinum’. It should be noted that Alphonsus used the same strategy in another work: he composed an apologetical pro-Christian work that he
pretended was his translation of an exchange of letters between a Jew and a Muslim.\footnote{10}

In this way, Alphonsus creates the conditions to avoid that his readers question the veracity of the text. The argument of the ancientness of the text gives to it a supplement of legitimacy and authority. The fact that it is presented as if it had been occulted may increase the mystery and the desire to read it; and most of all if the Jews wanted to dissimulate the letter, it implies that they considered it as dangerous or convincing, which proves its truth. The argument of ancientness of a text, or of its writing by a Jew, is often used in such demonstrations: in his \textit{Tractatus Venerabilis patris Nicolai de Lyra contra quendam Iudeum,}\footnote{11} Nicolas of Lyra also uses this device to legitimize his work. He says: ‘a certain treatise written by a certain Jew came into my hands.’\footnote{12} And in his \textit{Questiones disputatae}, he justifies an explanation saying: ‘But afterwards, a little book came into my hands, written in Hebrew, the offered a solution to this problem.’\footnote{13} In our case Alphonsus uses both arguments. He pretends the letter has been written: ‘in anno Domini millesimo sed translata de Arabico in Latinum \[\ldots\] anno Domini 1338, tempore pontificatus Domini Benedicti Papae XI\footnote{14}’. We may wonder why the supposed date of the letter is the year 1000. It is hard to believe that the date is chosen by chance. Does it reveal a belief or a representation of the Christians about Jewish millenarianism? Does Alphonsus mix up the Jewish and Christian millenarianism? It may be an answer as the real purpose of the text as we shall see later, is the conviction of the Jews so that they convert to Christianity. The so-called author, Rabbi Samuel of Fes is himself a convert, or is about to convert, and sends a letter to a fellow rabbi, Isaac, considered as an authority of his time, pretending he wants to question him about important matters, but in fact, he exposes the arguments why he is about to convert.\footnote{15}

\footnote{11} \textit{Tractatus Venerabilis patris Nicolai de Lyra contra quendam Iudeum \[\ldots\]}, Anvers, 1614, prologue, colonne 1716.
\footnote{12} ‘quidam tractatus a iudeo quodam confectus venit ad manum meam’ \textit{Ibidem}.
\footnote{13} ‘Sed postea venit ad manum meam quidam libellus hebraice scriptus ubi predicta ratio aliter soluitur’ \textit{Questiones disputatae}, fol. 8r.
\footnote{14} \textit{Alphonsus Bonihominis, Epistola}, ed. Budae, p. 4.
\footnote{15} \textit{Ibidem}: ‘Unde ego particeps doctrinae tuae fieri desiderans, tibi expono exitus cordis mei, super illis quae Legis sunt, et Prophetarum, super quibus anxior cum timore. Quapropter recuro ad abundantem scientiam tuam, et sapientiam et mitto tibi libellum istum sperans per te Deo volente in veritate confirmari ac in dubiis declarari’. 
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2. The Theme of the Language, the Importance of the Context

Besides the date, the language of the text is another important point. Alphonsus pretends he translated the letter from Arabic, and devotes a quite long development in his introductory chapter to that language. I mentioned above that the matter of the language is very important in the art of polemics, because Jewish and Christian scholars disagree about the translation of Scripture. Noticing the wrong translation of one another, they can’t admit the statements and opinions about the quotations of the biblical text and reject their arguments. In our case, Alphonsus uses a device or a bias, pretending the text was written in Arabic. This device is a good reflection of the context as Alphonsus is a Spanish Dominican, pretending he discovered an old text dating from the era of Muslim domination of the Peninsula, when the spoken and written language of the Jews was Arabic. This device allows him to avoid two stumbling blocks: the rejection of his arguments because of a bad translation, and the suspicion about the veracity of the letter. Furthermore he adorns the Arabic language saying that it is the language of the best scholars, that is the most truthful ones and that:

among the Jews, the most famous are the ones that possess the science of Arabic letters, and whereas in ancient times they used them a lot, the modern ones, Jews and Christians, don’t do so (because they don’t know the language), and they only use the Arabic language to expose their secrets, the things they want to occult.16

that is, here, the truth of Christianity. And he adds: ‘I think that this is the reason why, this Jew, the author of that book, a convert, wrote the opus in Arabic and not in Hebrew.’17 What is not so convincing in Alphonsus’ argument is the reason why Rabbi Samuelis chose to keep it secret. Either he was convinced of the Christian truth and he decided to expose it to most of the Jews, or he was not and he would not have said anything. But Alphonsus decides to translate the letter so that most people can have an access to the reasoning. And then we find the old argument about matters of translation as he says that:

I will translate from the Arabic directly from Rabbi Samuel’s text, rather than from saint Jerome translation, so that nobody can tell I add, or suppress or change anything

16 ‘Sciendum quod inter Judaeos multum gloriantur illi, qui Arabicarum litterarum obtinent peritiam. Tum quia illae litterae sunt in antiquorum Philosophorum usu satis copiosae; Tum etiam quia in eis, ut puto, paucis Judaeis paucioribus Christianis, notis scribunt confidentius secreta sua, quae volunt aliis occultare.’ *Ibidem*, p. 2.
17 ‘Qua de causa, ut existimo Judaeus iste, licet cathecumenus, auctor hujus libri, non ipsum Hebraeo sermone, sed in Arabico annotavit’ *Ibidem*. 
in the text [...] so that if the Jews see the both texts, they can notice that the Arabic one and the Latin one don’t differ.\textsuperscript{18}

These special characteristics of the language, the great attention paid to the exact meaning of words and correct translation of sentences, especially from the thirteenth century, and the mixing up of times for the composition of the opus, proof that the Epistola is part of the new polemic.

Another proof of it stands in one theme developed to give force to the controversy: the insistence on the length of the Jewish sufferings.

3. The Length of Jewish Sufferings, a Powerful Argument

This theme in itself is rather classical. It is used by the Jews themselves as a mean of expiation for the rupture of Lord’s covenant. But whereas in the Jewish texts there’s always some hope behind the despair provoked by the sufferings (accentuated since the First Crusade\textsuperscript{19}) (see for example Nachmanides and the Vikuah, studied by Professor Chazan, for whom: ‘(God) will gather the dispersed of Israel to the wilderness of the nations [...]) and will bring Israel to their land, as did Moses [...]\textsuperscript{20}), the Christian scholars present them as endless. This difference of analysis is also classical. But what is new in Alphonsus’ Epistola, is the insistence with which he uses this theme. He insists on it all along the text and when he quits it for a while, then he comes back to it, few chapters later. He begins in the first chapter when he puts into Rabbi Samuel’s mouth the following words:

Our punishment is endless [...] God has been punishing us for more than a thousand years and scattering us through the 4 parts of the world. Then whatever may happen, we are without God, because we have no excuse.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{18} ‘Ego vero in transferendo ipsum auctoritates Bibliorum ab ipso Judaeo inductas, sic scripsi in locis suis in Arabico et Latino, non prout in nostra habentur translatione secundum beatum Hyeronimum sed prout iste Judaeus eas scripsit quando composit istud opus. Et hoc feci, ne aliquid mihi possit imponere, quod in contextu aliquid praesumperim addere, diminuere vel etiam immutare [...] ut etiam iudei, si viderint istum librum in utraque lingua conscriptum, tantum convincantur per eum, si viderent, quod auctoritates in Latino ad hoc descriptae in Arabico non discordarent.’ Ibidem.


\textsuperscript{21} ‘quare ergo nostra poena eset sine termino [...], et nos punivit jam sunt mille anni et ultra et punit et dispersit nos per quatuor partes mundi. Tamen quicquid contingat, Dei sumus in omni eventu, quia nulla est excusatio super dicta’ Epistola, ed. Budae, p. 7.
And farther in the third chapter, quoting Daniel 9, he adds: ‘And this captivity, my lord, is doubtless the one that God, through the Prophet Daniel, calls desolatio as he says in chapter 9: “Our desolatio will last till destruction and end of times”’. Alphonsus compares the captivity of the Hebrews after the destruction of the first temple which lasted 70 years, but had an end, and the one of his fellows of the Middle Ages that has no end, because they know the truth, whereas the Ancients had an excuse, they did not know the truth. In chapter 4, Alphonsus goes on in that way underlining the endlessness of Jewish punishment as he says: ‘God doesn’t forgive us as we are alive, and won’t forgive us when we are dead’. That means that there is absolutely no hope, neither for a close future nor in heaven.

This argument of an impossible redemption after death reveals the true nature of the author, a Christian scholar. Indeed if the Jews often postpone the time of their liberation, they never speak of a time after death, even if otherwise the belief in the Olam Ha-Ba is very important. Jewish scholars can imagine salvation for the following generations, that is a real future, which allows them to hope, in spite of the difficult times. So, the argument of an impossible hope, even for the following generations, is really despairing for Jews and a good angle of approach from Alphonsus. Then chapter 5 explains that the Covenant between God and Abraham has been irremediably broken and that the Jews wait in vain.

4. The Use of Reason

A last point indicating that the Epistola is part of the new polemics is the use of Reason. Since the thirteenth century, the argument of Reason, Ratio, is often used in controversial works, either in Jews’ mouth or in Christians’ one. The goal of polemicists is then to prove their truth in reason. As Ramon Marti wants to demonstrate rationes Christianorum and nequitiae judeorum in his Pugio Fidei, Jewish polemicists also use reason to deny the Christian truth. Among lots of examples we can quote Meir bar Simon’s appeal to reason to criticize the Christian
dogma about Trinity. In the *Epistola*, Alphonsus tries to demonstrate in reason one of the most important dogmas of Christian thought, the ascension of Jesus. He develops his argumentation through Rabbi Samuel. Rabbi Samuel has been convinced by the truth of the dogma and then tries to convince Rabbi Isaac. This is the same device that is used as mentioned above (Alphonsus pretends that a Jew is speaking), but here the interlocking of the reasoning is really striking and admirable. He then uses the usual Jewish responses and contradicts them saying:

If it seems hard to believe that a man with a body went up to heaven, listen to the authorities and examples that we have from our Scriptures. As David the Prophet said: ‘Ascendit Deus in altum et salvabit captivatatem.

and then follow numerous quotations about ascension whose conclusion is that: ‘These authorities convince me that Christ was exalted in his body up to heaven’. Rabbi Samuel goes on saying that even if it is hard to believe, many examples from the Torah or the Prophets prove that God brought up a few holy men into heaven, with their body and soul. Here we have an illustration of the classical debate of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the compatibility between faith and reason. For example, he quotes Moses and says that he no doubt acceded body and soul together, to heaven. To strengthen his reasoning he says that up to his era (the fourteenth century) nobody knows where Moses’ grave is located. That means in Alphonsus’ mind, that there is no grave as God brought Moses up to heaven and kept him with him. But as a scholar of his time, he is aware of the objections that one could oppose to him and especially on a scientific basis. He is preoccupied with very pragmatic considerations as he says:

27 Cf. Robert Chazan, *Fashioning..., op. cit.*, p. 267: ‘With regard to this, there is a true reply grounded in reason. For while you bring a proof from one of the created things that is one and simultaneously three, bring a proof from one of the created things that is one and five or one and ten or even more’.
29 Ibidem, col. 349: ‘Et hoc est propter considerationem nam in lege et in prophetis invenimus quod Deus verus et gloriosus assumpsit de terra et elevavit plures sanctos viros patres nostros et si de istis non dubitamus de ascensione istius iusti in corpore et anima cui magis scriptura perhibet [...]’.
We must not consider that air which is a very light and subtle material cannot carry bodies as big and heavy, because we know that the water which carried the bodies of the sons of Israel as they went out of Egypt, was like air.31

The basic physical argument, which consists in saying that a body can’t be lighter than air and then can’t rise up, is not acceptable and there, the last argument is a matter of faith and miracle. The limits of the use of reason always consist in faith. And finally, Alphonsus/Samuel regrets that the Jewish faith is selective as he says: ‘Therefore, we must believe that the bodies of those saint men did rise up, but we don’t believe that Jesus went to heaven’.32 All these arguments show that Alphonsus Bonihominis is part of the new polemics. In the same time, Alphonsus also practices the traditional ones.

II. The manipulation of traditional polemical themes

1. Jesus as both God and Human

This theme is indeed one of the most frequently disputed between Jews and Christians. Beside the Trinity which is a stumbling block of the controversial debate, the real nature of Jesus is another tough one. For the Jews there is only one God, and he is absolutely not human (even if there are lots of explanations about the creation of the man in the image of God). And linked to that question is the one of the Messiah. For the Jews, the Messiah is human and not divine. For the Christians who consider Jesus as the Messiah, the Messiah on the contrary is both God and human, which the Jews cannot accept. This argument has been disputed for ages and the polemicists always try to renew it. This theme, that is the refusal of the Jews to recognize Jesus as messiah, legitimates the theology of substitution. As the Jews did not accept that the Messiah had come, they prove to be unfaithful to God’s message and no longer deserve to be God’s People. In the Epistola, Alphonsus quotes Zacharia 14. 4, saying that the One evoked must be Jesus, because the Jews deny that God is human, or has a human shape, and still the Vulgate has: ‘Et egredietur Dominus et stabunt pedes eius in die illa super Montem Olivarum [...]’.33 Alphonsus adds through Samuel’s mouth: ‘And we, my friend, don’t say that God in his being and in his nature has either feet or flesh, or whatever evokes the body, now having feet means that the creature is

---

31 ‘Nec nos debemus mirari supra hoc, quod aer iste levis et subtilis posset portare corpora tam grossa et ponderosa, quia nos scimus quod aqua, quae est in raritate similis aeri, quando placuit potentie omnipo- tenti portavit corpora filiorum Israhel in eorum exitu de Aegypto.’ Ibidem, col. 350.
33 Zacharia 14. 3–4, Vulgata edition. The hebrew text also speaks of God.
human.\textsuperscript{34} Which means that the word Dominus in Zacharia designates Jesus as Messiah. He then adds a quotation to Psalm 49, in which the body of an entity is evoked, of which the Jews say that it does not designate God, but the Christians say that it does.\textsuperscript{35} And it is precisely the Nature of Jesus that is argued here, and the subject of corporeal God. We can compare this very mild reference to the Jewish arguments on that matter with the opinions or sentences pronounced by other Jewish polemicists which seem much more violent. For example In his \textit{Milhamot Ha Shem}, Jacob ben Reuben evokes the corporeality of God or precisely of Jesus considered as divine in these terms: ‘Christians’ faith is not true as they say that God who created them is born of a women and was raised in a cradle and accepted to be put on the cross for the salvation of God’s creatures [...]’.\textsuperscript{36} We find the same arguments in Joseph Kimhi’s \textit{Sefer Ha-Berit} as he says ‘For who can believe, that the Holy-One, blessed be he, entered the womb of a woman and took on flesh?’\textsuperscript{37} The Jewish commentators feel some disgust as they think of God’s corporeality. In our case, Alphonsus recalls that the Jews don’t agree with that dogma, but doesn’t quote the exact sentences they formulate. We understand why.

2. The Long List of Jewish Sins and its Consequences: The Rupture of the Covenant

Another theme frequently disputed in the classical polemics consists in a long list of Jewish sins. This theme justifies, as we said, the reprobation of the Jewish People. Alphonsus like lots of other polemicists uses this theme and seeks in the Old Testament the scriptural proofs of the Jewish sins. Parallel to the genealogical succession of important figures of the Jewish People, he stands the list of their sins, even for the most symbolic ones:

Moses also sinned during the episode of the water in the desert and then did not deserve to enter the Promise Land (Nb. 20). Aaron also sinned and wears the weight of the sin. Eli the Priest sinned [...] and his descendants lost the priesthood [...]. Even if a promise is made for ever, the sin breaks the promise, and then the carnal descendant of King David has lost the terrestrial realm.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{34} ‘Et nos domine non dicimus quod Deus in essentia sua et natura habet pedes, nec carnem, nec ista quae corporis sunt, sed habere pedes convenit omni creaturae corporeae’ \textit{Epistola}, PL 149, Chap. 10, col. 384.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibidem}, ‘Dicit etiam David propheta quod supra allegatum est, loquendo de secundo ejus adventu: ‘Ignis in conspectu ejus exardescet et in circuitu ejus inflammabit (Ps XLIX)’. Sed domine non dicimus quod Deus sit circumscriptus, quod aliquid posset esse in circuitu ejus, in quantum Deus’.

\textsuperscript{36} H.Trautner Kromann, \textit{Shield and Sword, Jewish polemics against Christianity and the Christians in Spain and France from 1100–1500}, Tübingen, 1993, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Robert Chazan, \textit{Fashioning Jewish Identity...}, op. cit., p. 256.

\textsuperscript{38} ‘Peccavit enim Moses ad aquas contradictionis et terram promissionis non meruit (Deut. 22). Peccavit ipse Aaron et portavit poenam (Num. 20). Heli sacerdos peccavit [...] et posteritas ejus sacerdotio privata
Here the logic of the reasoning is striking and leads to the only possible conclusion: the end of the Covenant and, once again, the hopelessness of the Jews’ situation:

Whereas God promised Abraham and his descendants the eternal possession of the Land, they lost it several times because of their sins and God gave it back to them until their final sin when they lost it again. A thousand years have passed, and there is no hope to get it back.39

And then in a very subtle way, Alphonsus/Samuel comes back to the present era as he says ‘because we altogether are staying in that sin, for which we lost our land’. It is a way of maintaining the sin through history on the Jewish People and forbidding them to ask for the Promised Land. We see here another mixing up of times, between an ancient past and the real present. The use of the question of sin is very clever because it is completely assumed by the Jews themselves in their theology. Judah ha Levi for example in the eleventh century, turns the argument back in his Sefer Ha Kuzari, and makes of the Jewish sins and the sufferings they bring a kind of condition to prove their being chosen by God. Doing so, he goes very far. Most of the other Jewish scholars use the theme of Jewish sins for ages, in a milder way: they make of it an excuse to accept the idea of exile and diaspora.40 It is then a key of explanation, the only way to accept a tough fate. All themes are linked and open on another classical theme: the substitution of the Jews by the Christians as God’s chosen people.

3. The Theology of Replacement

Supersessionism (or the theology of replacement) is indeed only the logical consequence of the classical statements of Christian polemics. As the Jews were unfaithful, God chose another people, and initiated a new Law. Bernard Oliver in his Contra cecitatem Judeorum in the beginning of the fourteenth century expresses it this way: ‘The authorities of the Old Testament state that the Old Law

---
39  ‘Sicut etiam Deus verus et gloriosus promisit Abrahae et semini suo terram illam in aeternum possidendam, et frequenter perdiderunt eam propter peccata sua et frequenter restituit illis Dominus usque ad ultimam vicem qua perdiderunt. Jam sunt mille anni; et ultra, et jam non est spes recuperandi eam. [...] quia manenus omnes in eodem peccato, propter quod terram nostram perdimus.’ Ibidem.
had to end. He goes on saying that ‘As long as the Law of the Chosen People was effective, the sign by which they distinguished from the others had to last, but once the Law was over, the sign was also’. This argument is developed by all the polemicists, and Alphonsus is not an exception. But once more, what is striking is the tone he uses to make it convincing. He insists on the hate felt by God towards the Jews, as previous polemicists (among them, Bernard Oliver) lay out the substitution as a result for a breaking off a contract (the one of the Covenant). Alphonsus says through Samuel’s mouth: ‘I am afraid, my friend, that God is furious at us and our Law forever’. And then farther: ‘If God rejects us and has no pity for us as it is the case since one thousand years and more, is it worth it for us to have a Law, circumcision and Sabbath?’ Once more the reasoning seems to be very logical. And then Alphonsus quotes Isaiah 26. 3 saying that the prophecy (Vetus error abiit) has come true: ‘What is old, but our Law which was removed with its king, sacrifice, incense and altar?’. And to prove it and support the idea of the new election he says: ‘And those people purified by faith have their fast and the rules of the new Law’. And then Alphonsus/Samuel expresses his anxiety:

I fear, my friend that God rejected us and our sacrifice from him and agreed the sacrifice of the peoples: ‘Then for God the Peoples’ sacrifice is purer than our sacrifice’ [Malachi 1. 10–11].

And quoting the very violent words of Isaiah 1. 15, Alphonsus/Samuel considers that God’s rejection of Israel is permanent: ‘The abomination of our sacrifice to God means nothing but the replacement of our carnal sacrifice by a spiritual one’. Then after having demonstrated Israel’s rejection by God and

---

42 ‘quamdiu lex duravit quod solum uni populo precipiebatur, debuit durare signum quo ille populus ab aliis gentibus distinguebatur et lege cessante eciam signum debuit cessare’ Ibidem, p. 116.
43 ‘Timeo domine mi de lege nostra que furoris iram habet in perpetuum’ Epistola, PL 149, chap. 23, col. 362.
44 ‘Et si Deus proiecit nos et non miseretur nostrui ut experti sumus iam sunt mille anni et ultra, que utilitas est nos habere legem circumciscionem et sabbatum?’ Epistola, PL 149, chap. 15, col. 352.
45 ‘Et quid est antiquum, nisi lex nostra quae recessit a nobis, domine mi, cum rege, cum sacrificio, cum incenso et cum altaribus’ Ibidem.
46 ‘Et ipse gentes purificate per fide habent ieiunia sua et observantias legis nove et habent cuncta.’ Ibidem, PL 149, chap. 18, col. 355.
47 ‘Timeo domine mi quod Deus ecceit nos a se et sacrificium nostrum et acceptavit sacrificium gentium sicut dixit per os Malachie prophete cap. 1: “Non est mihi sacrificium voluntas dicit dominus neque sacrificium vestrum [...]” Ergo apud Deum sacrificium gentium est mundus quam sacrificium nostrum.’ Ibidem, chap. 30, p. 277.
48 Isaïe 1. 15: ‘Si elevatis manus vestras ad mea veniam vultum meum a nobis. Et si multiplicaveritis orationem, non exaudiam quoniam manus vestre plebe sanguine sunt et omni sacrificium vestrum sicut ca dever fidetur [...]’
the fact that it has been lasting for more than a thousand years and that it is to
be lasting forever, a logical conclusion must follow: the necessity for the Jews to
convert. That is what we will examine now.

III. The Epistola, What for?

1. Millenarianism, an Important Issue

Before examining the matter of conversion we must recall few themes, of which
one is very important: millenarianism. The theme of the ‘thousand years’ comes
back very often through Alphonsus/Samuel reasoning. It may reflect a confusion
or mixing up of themes in Alphonsus’ thought, but also the consciousness of the
importance of this theme in Jewish spirituality. What is interesting and amusing
is that Alphonsus confuses the Jewish and Christian computations. He asserts
that Samuel wrote his Epistola after one thousand years of the Christian era,
underlining that the waiting time of Jews for the messiah is over, and nothing has
changed or happened; (which proves that the Jews wait in vain and are wrong)
but the Jews have another system of computation. That system is expressed
by Nachmanides, among others, in his Sefer ha-Ge’ulah analysed by professor
Chazan.50 Quoting Daniel 9. 24–27, so often commented upon by exegetes et
theologians, Nachmanides says that prophecy has not ended and postpones to a
last exile, which has not begun, the building of a third temple; whereas Alphonsus
gives a much more classical explanation of the words ‘Postquam consumatae
fuerunt 62 hebdomadae’ saying:

There is no doubt that the destruction of the eternal desolation means our captivity,
for the past one thousand years. And God said through the prophet’s mouth that
there will be an eternal desolation after the murder of the Christ, as is our desolation
after Jesus was killed.51

We notice here the very different perspective of those explanations: hope in
Nachmanides; despair in Alphonsus. When Alphonsus/Samuel leads back the
Jewish People and makes them consider the end of an era, Nachmanides offers a
future perspective and leads his fellow Jews to that future. He goes even farther
as he quotes Daniel 12. 11–12 and establishes a precise date for the advent of
the Messiah, that is the year 1358. We must recall that Nachmanides writes in

51 ’Et non est dubium, domine mi, quin destructio desolationis perpetuae sit captivitas in qua sumus, jam
sunt mille anni. Et aperte dicit Deus per prophetam quod erit desolatio perpetua post occisionem Christi,
sicut est desolatio nostra postquam Jesus fuit occisus.’ Epistola, Chap. 8, PL 149, col. 344.
the 1270s and that Alphonsus produces his so-called translation in the 1330s. Then the perspective and the hope given by Nachmanides, are still allowed when Alphonsus writes. We can’t imagine that Alphonsus doesn’t know Nachmanides’ works even if he doesn’t have direct access to them. There is a real emulation around these themes and the notions of hope and despair are effective as the question of the perpetuation of the Jewish People is at stake and as the assaults to convert the Jews are more and more insistent. Which leads us to an important question, a question that we can often wonder: who read the Epistola, for whom was it produced? And once again the question of its real author is set up. Written in Arabic or in Hebrew as Alphonsus pretends, it could be intended to a Jewish readership. We know, and I will focus on that theme in a moment, that the matter is more and more sensitive in the first third of the fourteenth century, and that such a correspondence between two scholars was plausible. Written in Latin it couldn’t be intended to a Jewish readership, but to a Christian one, to whom Alphonsus the scholar would like to give the keys to dispute with the Jews. We know examples of that kind with Ramon Marti sixty years before. The form of the exercise would have changed, becoming more subtle, even if Ramon Marti was a very clever and literate polemictist, but the goal would have stayed the same: provide convincing arguments to make effective polemics.

2. What about Conversion?

Conversion is precisely at stake around the Epistola, in the context of fourteenth-century Dominican apologetics. The so-called letter is part of a group of texts produced during the same era, of different forms and genres, but whose goal is to convince the Jews to convert. As Ramon Marti expresses it in his Pugio Fidei, he works for his brothers, to give them some arguments in their task of missionizing towards the Jews. It is clear when one reads the Pugio that the treaty could not be handled by an average Preacher and even by an average Jew who couldn’t argue on the basis of Ramon. However, even if those texts and arguments couldn’t be

52 Jaume Riera i Sans, « Literatura antijueva en Català ... » op. cit., p. 215 also raises that question. The very few Latin manuscripts of the opus indicate that the readers were not numerous. The later translation in Catalan has the reading of the opus increased.
53 Jaume Riera i Sans, « Literatura antijueva en Català ... » op. cit., p. 217 explains that this is much more the case around the 1400s’ and thinks, with other scholars, that the opus must have been translated from Latin to Catalan in the end of the fourteenth century. Preachers of that time considered that the Epistola was the most useful text to convince the Jews because it was not too complicated. At that time, people were familiar with the themes of conversion because of the Friars’ preaching and then they were very receptive to that kind of polemics.
55 Ora Limor, art. cit., pp. 193–94 explains that the copies of the Epistola are often preserved in manuscripts possessed by monasteries or Preachers’ convents. The goal of such an opus was predication and
really used in the everyday life of the controversy, it shows that the atmosphere had changed and that there was emulation around the idea of conversion. And we know precisely that since the Barcelona disputation in 1263, the Preachers had obtained from King James the 1st the right to preach in the synagogues and that there were free disputations organized by clerics, in towns or elsewhere.56 And we also know that some Jews did convert, even before the pressure of the years 1348 and 1391. I already said that the Jewish polemics reflects the higher pressure felt by the Jews and that a scholar like Meir ben Reuben clearly writes to prevent his coreligionists from the will to convert.57

The theme of conversion is present by two means in the Epistola: an implicit one, as Rabbi Samuel suggests that the Christians are right and that the Jewish scriptures demonstrate that the Christians are the new Chosen People. It is also present explicitly in the 19th chapter whose title is De electione Apostolorum loco Prophetarum, as Alphonsus/Samuel comments Malachie 3. 6: ‘Et convertet cor patrum ad filios et cor filiorum ad patres [...]’ saying:

As, my friend, our sons came before us to God’s faith, if our hearts converted to them, their hearts would convert to us. And as God said ‘There will be one people and one God’ then we mustn’t understand another conversion than from unfaithfulness to the faith and teaching of the one who is the master of salvation of those who believe in him.58

The reasoning is quite complex, but farther, Alphonsus is more direct:

But those faithful sons, sent through the whole world stood in front of God instead of us after God killed Israel and our name, and thanks to them, the first Law is renewed in accordance with Melchisedech who changed the sacrifice for God to bread and wine.59

---

57 Cf. Robert Chazan, Fashioning Jewish Identity...op. cit., p. 344, quoting Meir de Narbone: ‘Now it is known to every sage of intelligence and understanding who might wish to join in teachings and faith with another or with others who are not of his belief and faith must surely investigate [...] If he sees that his behavior is better than their behavior, he will not change good for bad.’
58 ‘Cum ergo, domine mi, filii nostri venerunt ante quem nos ad fudem Dei, si corda nostra convertentur ad filios, corda eorum convertentur ad nos. Et sicut dicit Deus altissimus “Erunt populus unus, animus unus in deo glorioso et victorioso” quia non debemus intelligere illam conversionem, nisi de infidelitate ad fudem et doctrinam illius iusti qui est magister salutis eorum qui credunt in eo [...]’
59 Sed isti fideles filii sic proiecti vel missi per universum mundum, surrexerunt coram deo loco nostri, postquam Deus occidit Israel et nomen nostrum [...] et per istos innovata est lex prima secundum ordinem Melchisedech qui sacrificium deo instituit in pane et vino. Epistola, PL 149, Chap. 19, col. 357.
The sentence is very clear, the conversion is from the Old Law to the New Law, and after a long demonstration, it seems to be the only possible issue.

**Conclusion**

All these elements show that the *Epistola* is fully part of the polemics of the fourteenth century. Alphonsus/Samuel writes to persuade the Jews to convert, using a device to be more convincing: he pretends that the author is a Jew. But the themes he uses, his tone, his appeal to Reason contradict the story he tells about the context of the letter. On the contrary, the immediate context of Spain in the fourteenth century perfectly fits with the opus. The Preachers’ mission and the growing pressure on the Jewish communities are well reflected, even if in an indirect way, through the *Epistola*. We could have developed the demonstration from the themes that the opus doesn’t mention, the main themes of the Christian dogma, to show that Alphonsus, a Preacher preoccupied with efficiency, is its real author. Indeed, the traditional polemics that used to handle these themes to persuade the Jews never succeeded. It is a distinctive point of the new polemics to adapt to its audience, to speak to the Jews from a Jewish point of view, without using the arguments of the *Christianæ Veritæ*, to which the Jews have always been hermetic. By contrast the Jews should have been receptive to the discourse about fate and redemption at a time when their present and future looked increasingly bleak. That is precisely what was at stake in Rabbi Samuel’s/Alphonsus Bonihominis’ *Epistola*. 
III

ART AND MATERIAL CULTURE
In an important series of art historical studies, Bernhard Blumenkranz raised awareness of not only the sheer scale of late medieval anti-Jewish image-making, but also its extraordinary variety and artistic inventiveness, especially in French and English manuscript illumination.1 Working within the analytical framework of the Jewish – Christian debate, Blumenkranz produced insightful interpretations of medieval images that reached beyond their more obvious defamatory functions to elucidate relationships between visual and literary cultures, especially between negative imagery and polemical texts; and he further situated images in their broad social and political contexts in relation to conversion activities, money-lending, sartorial laws, and the expulsions of 1290 and 1306. More recent art historical treatments of late medieval representations of Jews in Northern European art, even if not explicitly grounded in Blumenkranz’s insights, can nevertheless be linked to them retrospectively as expanded investigations of some of the themes he pioneered.2 In the footsteps of Bernhard Blumenkranz, beyond

---


their attention to certain pictorial themes, such studies share a concern with the ways anti-Jewish works of art helped to shape the very social and religious ideologies that gave rise to their creation.

One of Blumenkranz’s art specific historical goals was to account for the virulence of late medieval Christian representations of Jews by recognizing their function as active ‘agents of hate’, and sometimes as the only witness to certain negative themes and ideas. The depiction of the mocking and flagellation of Christ included in the fourteenth-century English *Holkham Bible* epitomizes one of the more ubiquitous types of Passion image that Blumenkranz interrogated, in which figures of Jewish attackers are sharply differentiated from the victimized figure of Christ through their relative size, positioning, costume, grotesque physiognomy, and aggressive gestures and behaviours (Fig. 1). Although contemporary costume details that connect these figures to Jews still living in Western Europe ensure that such images are clearly defamatory, more recent critics have called attention to their devotional significance in order to suggest that they fulfilled more than just a single and universally negative social function.

One of the distinguishing features of Bernhard Blumenkranz’s art historical scholarship was its wide investigative scope, borne of a willingness to examine not only the more obviously pejorative images but also other, less familiar ones that communicate quite complex relationships between Christianity and Judaism. One such image that caught the scholar’s attention is an especially inventive marginal illumination found in the early fifteenth-century *Rohan Hours* (Fig. 2). It depicts the infant Christ, identifiable by his cruciform halo, strapped to a large, closed book before a praying female figure whose identity is complicated by the accompanying text: ‘That Maria [Miriam] cries when she sees her brother Moses discovered in the water signifies *Synagoga* who cries for Jesus Christ when she sees [him] in the world revealed in his divinity.’

---

3 ‘…cette œuvre n’est pas seulement témoin de la haine antijuive; nous voyons ici comment l’œuvre d’art peut être par elle-même un facteur de haine’ (Blumenkranz, *Juíf medieval*, p. 115).


6 *Paris*, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS lat. 9471 (*Paris*, c. 1416). The marginal cycle was apparently copied from a fourteenth-century Italian moralized bible identifiable today as *Paris*, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS fr. 9561, thought to have been commissioned by the Duchess Yolande of Anjou, either for her nephew Charles, Dauphin of France (crowned Charles VII in 1429) or her son, Duke Louis III. See Millard Meiss, *The Rohan Master: A Book of Hours* (*New York*: Braziller, 1973), pp. 13–14 and pp. 21–22. Regrettably, Meiss did not reproduce or discuss this fascinating marginal image (fol. 113).

7 ‘Ce que marie pleure pour ce qu’elle voit son frère moyse en l’eau decouvert senefie la synagogue qui pleure pour lhesuscrist qu’elle voit au monde decouvert en la divinite’ (lat. 9471, fol. 133). The reference to Moses is based on Exodus 2:1–10.
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Of this text, Blumenkranz observed that there is no correspondence between the two types of weeping because while Miriam cries tears of joy, Synagoga cries tears of sorrow. He further observed the disjunction between the text and the image: rather than represent the two female figures identified in the text – Maria [Miriam] and Synagoga –,8 the artist has depicted just one woman, and she is not weeping but rather holds her hands in a gesture of prayer. I suggest this gesture allows the figure to incorporate an additional, unscripted identity as the Virgin Mary, and that the choice of the name, ‘Maria’ rather than ‘Miriam’ prompts the reader-viewer to contemplate the typological relationship between these two women.9

8 Elsewhere in the Rohan Hours (fols 228r, 228v), a bare-chested Synagoga holding a scorpion banner is the main iconographical subject. See Bernhard Blumenkranz, ‘La représentation de Synagoga dans les Bibles moralisées françaises du XIIIe siècle’, in Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Jerusalem), 5 (1970), 70–91 (p. 86) and pl. VIII.1–2.
A Marian dimension of the figure is also justified in light of the Rohan Hours’ close relationship to the thirteenth-century Bible moralisée iconographical tradition. In the Vienna Bible, a very similar text accompanies a pair of images, both enclosed in medallions, which together present a variant response to it. In the first image, Pharaoh’s sister finds the baby Moses in the bulrushes while Miriam watches and in the second, the allegorical female figure of Synagoga unbinds the Christ child from the book before a group of hat-wearing Jews – one holding a moneybag – ; and a crowned Virgin Mary. Unlike the corresponding Rohan Hours text, the Bible moralisée passage includes a reference to Holy

---

10 On anti-Jewish imagery in the Bibles moralisées, see Blumenkranz, ‘Représentation de Synagoga’; and Lipton, Images of Intolerance.
Church (sainte eglise) that presumably prompted the artist’s inclusion of Mary in her allegorical guise as Ecclesia, signified by her crown.11

In his own analysis of the Rohan Hours image, Blumenkranz was most concerned with its central message of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. He identified the book into which the haloed Christ child is strapped as the Old Testament, which medievals believed was a book in which ‘every page, every sentence announces Christ’.12 And yet the pictured book, like the praying female figure, has a double identity in that it can be seen to represent both the Old Testament and the New. That is, from a typological perspective, the Christ child is emerging from the Old Testament, but he is also emerging from the Gospels: the Word is made flesh. In whatever manner its iconographical complexities are resolved, it is clear that the image’s devotional power lies not in its use of crude pictorial stereotypes, and least of all does it function as an ‘agent of hate’. As a visual explication of the proper place of Judaism in a Christian worldview, it juxtaposes and merges, rather than opposes and alienates, the signs of both religions. With a composition oriented around a prominent book painted inside a real one, the image ultimately transcends its accompanying text to encourage contemplation of the emergence of Christ the Word of God as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy signified by the continuation of one book by another. This visual message challenges the theme of redundancy adapted in the accompanying text from the Bible moralisée tradition by laying emphasis on continuity, rather than antagonism, between Christianity and Judaism.

Bernhard Blumenkranz closed the image survey in his major study, Le juif médiéval au miroir de l’art chrétien, with a brief description of another fascinating and highly unusual depiction of the Supper at Emmaus included in the English Saint Louis Psalter, a manuscript notable for its perceived status as a relic of Saint Louis.13 This image and its accompanying narrative representations of the Noli

---

11 See for example the Vienna Bible (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Codex Vindobonensis 2544), fol. 16V-a; reproduced in Gerald Guest, Bible moralisée (London: Harvey Miller, 1995) (facsimile); text translated on p. 70. Although Synagoga is depicted in the image, she is not mentioned in the accompanying text, which has a somewhat different emphasis than in the Rohan Hours: ‘That Pharaoh’s daughter saw Moses in the water and had him brought in signifies the Holy Church who saw Jesus Christ in the world, small and uncovered, and commanded that he be brought forth and revealed in his divinity’ (trans. Guest, Bible moralisée, p. 70). See also Sara Lipton, ‘The Temple is My Body: Gender, Carnality, and Synagoga in the Bible moralisée’, in Imagining the Self, Imagining the Other: Visual Representation and Jewish-Christian Dynamics in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 119–54. On other pictorial contexts for Mary’s guise as Ecclesia, see below.

12 ‘…c’est un important principe de l’exégèse scripturaire chrétienne que notre artiste exprime ici: ce livre n’est autre que l’Ancien Testament dont, selon la doctrine chrétienne, toute page, toute phrase annoncent le Christ’ (Blumenkranz, Juif médiéval, pp. 57–58).

me tangere and the Doubting of Thomas all have in common the theme of post-
resurrection recognition of Jesus (Fig. 3). The visual novelty in the Supper at
Emmaus image is that not only the two disciples but also Jesus himself wear the
Jewish hats that function as pejorative attributes in so many other Christian pic-
torial contexts. But in Jesus’s case, divine identity trumps negative sign: if Jesus
is wearing it, then it cannot be a bad hat; on the contrary, the hat participates in
the sanctity signified by the halo that surrounds it. But the hat is still a Jewish hat
and thus a reminder to Christian reader-viewers of the Saint Louis Psalter that
Jesus Christ was not only God – he was also a Jew.

The theme of the Jewishness of Jesus introduced by Bernhard Blumenkranz in
connection with this image is the one I would like to pursue in what follows with
specific reference to late medieval English works of art. In the background of my
discussion lies the 1290 expulsion of the Jews from England, but for a different
reason than that articulated by Blumenkranz in his examinations of pejorative
imagery. While Blumenkranz looked to the Western European expulsions and
tensions leading up to them as driving forces behind anti-Jewish image-making,
I would like to explore what cultural purposes Christian artistic representations
of the Jewishness of Jesus served in a post-expulsion England. A theoretical ap-
proach of potential value for addressing this question, as developed mainly by
literary critics, is constructed around the concept of the ‘virtual Jew’ in late medi-
evial England. Discussions of the ‘virtual Jew’ attempt to uncover the reasons for
continued anti-Jewish image-making in an England without Jews, who although
legally absent may be seen as ‘virtually’ or conceptually present. Towards the end
of this essay, I shall consider the explanatory value of this theory in relation to my
own analysis of a rather different type of imagery than that normally considered
in this connection.

Another departure from traditional art historical examinations of the role
of works of art in shaping Christian–Jewish relations and their aftermath in
England is my focus not on images of the adult Christ, but rather on scenes of
his childhood, on the assumption that circulating ideas about Jesus’s family and

---

14 For an excellent discussion of Jewish hats in medieval art, see Lipton, Images of Intolerance, pp. 15–19.
15 The Jewishness of Jesus, examined from both Christian and Jewish perspectives, is an expanding theme
17 The concept is succinctly explained in Krummel, Crafting Jewishness, pp. 6–7.
community relationships are fundamental to discussions of contemporary perceptions of his Jewishness. Representations of Jesus’s childhood are relatively rare, but they provide fuller understanding of the variety of types of image-making
that may be brought to bear in investigations of Jewish-Christian relations in post-expulsion England. I will focus my analysis on one of the best-preserved series of scenes of his childhood, the fourteenth-century English Tring tiles (Figs. 4, 5, 9, 13–17), which I will consider in relation to other thematically-related contemporary works of art and literature, such as the Holkham Bible, that foreground the theme of Jesus’s connections to his Jewish family and the wider Jewish community.

In what follows, I hope to advance a three-part argument. First and most importantly, I suggest that by developing visual ways of emphasizing that Jesus was a Jew, medieval artists helped negotiate the complex relationship between Christianity and Judaism. A more specific Christian agenda in which I believe such imagery participated was the affirmation of Jesus’s genealogical descent from the Tribe of David, in order to uphold claims that he was the true Messiah against Jewish counterclaims that he was not. In the third and most controversial part of my argument, I suggest that the images of a Jewish Jesus on the Tring tiles were a complex, visual response to acts of ritual murder supposedly being carried out by fourteenth-century Jews elsewhere in Europe.

***

Like the Holkham Bible, the Tring tiles were produced in England around 1330, forty years after the Jews had been expelled by King Edward I. From an originally larger series, they survive as ten tiles containing a total of nineteen scenes, plus three fragments. Their original patron and location are unknown. The ten complete tiles and two of the three fragments are currently on display in London.

---


museums, eight tiles in the British Museum, and the remaining two tiles and two fragments in the Victoria & Albert Museum. Because all of the tiles and two of the three fragments share a connection with Tring in Hertfordshire, it has been proposed that the original series decorated the parish church here, although there is no firm evidence for this. Recently, however, this theory has been challenged by Mary Casey, who relocates the tiles to Ashridge College, a no longer extant monastery three and a half miles east of Tring founded by Edmund, Earl of Cornwall and nephew of Henry III for the order of the Bonhommes (associated with the Augustinians) in 1283. Because Ashridge, which was considered a royal foundation, housed a vial of the Holy Blood and the heart of Thomas of Cantilupe and was therefore an important pilgrimage destination, Casey argues that the imagery on the tiles was aimed at pilgrims wanting to know more about Christ’s life and childhood. Owing to lack of evidence and some problematical analytical assumptions, however (such as that the subject matter of the tiles was too offensive for a parish church), I do not find this argument persuasive. Indeed, one might sooner question the suitability of infancy imagery at a pilgrimage site, a type of place normally decorated with paintings and other artworks designed to order the pilgrim’s experience through evocation of the resident saint or the Eucharist. It is also normally the case that works of art commissioned for a royal foundation were considerably more luxurious than relatively inexpensive and humble tiles. Therefore, I believe much more evidence will be needed to dislodge the tiles from their assumed original display in Tring parish church.

20 Description and digitised images of the complete set of eight tiles are available on the British Museum website: http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/pe_mla/t/the_tring_tiles.aspx (accessed 11 April 2014) and in Robinson, Masterpieces, pp. 118–19. The British Museum also houses a fragment (inv. 1316) not on display that depicts the head of Jesus; see the line drawing in Eames, Catalogue, vol. ii, pl. II (design 30).


22 The British Museum tiles were bought at a ‘curiosity shop’ in Tring between 1843 and 1877 by Revd E. Owen, after which they passed into the collection of his son, Revd J. R. B. Owen. They were then sold at Sotheby’s to the British Museum on 1 March 1912 (Alexander and Binski, Age of Chivalry, p. 284). The British Museum fragment was found in excavations near Luton (Bedfordshire). The two V&A tiles were obtained from a woman in Exeter who purchased them in 1881–82 having been told that they had come from a church in Tring during renovations there, and the two V&A fragments were found in rubble in Tring, one in an old wall and the other in a garden path (Casey, ‘Fourteenth-Century Tring Tiles’, p. 7).

23 The earliest part of the parish church of St Peter and St Paul in Tring is the chancel with a thirteenth-century lancet window in the north wall. Most of the rest is fifteenth- and sixteenth-century, except the tower whose arch to the nave is early fourteenth-century. The building was extensively restored from 1861–82 [Nikolaus Pevsner, Hertfordshire, 2nd ed., rev. by Bridget Cherry [London: Yale University Press, 2002], pp. 367–68].

Wherever they were originally installed, lack of signs of wear suggests the tiles were displayed on a wall rather than used to pave a floor, giving rise to the supposition that they originally functioned as mural decoration. They are rendered in an etched technique unusual for tiles of this period, known as sgraffiato, which produces a lively, three-dimensional effect. When fired, white figures turn yellow, a colour incidentally appropriate for the representation of Jewish figures, given the long historical use of yellow in stereotyped representations. Because they form a nearly coherent narrative series, I shall confine my remarks to the eight complete tiles housed in the British Museum that are currently displayed together on a wall in imitation of their proposed original disposition.

In view of the adult Jesus’s reputation as loving and merciful, the lively scenes from his boyhood depicted on the Tring tiles will surprise the uninitiated. On the first two tiles, for example, little Jesus murders two of his playmates for annoying him (Figs. 4, 5). In the second scene on the first tile, he begrudgingly revives the first one, whom he had killed for disturbing his playing pools, only when implored to do so by his mother, Mary (Fig. 4). On the second tile, Jesus kills a boy who playfully jumped on his back, and then revives him only after the boy’s parents complain to Joseph (Fig. 5). These and most of the other episodes on the tiles do not represent especially inspiring moments in Jesus’s early life. Given their emphasis on members of his Jewish community, however, they are of great interest as conveyors of doctrinal and social meanings relevant to fourteenth-century English Christian viewers aiming to find a conceptual place for the Jews no longer living among them.

To find out what a late medieval Christian audience understood about Jesus’s childhood, one must look beyond the Bible. The four evangelists have nothing to say about Jesus between the Flight into Egypt, while he was still an infant (Matthew 2:13–23), and his sudden appearance at age twelve in the Temple (Luke 2:41–52). From a Jewish life-cycle perspective, this leaves a narrative gap in Jesus’s biography between the ritual stages of circumcision and social maturity. Apocryphal stories transmitted orally, pictorially, and in various literary forms, helped to fill this gap. The ones that informed the Tring tiles may be traced to the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew and the Arabic Infancy Gospels, which were popularized in other works of art, exempla, sermons, and vernacular plays,

25 On this technique, see Eames, Catalogue, pp. 56–58.
26 As discussed in Mellinkoff, Outcasts, I, pp. 35–46.
28 The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew is an eighth- or ninth-century compilation of stories about Jesus’s childhood drawn from the Gospel of Thomas (2nd c.) and about the life of the Virgin Mary (from her own conception through the birth of Jesus) from the Protoevangelium of James (2nd c.). English translations of the Gospel of Thomas and the Protoevangelium of James, as well as excerpts from the
Fig. 4 Jesus makes pools and kills the boy who disturbs them / Mary persuades Jesus to revive the boy, Tring tile (1). England, c. 1330. London, British Museum. Photograph: © The Trustees of The British Museum

Fig. 5 A boy jumps Jesus at school and Jesus kills him / Parents complain to Joseph and Jesus revives the boy, Tring tile (2). England, c. 1330. London, British Museum. Photograph: © The Trustees of The British Museum

especially in England. That the stories were very well known by the fourteenth century is attested by the lack of inscriptions on the tiles, and that they circulated mainly in England is suggested by the fact that most of the major pictorial cycles, including the Tring tiles, were produced here. One of these cycles with short text descriptions is found in the Holkham Bible, mentioned already in connection with pejorative Passion imagery, and there are a few shorter cycles lacking either text or inscriptions included in other illuminated manuscripts of this same period, especially Books of Hours.

Of central importance for reconstructing the missing scenes on the Tring tiles is an English manuscript that contains the most complete pictorial cycle of the apocryphal infancy stories extant. Known as the Selden manuscript, it is dated c. 1315–25 and contains sixty miniatures that accompany an Anglo-Norman poetical version of the infancy stories known as the Les Enfaunces de Jesu Crist. The manuscript also includes a fully illustrated apocalypse, so that together, the two cycles present the first and last of Jesus’s earthly manifestations. It has been


argued that although the Selden manuscript’s pictorial cycle is closely related to the Tring tiles, it could not have been the model because some of the scenes on the tiles do not appear in the manuscript.33

Of particular relevance to the present discussion is the fact that the text in the Selden manuscript is closely related to a mid-thirteenth-century Old French poem known as the Evangile de l’enfance, which expresses what has been described as ‘an ancient, ignorant, un-reasoned, almost visceral dislike of the Jews’.34 The anti-Jewish character of the poem is indeed very prominent. Throughout, Jews are frequently referred to as plains de felonnie, and li fel Juif, among other negative ways. According to the poet, the Jews and Jesus hate each other. At an especially low moment, a hostile Jew is made to shout:

Vivre ne devroit o nous chi,
Ains le doit on crucifier
Pendre ou ardoir ou escorchier,
Car il confront toutes nos loys;
Je veul gue il soit mis en crois. (lines 1232–6)
[He should not live with us here,
But we should crucify him
Hang him or burn him or skin him
Because he is destroying all our laws;
I want him to be put on a cross.]

The poet then explains:

Che fu la premier racine
Dont Dieu out des Juïs haïne. (lines 1237–8)
[This was the first root [cause]
Why God had hatred for the Jews.]35

Although the Jewish characters in the Evangile have been interpreted as ‘generic bad guys’ rather than expressive of a current hatred of contemporary Jews,36 as we shall see presently, there are reasons to question this assumption in light of the ways some of the stories were visually glossed by contemporary artists.

In general, the tales of Jesus’s extraordinary childhood helped satisfy the curiosity of the faithful, and presumably enriched their devotions with a greater appreciation of how the holy child was nurtured and raised by his parents, Mary

34 Vitz, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 128.
35 Quoted and translated in Vitz, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 128. See also Smith, Art, Identity and Devotion, p. 279.
and Joseph. Given Jesus’s ‘superboy’ powers, manifest in his ability to raise his playmates from the dead, as described above, and to work other types of miracles, it has been suggested that the stories especially appealed to children. But the stories also served important theological agendas, one of which was to affirm Christ’s full humanity: it is as though the storytellers imagined how a child with supernatural powers might have behaved and constructed their tales accordingly. In light of protracted and vigorous Christian debates over the relationship between Christ’s humanity and divinity, stories of a miracle-working yet petulant and childish little Jesus neatly affirmed his full humanity, omniscience, and omnipotence.

By emphasising his filial relationships to Mary and Joseph, the stories also implicitly affirmed Christ’s genealogical descent from David as foretold by the Hebrew prophets. This is important because the genealogical ‘proof’ that Jesus was the messiah was complicated by Christian insistence that he was born via supernatural agency, without a human father. This difficulty was recognised but not resolved by either Matthew or Luke in their respective and radically different gospels genealogies, in that both allowed that Joseph was Jesus’s biological father, even though Christians believed that Jesus was born of a virgin who conceived not by a man, but by the Holy Spirit. In spite of the fact that tracing genealogy through the mother was not normal in Judaism, one Christian strategy was to claim that Mary was descended from David, which in turn sanctioned her son, Jesus, as the messiah.

Highlighting Mary’s genealogical position with respect to David would therefore appear to be an essential function of the iconographical motif of the Tree of Jesse. A simultaneously biological and metaphorical image, the Tree of Jesse is a visual response to Isaiah 11:1: ‘And there shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root’. Typical examples show Jesse asleep at the bottom of a tree with the tree’s trunk emerging upwards from the centre of his body. Situated one above the other on the tree’s trunk and symmetrically

39 According to the Baba Bathra (109B), which is the longest tractate in the Talmud, the family of the father, but not the family of the mother, is regarded as the proper family (Brown, Birth of the Messiah, p. 89).
40 The seminal study is Arthur Watson, The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914).
on the side branches are Christ’s ancestors, including King David, and various prophets, culminating at the top of the tree with Christ himself – the Christian interpretation of Isaiah’s ‘flower’ – or with the Virgin Mary holding the Christ child. The importance of the Tree of Jesse as an economical, organic expression of Christ’s biological and messianic legitimacy explains why it appears so often and in a variety of artistic media from the late eleventh century onwards. It was an especially popular inclusion in English illuminated psalters, where it operates additionally as a conceptual link between the Old and New Testaments that helped to justify a christological interpretation of the Psalms. It was even translated into dramatic performance in the ‘Root of Jesse’ play included in the late fifteenth-century English N-Town cycle.41 That the other plays in the N-Town cycle incorporate much of the apocryphal material as well as numerous references to both Joseph’s and Mary’s Davidic origins supports the hypothesis that the Jesse play, situated chronologically between ‘The Play of Moses’ and ‘The Mary Play’, was included not only to bridge the Old and New Testament episodes but also to underscore Jesus’s messianic legitimacy before a popular audience.

Much more frequently, however, the ancestors of the Holy Family were represented pictorially. The constructed genealogies of Mary and Joseph, respectively, are given full-page treatment in two sequential tree diagrams included in the Holkham Bible. The first is a Tree of Jesse, positioned in the manuscript immediately after the story and image of Noah’s drunkenness. A traditional selection of figures representing prophets and ancestors are symmetrically arranged among branches emerging upward like a tree grows, reaching from the belly of the prone, sleeping Jesse at the bottom to Mary at the top by way of a harp-playing King David, with whom Mary makes direct eye contact (Fig. 6). Mary does not hold the Christ child in her arms but rather holds her hands in prayer. The Marian emphasis is further underscored by the seated figure of Matthew, who has written on his scroll, ‘How St Matthew was the first to speak of the lineage and the generation of generations and the Tree of Jesse, which was the lineage of Our

41 The origins of the N-Town plays are uncertain but they are thought to have been compiled and performed in East Anglia. See ‘Root of Jesse’ in The N-Town Plays, ed. by Douglas Sugano (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007), pp. 69–73. See also Alan H. Nelson, ‘Some Configurations of Staging in Medieval English Drama’, in Medieval English Drama: Essays Critical and Contextual, ed. by Jerome Taylor and Alan H. Nelson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 116–47, especially pp. 131–47. There are no surviving stage directions or other evidence for staging the Root of Jesse play, but based on the pictorial examples, I can imagine positioned behind a life-sized painted facade of a tree with symmetrical branches a scaffold with multiple platforms at different levels on which players stood to create a ‘speaking image’. Since the actor playing Jesse (Radix Jesse) has a speaking part (lines 17–25), I imagine him centrally positioned at the base of the façade, lying on his side and facing the audience.
Lady Mary’.42 This statement is repeated in the inscription below the image.43 Just above the sleeping Jesse, on the right, hovers the horned Moses holding the twin tablets of the Law, a figure usually – if erroneously – considered a benign or even positive image in medieval Christian art.44 In this case, given the unusually pronounced anti-Jewish character of the Holkham Bible imagery, I believe that this particular horned Moses, holding and gesturing towards the dark and empty twin tablets of the Law, anticipates the Jewish violence so graphically illustrated and described in the Passion scenes depicted on subsequent folios.45

Having secured for the reader-viewer Mary’s connection to David on the Tree of Jesse, the next folio of the Holkham Bible presents a second genealogical tree that faithfully traces the Davidic lineage of Joseph according to the Gospel of Matthew (1:1–16) (Fig. 7). Unlike the Jesse tree, Matthew’s genealogy begins with Abraham, who in the Holkham image appears twice, at the tree’s root and again at the top left.46 Also distinct from the Tree of Jesse, the sequence of figures must be read from the top down and from left to right in order to replicate Matthew’s sequence. Like Mary’s lineage on the Tree of Jesse, Joseph’s passes through King David, who on this second tree is depicted in the middle row (second from the left) as a crowned head staring directly at Jesse to his immediate left. Joseph himself sits at the base of the tree on the right, pointing to a scroll that identifies him as the spouse of the Virgin Mary (Ioseph espoux de la pucelle vierge Marie). Taken together, the two genealogical trees in the Holkham Bible show the reader-viewer that with David as their common ancestor, Mary and Joseph are actually related to each other, which means that even if Joseph were the biological father of Jesus, the latter’s Davidic origins are secure, and thus his identity as the Messiah is confirmed. The manuscript’s imagery continues with portraits of the remaining three evangelists (Mark, Luke, John), Christ’s argument with Satan concerning the fate of souls, and scenes from the life of Christ, beginning with the Annunciation.47 As we shall see presently, the Holkham Bible’s incorporation of several scenes based

42 ‘Coment seyn matheu estoyt le primer que parla de la lineye e generacion de la generacionis e la racine iessé que estoyt de liniage nostre dame marie’ (Add. 47682, fol. 10).
43 ‘Comme[n]t saint mathieu fut le premier qui parla de la lignee et generatio de la rassine iesse qui est le linage nostre da[m]e marie’ (Add. 47682, fol. 10).
45 The virulently anti-Jewish nature of this manuscript’s imagery has not yet received the attention it deserves. I simply note here that images of grotesque Jews beating Christ (Add. 47682, fol. 19v, upper register [see Fig. 1]; fol. 10v, lower register) and driving nails into him on the cross (fol. 31v), among others, fully exemplify Blumenkrantz’s ‘agents of hate’. For reproductions, see Brown, Holkham Bible.
46 Matthew 1:1–16. The tree is misleadingly identified as a ‘Second Jesse Tree’ (Brown, Holkham Bible, p. 42) even though it lacks the defining figure of Jesse asleep at the root. The inscription to the left of the reclining Abraham reads, ‘Abraham qui est le premier de la geneal[e]gie’ (Add. 47682, fol. 10v).
47 Add. 47862, fols 11r–11v. See Brown, Holkham Bible, pp. 43–44.
on the apocryphal infancy stories places additional emphasis on Jesus’s Jewish family and community relationships.

Christ’s genealogy, sometimes with specific reference to the Tree of Jesse, was in turn of polemical value in the Jewish-Christian debate. Christians used it as a defense against Jewish counterclaims recorded in both Christian and rabbinic sources that Jesus was not the messiah but rather the illegitimate son of the adulteress, Miriam (identified with Mary), and a Roman soldier named Panthera. The polemical Toledot Yeshu (The Life Story of Jesus), widely disseminated during the Middle Ages and the major source of Jewish knowledge about Jesus, had a similar aim of discrediting Jesus’s messianic claims. According to this version of the story, Mary became pregnant with Jesus (Yeshu) after she was tricked into sexual relations with a neighbour, Joseph Pandera, when he pretended to be her husband. That Christian authorities from Origen to Martin Luther felt compelled to reaffirm Christ’s descent from the tribe of David via Mary and continued to finesse Joseph’s ambiguous biological status suggests that the Christian genealogical argument, both written and pictorial, remained unpersuasive. Outwith the official debates, the apocryphal infancy stories explained and emphasised Jesus’s family relationships to a broad Christian audience, but they did so in ways that arguably confounded rather than clarified the essential doctrinal issues. Analysis of the ways just a few of these stories are represented on the Tring tiles suggests


51 A lengthy section of Martin Luther’s Von Shem Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi (1543), in Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 177 vols (Weimar: H. Böhlaus, 1887–2009), V, pp. 573–648, discusses Christ’s genealogy in order to prove that Mary descended from David, and thus that Jesus was the true Messiah. See Gerhard Falk, The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther’s Anti-Jewish Von Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism (London: McFarland, 1992), pp. 201–09. In an earlier treatise, Daß Jesus ein geborner Jude sei (1523) in Martin Luthers Werke, XI, pp. 307–36, in which Luther is mainly concerned with conversion, he expresses amazement that the Jews did not believe that Jesus, ‘their own flesh and blood’ was the Messiah. See Martin Luther, That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew, trans. Walther I. Brandt in Luther’s Works, 55 vols (St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955–86), XLI (1962), pp. 199–229 (p. 220).
that they also performed additional devotional and social functions for their fourteenth-century English audiences.

In many of the tales, little Jesus behaves in a way that can only be described as disturbing. He mouths off to his parents and elders, he is uncooperative at school, where he humiliates and confuses his teachers; and when his playmates annoy him, he does not hesitate to bump them off, as depicted on the first Tring tile described briefly above, to which we return now for a closer look (Fig. 4). In the first scene on the left, Jesus amuses himself by forming little pools of water with what looks like a large compass, but when another boy comes along and closes one of them up, an angry Jesus kills him, as signified by the boy’s upside-down position. On the right, a crowned Mary pleads with Jesus to restore the boy to life and so Jesus obliges — by kicking the boy in the back. It is interesting and also appropriate, somehow, that in both scenes, Jesus lacks a halo. Such unpleasant stories take some of the shine off the jollier ones, for example, when Jesus magically brings clay birds to life (albeit naughtily on the Sabbath) or walks on a sunbeam. More often, Jesus’s misbehaviour upsets his parents and the entire community, who turn against the Holy Family as the local trouble-makers. The other parents try to keep their children away from Jesus, whose own parents fail to discipline him effectively. Little Jesus does also work some life-saving miracles, as well shall see. But as Evelyn Birge Vitz has observed, what is extremely interesting about these miracles is that unlike the ones performed by the adult Jesus in the Gospels, they have no transformative power: nothing changes, and none of the community Jews convert, impressed and amazed as they are at Jesus’s supernatural powers.

It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that the apocryphal infancy stories were rejected by Church authorities, beginning with Jerome, for their lack of authenticity and because they do not accord with the Gospels stories. Upholding traditional Christian views of Jewish enmity, Thomas Aquinas explained that it makes no sense that Jesus would have performed miracles as a child because if he had done so, the Jews would have handed him over for crucifixion too soon. But the

52 Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 26 (Elliott, p. 89).
53 The sunbeam miracle is depicted in the Holkham Bible (Add. 47682, fol. 15v); and both the clay birds and sunbeam miracles are depicted in the Selden manuscript (Selden Supra 38, fols 10v [clay birds], 24 [sunbeam]). See Smith, Art, Identity, and Devotion, pp. 269–73.
54 Vitz, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 130.
stories were nevertheless tolerated as literature for a wide audience for whom they are thought to have functioned as a ‘virtually autonomous gospel’. As testimony to their unofficial authority and enduring appeal in England, some of them were incorporated into widely circulating sources, such as the *Golden Legend* and the *Cursor Mundi*. By the fourteenth century, a number of Latin and vernacular French, Anglo-Norman, Italian, and Middle English poetic compilations were also in wide circulation. For the illiterate majority, the stories were transmitted in sermons, and aspects of their literary form suggest that they were transmitted orally and separately well before they were ever written down.

As already noted, however, visual representations of Christ’s infancy are much rarer and have survived primarily in fourteenth-century English art. Most importantly, pictorial cycles provided new opportunities to reference not only traditional doctrinal, christological, and devotional matters, but also more contemporary social concerns. For example, the short infancy cycle in the *Holkham Bible* includes a potentially socially loaded episode that has survived only incompletely on the Tring Tiles (Figs. 8, 9 [right scene]). According to this story, to protect them from Jesus, some local parents hid their children inside of an oven. When Jesus happened by and asked the adults what was in the oven, they responded ‘pigs’, whereupon little Jesus opened the oven door and a group of pigs leapt out before the aghast parents. After making his point, Jesus transformed the pigs back into children, although the *Holkham Bible* image does not depict this. The artist rendered these events as a continuous narrative, showing, on the left, a grotesquely rendered Jewish parent shoving his child into the oven head first as another parent addresses Jesus (Fig. 8). On the right, the same two parents are peering into the oven, depicted a second time, from which pigs are now emerging. The child Jesus is the centrally positioned, visual focus, standing between the two oven scenes while tugging on the sleeve of the parent of whom he is making the inquiry. On the corresponding seventh Tring tile, only the dramatic, anticipatory moment of Jesus conversing with the parents before the closed oven door is depicted to

---

57 Vitz, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 133.
59 See Boulton, ‘Evangile de l’Enfance’, pp. 44–55. Anthony Bale (Feeling Persecuted, p. 204, n. 69) notes that the Middle English versions are not as close to the Tring Tiles as the Anglo-Norman version. See *The Middle English Stanzaic Versions of the Life of St Anne*, ed. by Roscoe E. Parter (London: Early English Text Society, 1928), pp. 54–58, lines 2081–2232.
61 This story is apparently based on one in the Arabic Infancy Gospel (40) in which the boys are turned into goats (Elliot, pp. 106–07). See Casey, ‘Fourteenth-Century Tring Tiles’, pp. 40–41; and Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, pp. 275–81.
the right of a scene that represents the conclusion of the far more uplifting miracle of the cornfield, to which it is unconnected (Fig. 9). However, the missing second oven scene can be reconstructed from the Selden manuscript which, like the Holkham Bible, presents the story as a two-part episode, except in separate images rather than a continuous narrative (Figs. 10, 11). In the Holkham Bible, it is especially notable that the accompanying Anglo-Norman text articulates the episode’s explanatory value: ‘And that is why it is said that [the Jews] never eat the flesh of pork’ (Fig. 8). Representing a continuation of a centuries-long Christian obsession with Jewish dietary laws, these words in this context redirect the reader-viewer’s attention from Jesus’s childish magic trick to the (no longer resident) Jews of her own time, thus shifting the focus from the life of Christ to late medieval life, while at the same time implicitly affirming Jesus’s Jewish identity.

Some of the Tring tile images reach well beyond the infancy story texts by appropriating or ‘importing’ meanings drawn from other pictorial traditions. For example, on the first tile (Fig. 4), beyond the requirements of the apocryphal story of Jesus’s irritation with and murder of his playmate in which Mary does not participate, Mary is not only present but she is also crowned,

---

62. According to the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 34 (Elliott, p. 91), Jesus sowed one grain of corn that miraculously grew into a whole field full. The scene on the Tring tile, which depicts a man lifting a sheaf of corn onto a cart, is likely the second of two scenes, the first presumably depicted on a lost tile. The lost first scene can be reconstructed from the image in the Selden manuscript, which incorporates the child Jesus sowing the grain in an empty field (fol. 21v). The miracle is also depicted in the Taymouth Hours (Yates Thompson 13, fol. 96r, 96v) (as above, n. 30).

63. E por ceo l’en dyt que i[l] ne mangeyent point de la char de purceu (Add. 47682, fol. 16).
**Fig. 10** Jesus asks parents what is in the oven, Selden manuscript. England, c. 1315–25. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 38, fol. 22v (detail). Photograph: The Bodleian Libraries, The University of Oxford.

**Fig. 11** Parents astonished when pigs jump out of the oven, Selden manuscript. England, c. 1315–25. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 38, fol. 23 (detail). Photograph: The Bodleian Libraries, The University of Oxford.
recalling allegorical images of Ecclesia, as mentioned above in relation to the Rohan Hours image, but also the Marian miracles so popular in England and France during this period. In the Marian miracle miniatures included in the c. 1390–1400 Vernon Manuscript and bas-de-page cycles in the fourteenth-century Carew-Poyntz Hours and the Hours of Mary de Bohun, for example, Mary consistently wears a crown (Fig. 12).\(^6\) Besides functioning as her ‘Queen of Heaven’ attribute, the crown at once identifies Mary with her allegorical persona of Ecclesia and references her supernatural powers, which she employs in the miracle stories to rescue Christian victims from Jewish persecutors, after which all of the Jews convert or else are destroyed. The Marian miracle tradition thus helped promote the Christian view of Jews as enemies of the Church, but also ripe for conversion.\(^6\) But on the Tring tile, the tables are turned, as the crowned Mary facilitates the rescue of a Jewish boy from Jesus! Furthermore, the departing boy still exhibits his grotesque Jewish profile, which implies that even after Mary rescued him, he still did not convert. That Mary in her guise as Ecclesia has had to step in to save a Jewish boy both acknowledges the misbehaviour of Jesus and reinforces his Jewishness by setting him in opposition to the Church, even if only momentarily. Moreover, that the still-Jewish boy gets up and walks away points beyond the infancy story to the persistent Christian failure to convert the Jews.

From more contemporary and local perspectives, the image pointed to the failure of the thirteenth-century English monarchs to convert the Jews of

---


England. Active efforts began with Henry III, who in 1232 founded a halfway house in London for potential Jewish converts (domus conversorum), whose patron saint was the Virgin Mary. Ironically, after the 1290 expulsion, the domus continued to house a small number of converts and their children who lived out their days there until the mid-fourteenth century as the only survivors of the pre-expulsion Jewish community. Royal conversion policy became much bloodier and more confrontational under Edward I, who after 1280 forced Jews all over England to attend conversionist sermons preached by the Dominicans or face execution, which many did choose over conversion. These protracted efforts produced a very low conversion rate, estimated at no more than ten percent of the total Jewish population in England, with numbers peaking during the 1240s and 1250s more likely for economic and social reasons or to escape death than out of religious conviction. Moreover, converts, especially those who had been forcibly baptized, remained deeply suspect as ‘true Christians’, and thus had difficulties assimilating into mainstream Christian society. Of course, apart from those still resident in the domus, all unconverted Jews had been expelled from England some forty years before the Tring tile was made and viewed. But theologically speaking, conversion of all the world’s Jews remained a central Christian goal as

---

one of the prerequisites for the Second Coming, the ultimate earthly destiny of the holy child represented across the tiles.67

The Marian miracle iconographical tradition also probably informed the Tring Tile ‘children in the oven’ episode (Fig. 9). Remember that when Jesus asks the parents, ‘What is in the oven?’ they mendaciously answer, ‘pigs’. On the tile, where Jesus puts forth his query with lively gestures, the central motif of the oven and the caricatured renderings of the parents recall the Marian miracle of the Jewish boy in the oven.68 In this popular ‘gentile tale’, one of several depicted across Europe and in both pre- and post-expulsion English art, an angry Jewish father shoves his young son into an oven for going to the church and receiving the Eucharist with his little Christian playmates. But Mary comes to the boy’s rescue and protects him from the oven flames with her cloak, whereupon both he and his Jewish mother give thanks and convert, as depicted in a bas-de-page scene in the Hours of Mary de Bohun.69

However, in spite of being linked by key iconographical motifs, the messages of the Marian miracle stories and the Tring tile infancy tales differ in at least two fundamentally important ways. Recall that on the first tile, after Jesus killed the boy who wrecked one of his playing pools, Mary’s influence saved the boy, and yet he did not convert (Fig. 4). Similarly, in the infancy ‘children in the oven’ story, the wrong thing happens: rather than rescue the children from the oven, Jesus does them greater harm by transforming them into pigs (Figs. 8, 11)! And even after Jesus turns the pigs back into children – the part of the story not represented in either the Holkham Bible or the Selden manuscript – none of the Jewish parents convert. By contrast with the ‘Jewish boy’ tale, in which Mary’s actions save the boy and convert his mother; in the infancy story, Jesus merely demonstrates his omnipotence and then punishes the parents for lying to him, gaining no souls for Christendom in the process. In addition, images of pigs jumping from the oven before horrified parents perpetuated ongoing, pan-European associations between Jews and pigs that extended well beyond the Holkham Bible’s

pseudo-explanation for Jewish dietary laws to inform a number of other insulting and vulgar pictorial genres, peaking with the invention of the hateful Judensau motif, which depicts grotesquely stereotyped figures of Jews suckling a sow.\textsuperscript{70}

Like the image of the oven on the seventh tile, it is the prominent motif of the castle tower depicted in two sequential scenes on the third tile that shifts the focus away from the infancy story to more contemporary matters (Fig. 13). In this episode, a cruel Jewish father locks his son inside a tower to protect him from Jesus, as shown on the left; and on the right, Jesus liberates the boy by pulling him through a narrow crack. The tale does not appear in any of the Latin texts but only in the Anglo-Norman Les Enfaunces de Jesu Crist, whose sole witness is the Selden manuscript,\textsuperscript{71} which suggests that it is a later English addition to the infancy cycle. In her recent study of the Tring tiles, Mary Casey observes that castles were important in English Jewish life, and argues that the ones represented on the tiles recall the protection of the Jews by the English king as well as the imprisonment of Jews in the Tower prior to execution.\textsuperscript{72} Bearing this in mind, the image might align more closely to the latter than the former, since Jesus is pulling the Jewish boy out of the castle rather than enclosing him inside of it, which according to the terms of the story means that he is exposing him to the danger that he, Jesus, might inflict! If the tiles were originally displayed in Tring, a more local referent for the tower would have been Berkhamsted Castle, about eleven miles from Tring and a royal residence that in 1337 – around the time the tiles were made – was inherited by Edward the Black Prince (1330–1376) as part of the lands of the Duchy of Cornwall.\textsuperscript{73} There is no evidence of any anti-Jewish activities by the Black Prince himself or for that matter, by his father (Edward III) or his grandfather (Edward II), both of whom reigned during the early fourteenth-century after the Jews had already been expelled. But the Black Prince’s great-grandfather, Edward I, was the king responsible for expelling the Jews from England in 1290,

\textsuperscript{70} See Claudine Fabre-Vassas, The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, and the Pig, trans. by Carol Volk (\textit{New York}: Columbia University Press, 1997); Smith, Art, Identity, and Devotion, pp. 175–81. On the Judensau, see Isaiah Shachar, The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and Its History (\textit{London}: Warburg Institute, 1974). It should be noted that while this motif was popular in German art it was rarely, if ever, depicted in English medieval art. However, I have argued elsewhere that it was likely informed by representations of the sow in medieval English bestiaries. See Debra Higgs Strickland, ‘The Jews, Leviticus, and the Unclean in Medieval English Bestiaries’, in Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Antisemitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture, ed. by Mitchell B. Merback (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 101–31 (pp. 126–28).

\textsuperscript{71} James and Hobson, ‘Rare Mediaeval Tiles’, p. 34. The Selden manuscript text of this story is accompanied by three miniatures. The first depicts the father locking his son in the tower (fol. 16); in the second, Jesus pulls the child out of the tower through a crack (fol. 16v); and the third shows the raging father inside of the tower (fol. 17).


and his great-great grandfather, Henry III, was the first European ruler to uphold the accusation made against Jews of ritual murder.74

During Henry’s reign, the important Jewish financier Abraham of Berkhamsted, who lived and had property in Berkhamsted and Wallingford, was for his own protection ‘granted’ to Richard of Cornwall (1209–1272), the king’s brother, who like other members of the royal family now had in his possession a ‘personal’ Jew. During the 1250s, Abraham had been arrested for some unknown reason, but was released on condition that he should forfeit his chattels and avoid the king’s presence for a year.75 However, another version of the story had it that Abraham was charged with repeatedly fouling a statue of the Virgin Mary and of forcing his wife to do the same, and of subsequently murdering his wife when she thought better of it, as recorded in lurid detail by Matthew Paris (c. 1200–1259) in his Chronica majora.76 It is thus intriguing to consider that the tower tale was added to the infancy cycle by English compilers at this later date, and that the story and its associations might have held special local resonance for viewers of the Tring tiles.

Fig. 13 A father locks his son in a castle / Jesus pulls the boy out through a narrow crack. Tring tile (3). England, c. 1330. London, British Museum. Photograph: © The Trustees of The British Museum

75 Langmuir, ‘Knight’s Tale’, 461.
Still other types of concerns are addressed on the tiles whose imagery refers to specific aspects of Jesus’s Jewish upbringing. The first scene on the fourth tile, for example, depicts what happened when Joseph brought Jesus to school to study with Master Levi (Fig. 14). Although English viewers who had had no opportunities to observe Jewish customs were unlikely to realise it, a father arranging study for his young son with a single teacher was the normal pattern of childhood education in medieval Ashkenaz. The early compilers of the infancy stories highlighted Jesus’s early education presumably because it was an important Jewish rite of passage: entering school at age five or six was considered a boy’s next stage of life after circumcision and prior to social maturation at age thirteen. Two of the infancy stories pertain to Jesus’s respective encounters with his teachers, Master Levi and Master Zacchaeus, neither of whom managed to get him to cooperate with his lessons, but rather were subjected to humiliating displays of his omniscience. The exchange with Levi would have been the more dramatic and unsettling for a Christian audience because as depicted on the tile, when Master Levi’s patience snaps, he strikes little Jesus in the face for refusing to answer a question! That Jesus is depicted twice in the same scene both prolongs the violence and enhances its shock value (Fig. 14). In the next scene on the right, by sharp contrast, a fully cooperative Jesus kicks into gear to astonish his teachers with his wisdom and also heals the lame, shown leaning on small trestles (scabella).

Anthony Bale sees a parallel between the apocryphal Levi story and the Gospels episode of Jesus among the doctors in the temple (Luke 2:42–52), and beyond this interprets Levi’s startling behaviour in relation to medieval pedagogical practices in which learning a lesson was directly related to a master’s infliction of violence upon the pupil. Viewed in this light, the adjacent scene on the Tring tile of a wise and healing Jesus might even have been seen to justify such practices by presenting his subsequent virtuous behaviour as proof of their efficacy. From a Christian devotional standpoint, the image of Levi smacking Jesus the child points proleptically to images of other Jewish men striking the adult Jesus in

---

77 Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 31 (Elliott, p. 90). For the Selden manuscript version of the story, see Boulton, Les Enfances de Jésu Crist, pp. 57–60, lines 853–956.
78 Marcus, Rituals of Childhood, pp. 1–39, 75.
79 For a summary of Jesus’s encounter with Master Zacchaeus (Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 30), see Elliott, p. 90.
80 The iconography of this scene in the Selden manuscript (fol. 18) is very similar.
81 The disabled who relied on such trestles were thus known as scabellarii (James and Hobson, ‘Rare Mediaeval Tiles’, p. 14).
82 Bale, Feeling Persecuted, pp. 45–49. It is significant that the terms for ‘education’ in both Latin (disciplina) and Hebrew (mûsar) also mean ‘punishment’ (Upson-Saia, ‘Holy Child’, p. 28). On late medieval Christian representations of ‘Jewish schools’, see also Eva Frojmovic, ‘Taking Little Jesus to School in Two Thirteenth-Century Latin Psalters from South Germany’, in Merback (ed.), Beyond the Yellow Badge, pp. 87–117.
Passion episodes. From an eschatological perspective, Levi’s striking hand is a reference to the slapping Jewish hand in contemporary images of the arma Christi or ‘weapons of Christ’. Arrayed in mid-air around the figure of Jesus presented as the post-resurrection Man of Sorrows, the arma Christi are the emblems of the Passion, including the crown of thorns, the nails, the lance, the sponge, and so forth. Understood as Jewish instruments of torture, they formed the focus of pious Christian contemplation and meditation in late medieval devotional practices. However, the typical inclusion among the ‘weapons’ of a disembodied Jewish spitting head and a Jewish striking hand identifies the Jews as the ones collectively responsible for these tortures. Whether viewed as a forecast of Passion iconography or in relation to the arma Christi, the late medieval viewer of the Tring tile’s Levi episode saw what she expected to see: the physical abuse of Jesus by a Jew, which like other scenes on the tiles troubles the domestic Jewish narrative by visually highlighting Jesus’s alienation from his own community.

The two scenes on the fifth tile, both of which are missing their pendant scenes, combine christological and genealogical references in especially interesting ways. In the scene on the left, Jesus converses with his amazed parents and

---

83 Bale, *Feeling Persecuted*, p. 49.
local spectators after playing with three lion cubs (Fig. 15). 86 Besides recalling the ancient trope that wild animals become tame in the presence of divinity, the lion cubs in the presence of the child Jesus reference the popular bestiary description of Christ as the lion of Judah, a designation appropriated from Jewish tradition. 87 Three cubs also provide additional christological symbolism through reference to the Trinity while also, perhaps, evoking the three lions of the Plantagenet heraldic arms. 88 Further, it is notable that Mary wears the crown of Ecclesia while Joseph and the other onlookers wear hats or hoods and exhibit stereotypical Jewish physiognomy, which creates a sharp visual distinction between the degrees of ‘Jewishness’ embodied by Christ’s two earthly parents. In the next scene on the tile, which is unrelated to the lion cub episode, Jesus in a display of his precocious carpentry ability points out to a workman that Joseph has cut a beam to the wrong length. 89 The story continues with two more scenes on the sixth tile (Fig. 16). On the left, Jesus helpfully lengthens the beam that Joseph has cut too short, which can then be fitted to the plough depicted on the right. Aided by magic, the skills of the Jewish son have already surpassed those of his earthly father. For contemporary viewers, the ploughing scene also had symbolic value. Bolstered by many biblical allusions and an essential position in the social hierarchy, the figure of the ploughman had become synonymous with the good Christian, a tradition that culminated in William Langland’s great poem, Piers Plowman, composed in Middle English during the late fourteenth century. 90

In view of the genealogical issue, the distinct manner in which Jesus and his parents are rendered on these last two tiles is significant. In the lion cub scene and the first two of the too-short beam scenes, as already noted, Joseph is rendered as a Jewish stereotype, which sets him apart visually from Jesus, which in turn

---

86 Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 35 (Elliott, p. 97). The missing first tile scene can be reconstructed from the Selden manuscript image, which depicts Jesus, Mary, and Joseph coming upon the three lion cubs playing under a tree (fol. 27v). The next scene in the manuscript (on fol. 28) corresponds to the one on the Tring tile.


88 The royal arms of England (Gules, three lions passant guardant or), first adopted by Richard I in 1195, positions the lions walking in profile and facing the viewer rather than walking in strict profile as on the Tring tiles. See Adrian Ailes, The Origins of the Royal Arms of England: Their Development to 1199 (Reading: Graduate Centre for Medieval Studies, Reading University, 1982). See also Adrian Ailes, ‘Heraldry in Twelfth-Century England: The Evidence’, in Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium, ed. by Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), pp. 1–16; and Haist, ‘Lion’.

89 Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, 37 (Elliott, p. 97).

reminds the viewer of Jesus’s supernatural origins (Fig. 15). That is, in these images, Jesus does not look like Joseph at a time when physical resemblance was an essential gauge of whether or not a child was begotten by a particular man. Jesus does, however, bear a family resemblance to Mary, bearing in mind the limits of idealised late medieval ‘portraiture’ in a simplified drawing style. In Christian exegetical sources, Joseph is sometimes carefully referred to as a ‘foster father’

Fig. 15 Jesus plays with lion cubs / Joseph cuts the beam incorrectly. Tring tile (5). England, c. 1330. London, British Museum. Photograph: © The Trustees of The British Museum

Fig. 16 Jesus lengthens the beam / The beam is fitted to a plough. Tring tile (6). England, c. 1330. London, British Museum. Photograph: © The Trustees of The British Museum
(nutricius) as a reminder of his outsider status. Although both tiles and infancy stories consistently present Jesus as a child brought up in a traditional two-parent Jewish household, with Joseph in conventional fatherly roles; on the tiles, certain visual details continually remind viewers that Jesus’s true father was supernatural. In the written stories, Christian confusion on this point is quite predictably placed in the mouths of the Jews, who first assume Jesus was begotten by Joseph, but then question this once Jesus starts working magic – but at the same time seem to think that Jesus is just an ordinary child when they observe his childish misbehaviour.

The entire space of the eighth and final Tring tile is dedicated to a single feasting scene whose identification is uncertain (Fig. 17). What it brings to mind in the first instance is the Marriage of Cana, during which the adult Jesus miraculously changed water into wine (John 2:1–11), which corresponds to the Selden manuscript’s reference to the wedding of Archeticlin (Architriclin), the popular medieval name for the Cana wedding bridegroom. Another possibility is that it represents the family feast attended by Joseph, his four (other) sons and two daughters plus Jesus, Mary and her sister, Mary of Cleophas that is described in one of the infancy stories. Comparison with the imagery in the Selden manuscript does not settle the matter, because rather than correspond exactly with any of its three feasting miniatures, the Tring tile scene combines elements of all three of them: Jesus is gesturing before three vessels while a standing man hands a chalice to a male diner seated at table where three other male diners are conversing. Because the tile depicts Jesus not with Mary but among five additional male figures, I read the scene as the family feast, with Joseph at table receiving the chalice, surrounded by his sons natural and supernatural. If the scene were so recognized by fourteenth-century English viewers, it would have highlighted, rather than resolved, the doctrinal dilemma of Joseph’s role as Jesus’s father. Whatever its specific narrative reference might have been, any pre-Passion feasting image

93 Selden Supra 38, fol. 34. For the text, see Boulton, Enfaunces de Jesu Crist, pp. 83–85 (lines 1813–1908). The name ‘Architriclin’ was widely used to identify the Cana wedding bridegroom from at least the late twelfth century (Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and Thelma S. Fenster, The Life of Saint Alban by Matthew Paris [Tempe, Az: ACMRS, 2010], p. 109, n. 12).
95 The first feasting image in the Selden manuscript depicts Jesus seated at table with his parents and two other diners (fol. 32v); the second shows Jesus, Mary, and four other diners at table (fol. 33v); and in the third (fol. 34), Jesus converses with a man behind a table on which are positioned five vessels.
involving Jesus prefigures the Last Supper, referenced here by the presence of the chalice in a scene that ultimately points to the replacement of all Jewish feasts with the Christian feast of the Eucharist, a goal that had long been accomplished in fourteenth-century England.

If the scenes depicted on the original, full set of the Tring tiles followed the same sequence as the Selden manuscript illuminations, then the last tile would have represented Jesus taking leave of his parents to mark the end of his childhood and the beginning of his adult career. For the present discussion’s concern with Jesus’s family relations, the possible inclusion of this episode on the final tile is of great interest because its very subject is Jesus’s departure from his Jewish community. The episode was also crucial from a Christian devotional perspective as ‘evidence’ that Christ turned his back on the Jews. Prior to the composition of the apocryphal infancy stories, the Gospels had paved the way for this reading by recording instances of Jesus’s rejection of dietary and purity laws as well as his failure to keep the Sabbath, gestures that put him at odds with his contemporaries because they were violations of traditional practices of Judaism. With his physical departure from his parents, as pictured and described in the Selden

96 Selden Supra 38, fol. 15.
manuscript, Jesus seemingly rejects both the culture and religion into which he had been born. If an image of Jesus taking leave of his parents originally concluded the Tring tile series, its anti-Jewish significance would not have been lost on fourteenth-century viewers, because by this time, visual and verbal references to Christ’s rejection of the Jews were everywhere, from wall paintings to mystery plays, in bibles and bestiaries, which continued to be read and viewed even in an England without Jews.

***

Besides filling the gaps in the Gospels accounts of the life of Jesus, the Tring tiles and the apocryphal infancy cycles in devotional manuscripts functioned as a vernacular gloss on his ambiguous genealogy. The imagery thus served the crucial polemical purpose of shoring up his earthly and divine legitimacy by providing a detailed picture of his upbringing in the context of his Jewish family and community. Both texts and images supported the important theological position that Jesus was fully human, as manifest in his childish temperament and escapades; but also fully divine, apparent from his omniscience and working of miracles. Whether or not they were especially appealing to children or served as object lessons for them, the infancy stories and images doubtless provided reassurance to adult audiences that their own family experiences of conflict and troublesome children were shared by many others, including the Holy Family. Whether that recognition translated into greater tolerance of children’s misbehaviour in Christian family contexts is an intriguing question, but it is perhaps more plausible that the infancy stories helped to bring medieval experience closer to that of Jesus’s in the formation of what might be termed a ‘vernacular’ Christian identity.

Beyond these more general assumptions, in what other ways might the Tring tile images of Jesus’s Jewish childhood have functioned for their Christian viewers in a post-expulsion England? And how else might viewers during this time and in this place have understood negative portrayals of the youthful Son of Man / Son of God? Kristi Upson-Saia has argued that stories of Jesus’s bad behaviour would have been offensive to early Christian readers, having been invented by an early opponent of Christianity to demonstrate that Jesus was arrogant, ignoble, and a threat to the community. And so she hypothesizes that the task for subsequent Christian redactors of the tales was to ‘domesticate’ them for the faithful by adding justifications for Jesus’s actions, by showing that he was provoked by others or more specifically, by other Jews.

---

98 Upson-Saia, ‘Holy Child’, p. 3.
Further to this, I suggest that such later cultural ‘domestications’ of the stories were facilitated by the changed environments in which they were retold and viewed. In the case of the Tring tiles, is it just a coincidence that the public display of an image-cycle focused on Jesus’s boyhood corresponded with the height of the ritual murder accusations levelled against Jews in late medieval Europe – especially since Jesus is portrayed as the same age as the Christian boys said to be the victims of these imaginary atrocities? I refer to the libel, mentioned above in connection with Henry III, which was first brought against Jews in England in the mid-twelfth century, of ritually murdering Christian children, crimes supposedly borne of an irrational Jewish hatred of Christendom and insatiable desire to re-enact the crucifixion.  Although of English origins, this libel escalated into a centuries-long raft of accusations followed by the arrest and execution of large numbers of Jews all over Western Europe. The immediate material purpose it served for Christians was the creation of lucrative saints’ cults that for centuries afterwards attracted pilgrims and their money to commemorative shrines. On the Tring tiles, does the child Jesus – who murders Jewish boys – signify the ultimate spiritual triumph of these young Christian martyrs? Or to put it more negatively: in the same spirit of table-turning exhibited in the details of the individual infancy episodes discussed above: are these stories to be understood by now as images of Christian revenge – with the young Jesus forecasting the last eschatological laugh?

The fact that there were no Jews living in England during the fourteenth century, and therefore no current local ritual murder accusations, need not automatically invalidate this hypothesis. The theory of the ‘virtual Jew’ mentioned near the start of this discussion assigns to Christians living in post-expulsion England an understanding of Jews not as living people but as symbolic vehicles for Christian self-definition, which suggests that stories and images about Jews retained their relevance even when Jews were no longer physically present. But I believe there is still more at stake, because what this theory does not take into account is that Christians living in post-expulsion England knew what was going on in France, Germany, and other places where Jews still resided. Elsewhere in Europe during the fourteenth century, violent Christian – Jewish business continued as usual, and English cults grounded in ritual murder accusations, including those of

Saint William of Norwich and Little Saint Hugh of Lincoln were still active.102 In fact, the cult of William of Norwich enjoyed a surge in popularity during the 1370s and 1380s.103 Even in places where they were no longer legally resident, cultural evidence, including image-making, suggests that Jews never disappeared from Christian awareness as an active, living group whose real-life presence anywhere on earth was viewed as a continuing threat to the Christian faith and the Christian community. Through his embodiment of the irrational anger and vengeance attributed to Jews in Christian society writ large, Jesus on the Tring tiles invited fourteenth-century English viewers to contemplate his relationship to both biblical and contemporary Jewish society. By turning against members of his own community, Jesus the child foreshadows Jesus the adult turning away from the Jews for supposedly denying and murdering him. For Christian viewers of the tiles, little Jesus’s mistreatment of his Jewish friends and neighbours perhaps, as Aquinas suggested, explained the need for the ‘Jewish revenge’ carried out against him as an adult, and after that, against Christendom writ large. Other meanings lie in the space between the apocryphal infancy stories and the contemporary concerns to which they could now also refer, including the relatively recent Plantagenet involvement in ‘cleansing’ England of its Jews. In addition, like the stories that informed them, the tiles functioned as a vernacular, visual commentary on the Gospels genealogies, exploring Jesus’s Jewish parentage and upbringing; and like the Gospels themselves, without any consistency or clarity. In other words, the relationship between Christians and Jews communicated by the Tring tiles and their stories is complex, ambiguous, and antagonistic; just as it was in the reality of late medieval European and English societies.

My preliminary analysis of the Tring tiles might also have implications for art historical study of the more conventional anti-Jewish imagery employing the more familiar ugly, grotesque stereotypes. Even though one obvious ideological aim of the latter was to distance Jesus from the Jews through oppositional visual treatment, medieval artists nevertheless reminded viewers of Christ’s Jewishness each time they juxtaposed portraits of Jesus, however idealized, with figures of community deniers and tormentors, as in the virulent Passion scenes in the Holkham Bible (Fig. 1). This, it seems to me, is a fundamental way by which artists negotiated the ongoing Christian need to simultaneously identify with and distance themselves from the Jews and Judaism. Looking beyond defamation, we can see in such images a radically different process from that which unfolds on the Tring tiles of Jesus’s emancipation from the group into which he was born.

In the scene of the mocking of Christ on the Holkham Bible folio, for example, the attribute of the blindfold – a symbol of Jewish spiritual ‘blindness’ here worn by the Christian messiah – signals the Jews’ rejection of Christ but also Christ’s rejection of the Jews. For both, blindness is metaphorical. It is hoped that future art historical investigations that reconsider late medieval Christian imagery, both rare and familiar, in relation to the Jewishness of Jesus will bring us to a fuller understanding of the multiple and changing functions of anti-Jewish image-making in post-expulsion England and beyond.
Around the year 1220, in his *Dialogus miraculorum*, a work intended as an admonition to novices, the Cistercian monk Caesarius of Heisterbach (c. 1180–c. 1240) reported the following story about the canon Geoffrey from St. Andrew in Cologne. Already at the beginning of the story, Caesarius established why Geoffrey, who had died in 1205, had suffered a miserable death: ‘Erat siquidem avarus valde, et magnam in curia pecuniam collegerat.’ (‘He had been avaricious and had accumulated large sums of money at the Archbishop’s court.’) Geoffrey’s sudden death occurred during a dinner which he had hosted for the creditors of Archbishop Adolf of Cologne (1193–1216). He was intending to pay back their loans with money recently received from King Philip as reward for his coronation (1204). Even before Geoffrey could take his first bite of the food, he suffered a stroke and died.

This otherwise confirmed report was then elevated by Caesarius into a visionary moral story. Accordingly, after Geoffrey’s death a priest ‘saw’ the canon lying on an anvil *Coloniae ante monetam* (‘in front of the Cologne mint house’) being literally hammered by the Jew Jacob ‘until he was as thin as a dinar’. Jacob is characterized as the bishop of the Jews, the head of the Jewish community in Cologne, but, more importantly, also as Geoffrey’s friend. Caesarius comments...

---


2 Caesarius von Heisterbach, V, pp. 2143–2145: ‘Vidit eum Colonicae ante monetam incudi impositum; quem Jacobus Judaeus, imo Judaeorum episcopus, cui fuerat familiaris, malleo extendit usque ad denarii tenuitatem.’

3 The existence of the *Judenbischof* (Jews’ bishop) Jacob can’t be confirmed by other sources. Since the story is situated around 1205, Jacob was supposedly in office around the time of the presence of the Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The historiographical legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz, ed. by Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan, Turnhout, 2015 (RELMIN, 7) pp. @@@--@@@ © BREPOLSPUBLISHERS DOI 10.1484/M.RELMIN-EB.5.108444
on the priest’s vision: ‘This punishment was equal to his (i.e., Geoffrey’s) guilt. He was the mint master (\textit{magister monetae}) and the \textit{socius monetariorum}.’ Since he had amassed money in the mint, this was also – according to the vision – the place where ‘he had to suffer the punishment for his avarice.’\textsuperscript{4} Accordingly, the location of Geoffrey’s ‘sin’ was the mint; it was situated at the \textit{Altermarkt} neighbouring the Jewish quarter.\textsuperscript{5} His ‘companion’ was the Jew Jacob who became the instrument of Geoffrey’s punishment. The sin Geoffrey was accused of was avarice – a sin which had been regularly associated with money lending and with Jews for being engaged in it.\textsuperscript{6}

The association of Jews with material wealth and materialism had been made already in the New Testament and was promoted by early Christian authorities such as Paul and \textit{John Chrysostom}. The latter’s sermons accused the Jews of greed.\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Ambrose of Milan} made a similar connection equating the ‘Old Testament’, i.e., the Hebrew Bible, with ‘old money’ which ‘they (the Jews) have no longer’ (and which is now in Christian possession): ‘they (the Jews) have eyes and see not, they have ears, and hear not, they have money and have it not because they are ignorant of its use, they do not know its value, they have not recognized its form and shape.’ By this Ambrose meant to say that Jews are ignorant of the
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\textsuperscript{5} The minting house of the Archbishop was situated at the \textit{Altermarkt} adjacent to the Jewish quarter.


‘truth of Christianity’ that is prophesized in the ‘Old Testament’; they don’t recognize the value of the ‘old money.’

According to Sara Lipton, ‘by the year 1150 the Jew had become the stereotypical moneylender in the eyes of most Christians, or at least in Christian writings.’ In syllogisms, Jews were increasingly represented as avaricious and idolatrous because of their supposed adoration of money and cupidity which was equated with idolatry. Without reference to Jews as moneylenders, Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, polemicized in 1146 against the wealth of Jews, which he described as illegitimately acquired. Around the same time, in the context of anti-Jewish violence unleashed by crusade preaching, Bernard of Clairvaux argued in favour of sparing the Jews’ lives since their presence would prevent the Christians’ activity in money lending, which he considered to be worse than Jewish money lending. For lending money at interest, Bernard and others after him used the term judaizare, thus adding another element to the stereotyping process. These and other very pejorative depictions of Jews as moneylenders produced a stereotype that has formed the focus of scholarly research. Scholarship has proposed that the stereotyping process was either already more or less finalized by 1150 or ran

9 Lipton, Images, p. 33; Lipton, Dark Mirror, pp. 67, 69.
from the second half of the twelfth century into the beginning of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{13}

In this chapter, I would like to draw attention to those Jewish mint masters (\textit{Münzmeister} = \textit{monetarius})\textsuperscript{14} who were administering the production of money and whose negative stereotype Caesarius’ vision story is based upon and contributing to.\textsuperscript{15} Jewish moneylenders and mint masters were affected by similar stereotypes, at whose core the sin of avarice stood. Even the money that was given by Jews on interest might have been considered as ‘Jewish’.

But how widespread and widely accepted were these negative images about Jews among the Christian population? To what extent were these images internalized? Did they have direct consequences on the daily encounters between Jews and Christians in their transactions in the market or in each others’ homes? Strong perceptions of Jews as enemies and murderers resulted – among other factors and ideas – in persecutions and ritual murder accusations against them.\textsuperscript{16} What about the impact of economic stereotypes?

The writings mentioned above, which reflected and contributed to the stereotyping of Jews, had theological and ideological agendas, while all the same guided by mistrust for the new monetized economy.\textsuperscript{17} The majority of these sources was produced in a French setting and most probably addressed the economic situation of the French Jews.\textsuperscript{18} For instance, Anna Sapir Abulafia pointed out that ‘Bernard was basing his observations on his French experience’ while ‘he did not refer to

\textsuperscript{13} Todeschini, ‘Christian Perceptions’, p. 14, detects the stereotyping process in ‘penitential manuals and narrative or hagiographic sources, but also in the pontifical legislation’ for ‘the last years of the twelfth century.’ For an overview of research see Lipton, \textit{Images}, p. 166 footnote 17.


\textsuperscript{17} For other authors see also Anna Sapir Abulafia, \textit{Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance} (London: Routledge 1995), pp. 90–91 (Peter Abelard), 112–13 (Guibert of Nogent); Heinz Schreckenberg, \textit{Die christlichen Adversus-Judaes-Texte (11.–13. Jahrhundert)}. Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/335, 3rd ed (Frankfurt et al.: Peter Lang, 1997), pp. 9–11 (Guibert of Nogent), 140 (Peter Abelard), 190 (Peter the Venerable), 140 (Walter of Chatillon). In 1213, the Synod of Paris condemned usury and equated \textit{communiae} – i.e., credit associations – with \textit{synagogae malignantium}, see ibidem, pp. 396–97.

\textsuperscript{18} The situation is similar regarding legislation against usury. For instance, in 1154 Louis VII ordered that Jews had to cease any moneylending on interest (usury); see Hans-Jörg Gilomen, ‘Wucher und Wirtschaft im Mittelalter’, \textit{Historische Zeitschrift} 250 (1990), 265–301 (pp. 280–82).
moneylending in the letter he wrote to the Archbishop of Mainz. It seems that the Jews of the German Kingdom were less involved in money lending which began there in the early twelfth century as part of trade business but was ‘not completed, by all signs, before the mid-thirteenth century’. Eliezer bar Nathan (died around 1150) still declared trade ‘as our livelihood’, perceiving money lending with Christians in the same category. A clear separation of moneylending from trade is only detectable in sources from the end of the thirteenth century. Thus, it could be assumed that the stereotyping process either reached the Empire later in the thirteenth century or ‘spread’ independently of the reality of Jewish involvement in moneylending. It is notable that Christian anti-Jewish polemical writings were hardly produced in twelfth-century Germany; only Rupert of Deutz, Hermann of Scheda, and Walther von der Vogelweide can be mentioned. For the thirteenth century, Moritz Güdemann (1880) has found evidence for the synonymous use of usurer with Jew at Freidank, Ulrich von Liechtenstein, and Berthold of Regensburg. Although the attack on doing business with money was directed against Jews, it was part of a more general critique of society (Gesellschaftskritik) and monastic life; the focus of attention was as a rule first and foremost Christian usurers who probably dominated the moneylending business anyway. Nevertheless, we still lack a systematic study of the economic stereotyping of Jews in German polemics against moneylending; such a study would, further, have to differentiate and contextualize according to regions and time periods.

---


Negative perceptions could also include accusations of counterfeit or clip money. Yet despite a similar accusation in 1171 in Cologne and rabbinic admonitions to refrain from counterfeiting money in 1220 in Mainz, there are — according to Gerd Mentgen — no such libels reported for the thirteenth century in Germany: the stereotyping and equation of Jews with coinage fraud began only in the wake of the mass executions of Jews as coin-clippers in 1278/79 England. For the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century in the Empire, it is unclear to what extent negative perceptions of Jews regarding their dealings with money even circulated.

Not only does it stand to question whether the reality of economic life shaped the stereotypes, but also whether the stereotypes impacted daily economic exchanges between Jews and Christians or even hampered particular public dealings between them. By closely studying the reality and ambit of business transactions in an area East of France, we may be able to evaluate the existence or power of stereotypes and of theologically-influenced perceptions of Jews.

For our reflection about the relationship between stereotypes and the reality of economic life, the images on the coins minted by Jews seem to me ideal. Trade on the basis of coins presupposed mutual trust and special knowledge about the trade value of each kind of coin. Coins were a hands-on object and constituted a public medium of communication between Jews and Christians in medieval Europe in general, and in medieval Ashkenaz (i.e., in the German Kingdom), in particular, where Jewish communities emerged in the tenth century. The communication that was facilitated by coins led therefore also to the transfer of knowledge between Jews and Christians in the sphere of business. Trust was especially necessary in the lending of money; it bound the different partners in the business transaction together. Even the most problematic business relationships created a more or less public cooperation between Christians and Jews. Since the relationship between lord of the mint and mint master was very public, both partners were quite vulnerable against attacks like Caesarius of Heisterbach. Against this background, we will now turn to the coins minted by Jews and coins with Jewish symbols, since they constitute the most public statements of the relationship between a Christian lord of the mint and a Jewish mint master.

Our first coin is a bracteate, a silver penny struck only on one side, from the 1170s. On the obverse of the coin, in its center, is shown the imperial ministerialis Kuno of Münzenberg (documented 1151–d. 1207/10). Turning towards Kuno, there is a seated man, identified as a Jewish person by the Hebrew inscription ‘David haCohen’.28 (FIG. 1) The whole image informs us thus that this bracteate was minted under the aegis of the imperial ministerialis Kuno with significant involvement by the Jew David haCohen. Kuno of Münzenberg cooperated with Jews, as this image indicates.

Bracteates belonged to the regional penny (Latin, denarius) system which emerged in the eleventh century in the German regnum.29 They were at the core of a money economy that remained throughout the Middle Ages underdeveloped compared to the Mediterranean economy. These coins were struck by hundreds of mostly temporarily active mints for use mainly in local or regional markets. Indicative of the developing economy, the number of active mint houses reached

Fig. 1 Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt. Photo: Wolfgang Fuhrmannek


In 1197 and therefore had doubled in the time period since 1140. These mints were in the hands of secular lords (81), but also of bishops and archbishops (61) as well as monasteries (45). With 28 mints, the kings had only a small part in the coin production. Among the minting centers, the coins produced in the cathedral cities were especially highly appreciated. The Cologne penny (and mark) even became the leading currency, especially in the Lower and Middle Rhine region (in the south until about Oppenheim), and was held in high regard in England, Bohemia, and Hungary. All other pennies were subordinated to the Cologne penny, and were of lesser, although strictly defined value. In their endeavours to establish, develop and strengthen their own minting policy, the Staufen Kings ordered – in Aachen and Duisburg – the imitation of the Cologne penny. In general, imitating coins minted by cathedral cities was a common practice for newly founded minting centers; it was an attempt to gain acceptance from the population. Between 1197 and 1260 the number of mints increased again to 37 royal mints, 106 episcopal, 46 monastic, and – a new phenomenon – to several city ones. The great majority of mint houses were run by secular rulers such as Kuno of Münzenberg; we count 277 of them. Among these, many mints were held in condominium between secular and ecclesiastical authorities.

Each minting house had different penny designs; like our bracteate they were used in the local and regional markets by Christians and Jews alike. Scholars differentiate between the era of the Fernhandelsdenar (long-distance trading denarius) and the era of the regional penny system. The latter is a period of regionalization of the money economy that coincided with the Staufen period (1137–1250) and the Interregnum (1250–76). Despite the supra-regional acceptance of the Cologne denarius, the validity of the penny was bound to the region of its origin and had to be accepted on the local markets of the region whose ‘lord of the market’ was in general also the ‘lord of the mint’.31


The presence of Kuno of Münzenberg on this coin gave the coin its legitimacy, it gained for it acceptance and was supported by the authority of Kuno as the lord of the mint and owner of the regalian right to mint coins. Who was he? And why did Kuno chose to be accompanied by David haCohen on his coin? What was the purpose of this representation of cooperation between a Christian lord and a Jewish mint master?

Kuno had stayed in close contact with the Staufen court under Emperor Frederick I and his son Henry VI from the 1150s onward; he was obviously also very highly regarded on a personal level by both rulers. In imperial charters, Kuno was often named *camerarius* (‘member of the chamber’) from the beginning of the 1160s. He still used this title on his seal of 1203 when he was already an old man. Judging from the lists of document witnesses, Kuno headed the group of the Staufen retainers (*Gefolgsleute*). With this honorific epithet, Kuno’s close and long-lasting connection to the imperial *camera* (‘chamber’) was acknowledged, along with its diverse areas of responsibilities and services for which the *getruwen Cunen* (‘loyal Kuno’) was repeatedly lauded. It was to this same *camera* that the Jews of the *Regnum teutonicum*, the German Kingdom, were assigned.

At the court, Kuno had contacts with the Jew Kalonymos ben Meir, who belonged to ‘one of the most illustrious families in Germany in these days’ and was known for his leadership – *קלונימוס הפרנס* (Kalonymos, the *parnass*) – of the Speyer community. Kalonymos stood in the service of the Emperor Frederick I as his financier and financial advisor.

Recent research has shown that Frederick I, together with

---

34 Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst*, pp. 164, 169: or ‘quod nos fide ac devotione dilecti ministerialis nostri Cunonis de Minzenberc…’.
37 Yitshak ben Mosheh, *Sefer Or Zarua*, III (Žitomir: Šapirov, 1887), Baba Kamma no. 460. The source is embedded in the compendium *Or Sarua*, which was written by the famous scholar Isaac bar Moshe from Vienna in the first half of the thirteenth century. In it, Isaac integrated a commentary of his teacher
several persons closely related to the court, introduced a number of measures intended to bolster and stabilize many areas of the economy. These measures were also influenced by Frederick’s intention to increase the financial strength of his court. The Emperor’s need for money was rising enormously, most especially because of his Italian campaigns, for which he hired a large force of mercenaries. Thus, the Staufen court depended on ready liquidities in order to be able to respond with flexibility to the exigencies of its political and military situation. As Ulf Dirlmeier has rightly pointed out: ‘Frederick the First [...] dealt more and more closely with money than any German King and Emperor (römisches-deutsche Herrscher) before him.’

Taking into account the evidence about Kalonymos’ dealings in substantial credit affairs for the Emperor, it becomes clear that this Jew was the expert in such matters. It may be that he was responsible for the court’s swift access to capital assets. Moreover, Frederick I pursued a policy of minting with unprecedented intensity. He had set up a large number of new mints in the Staufen imperial lands (Reichslande); these demanded not only specific expertise but also investments of...
capital.\textsuperscript{41} Emperor Frederick himself may have pursued his minting policy under Kalonymos’ aegis.\textsuperscript{42}

One of Kalonymos’ sons, the scholar David, is mentioned in Hebrew sources with the explicit addition to his name ‘David ben Kalonymos ממלכתוורק’ (‘of Minzburg’).\textsuperscript{43} From at least the 1190s, David lived in Kuno’s fortress, or in the nearby settlement by the same name and under its protection. His responsa indicate that he had moved from Speyer, first to Mainz, and then to Münzenburg. However, he was among those Jews from Mainz who found refuge in Kuno’s fortress of Münzenburg and benefited from its protection against the crusaders during the violence that preceded the Third Crusade in 1188.\textsuperscript{44} It is unclear whether David is identical with the mint master David haCohen. If they were two distinct persons, the financial knowledge of David’s father supports the assumption that David haCohen had good connections with the Kalonymos family. David haCohen was called into the service of Kuno probably due to the close relationships of Kuno and Kalonymos to the imperial court.\textsuperscript{45}

Both Staufen rulers were forceful and effective in defending Jews against their persecutors. The tax on the Jewish communities was a quid pro quo for the Emperor’s protection of the Jews and their privileged status of \textit{imperial immediacy} (\textit{Reichsunmittelbarkeit}). Frederick Barbarossa himself emphasized this interpretation of the law in 1157 when he reissued \textit{iudeis de Wormcia et ceteris sodalibus suis} (‘to the Jews of Worms and their other fellow [Jews]’) Emperor Henry IV’s charter of 1090 to the Worms Jews. The 1090 charter had been first issued to the Jews of Speyer, negotiated by Judah ben Kalonymos and through the petition of Bishop Rudiger of Speyer, also in 1090. Its main dispositions became ‘the legal

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{42} We may assume that the mentioning of Kalonymos’ many (other) affairs also included his engagement with the minting affairs of the kingdom.


\textsuperscript{45} For minting operating in castles, see Bernd Kluge, ‘Burg und Münze – Burgen als Münzstätten im hohen Mittelalter’, in \textit{Die Burg Wissenschaftlicher Begleitband zu den Ausstellungen}, ed. by Georg Ulrich Großmann and Hans Ottomeyer (Dresden: Sandstein Verlag 2010), pp. 87–93. Minting in castles was also regarded as part of a ruler’s expansion in power and governance.
\end{footnotes}

When, therefore, the \textit{camerarius} Kuno in 1188 rescued the Jews who were under the protection of the imperial \textit{camera}, he acted in the interests of the Emperor and his royal son Henry, and as their representative. Our discussion thus far should have made it obvious that the image on our bracteate reflected the political constellation involving the Jews at the time. By depicting David haCohen as sitting close to and next to Kuno, the coin declared, firstly, that David – together with other Jews – belonged to the inner circle of the local ruler, Kuno, who himself was closely associated with the Emperor, and, secondly, that David and the Jews were under Kuno’s and ultimately the Emperor’s protection and power. Similarly, another coin shows Frederick Barbarossa accompanied by Kuno, demonstrating the cooperation between the two men in ruling as well as the imperial authority on which Kuno based his claims to rule and mint.\footnote{Keupp, \textit{Dienst und Verdienst}, p. 173.} The seated position of David might have been intended as demonstrating the dependency of the Jews on Kuno and the Emperor and their rule over them.

In addition to this double political statement, the image also conveyed, of course, thirdly, an economic message. The trustworthiness of the new coin and its acceptance among the competing coins were based on the cooperation between the imperial \textit{camerarius} Kuno and David haCohen. The ‘credit’ – in the double connotation of trust and worth – of the coin was increased by the close relationship of Kuno and David to the Emperor. Since Kalonymos was highly regarded as the financier and financial advisor of the Emperor Frederick, the presence of David on the coin was very likely intended as a stamp that guaranteed the high quality and trustworthiness of the coin.
Kuno’s political influence concentrated on the region of the Wetterau, which became *terra imperii* of the Staufen par excellence.\(^49\) In the larger picture, the Wetterau had only received the Staufen’s political and economic attention when it became territory bridging the ‘old’ Rhineland centers and the ‘new’ economy of Thuringia and Hesse. This is also reflected in its penny system: It was influenced by the Thuringian and lower Hessian minting technique.\(^50\) The royal minting centers in the Wetterau had produced since around 1160/65 highly successful pennies – first in Frankfurt, from 1170/80 in Gelnhausen, beginning of the thirteenth century in Friedberg – which took the lead among the Wetterau’s various coins. These pennies were worth half the Cologne penny (which of course remained widely accepted as the standard coin also in the Wetterau). In addition, in 1175/80, the Frankfurt mint started to copy the Cologne penny.

That the royal coins were preferred on the different markets is also reflected in their imitations by the minting program of Archbishop of Mainz in Aschaffenburg and by those of the imperial ministeriales of Münzenberg who held several minting centers in the Wetterau.\(^51\) Kuno’s minting policy stretched, therefore, over large regions of already high and even increasing economic importance, but always in strong competition with the royal coins. The imitation reflects, however, in particular also Kuno’s own standing in minting and politics in general. Giselbert of Mons characterized him as ‘rich and wise man who had his own castles, manors and entourage of knights’.\(^52\) Around the time of our bracteates’ minting, the ministerialis Kuno was successful in establishing a domain comparable to that of a noble; invited nobles, relatives and friends to representational gatherings onto his castle; and expanded his territory (for instance by acquiring the domain of the last count of Nuerings).\(^53\) Our bracteate – from the 1170s – circulated as currency when the Frankfurt royal coin was on the rise; it was competing with it, and reflected Kuno’s political self-consciousness and political influence independently of, or even against the Emperor. In the Staufen’s service, Kuno had built his own regional position of dominion, which also led him into conflict with Emperor Henry VI over the revenues from the bailiwick of Nierstein.\(^54\)

---

\(^{49}\) Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst*, pp. 151–76.

\(^{50}\) Kamp, *Moneta Regis*, pp. 286–89.

\(^{51}\) Kamp, *Moneta Regis*, pp. 287–92, 124; Hävernick, *Das ältere Münzwesen*, pp. 1–9. Regarding the imperial minting center Wetzlar where since about 1160 pennies were minted double sided according to the Middle Rhine style and were therefore different from the one sided pennies of the Wetterau bracteates, see Kamp, *Moneta Regis*, pp. 292–93, and Reverchon, *Metzer Denare*, p. 249.

\(^{52}\) Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst*, p. 152 (and footnote no. 262).


\(^{54}\) Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst*, p. 172.
Moreover, the Wetterau was politically, socially, and economically interconnected with the adjacent cathedral cities of Mainz, Worms, and Speyer, which contained the largest and most respected Jewish communities in the Empire. It was probably for these Christian and Jewish communities that our bracteate was minted, and to whom it was addressed. The minting centers of Speyer and Worms – and especially of Mainz – had been in the production of the Fernhandelsdenar (long-distance trading denarii). Their influence is demonstrated by the fact that they rank third behind those of Cologne in coin caches found in Sweden reflecting international trade. This is as well a reflection of the respective economic rank of the Jewish communities. They had been the only coin production center also for the underdeveloped Wetterau. Economically, the Mainz coin lost its standing in the second third of the twelfth century, becoming a very local currency while Speyer and Worms developed half-bracteates, thus staying in the competition with other bracteates such as the Münzenberg coin.

How would Christians and how would Jews have read the bracteate? Jews were in general able to read and understand the inscription, and they recognized both Kuno and David, who was probably well known in the prominent Jewish communities of Mainz, Worms and Speyer. In particular, the Jewish communities of Speyer and Worms comprised oftentimes merchants who had been granted freedom of trade and from customs by the charters of 1074, 1084, 1090, and 1157. The charters also regulated – with different stipulations – commerce on a local scale between Christians and Jews, relating to the selling of kosher meat, wines, dyes or medicines. For both, Christians and Jews, the quality of the Münzenberg coin, which was indeed relatively high in comparison to other contemporary bracteates, was guaranteed by the pair on the coin. However, that the entire message of the coin’s image could only be understood by Jews means that it was addressed first and foremost to the Jews whose confidence in the coin was especially heightened by the display of David and his name. The coin might have even triggered a sense of pride among the Jewish communities.

---

55 Reverchon, Metzer Denare, p. 286.
58 In comparison to other contemporary bracteates, it brings 0.95 Gramm onto the scale, and is therefore much heavier than the usual bracteates of the Wetterau. Hävernick, Das ältere Münzwesen, cf. no. 16 on p. 29 with the list of coins on pp. 26–70.
In addition to the more local Jewish merchants and market customers, another target of the coin might have been those Jews involved in distance trading who attended the markets of Worms, Mainz, and Speyer, and (even more important perhaps) the semi-annual trade Frankfurt fair. This trade fair is documented already since around 1152; Eliezer bar Nathan reported then Jews frequenting it and renting accommodations from Christians. Although a few Jews might have already lived there, Frankfurt’s Jewish community was not yet established. But between 1175 and 1191, a Jew Gottschalk of Frankfurt sold his house in Cologne. Thus around the time of the minting of our bracteate, in a context in which the imperial minting center of Frankfurt was on the rise, there were some relations between the Jews of Frankfurt and the great trading center of Cologne. Kuno could have aimed for the acceptance of his Münzenberg coin in Frankfurt. The following scenario is possible: The inscription ‘David haCohen’ instilled trust also in non-local Jews who did not know of David’s connections but were intrigued by the epithet ‘haCohen’. When they then came to the trade fairs reading the Hebrew inscription they would have preferred Kuno’s coin over the imperial Frankfurt coin or others. A few decades later, Kuno himself participated in the flourishing Frankfurt coin production: in 1194, Emperor Henry VI granted him half of the revenues of the royal Frankfurt mint as fief.

With a few exceptions, and in strong contrast to the Christians of the Mediterranean, the Christians north of the Alps were mostly illiterate, but gained practical literacy through different kinds of text recognitions. For them, the symbolic images on the coin supported their abilities to ‘read’ the coins. In our case, the Christians recognized the ruler of the Wetterau according to the signs he was holding in his hands. Despite the fact that the Hebrew signs were seen as ornaments, it was also necessary for the Christians to pay attention to the whole image of the coin. There was a practical financial ground for this: Series of bracteates and pennies were cancelled on a regular, often annual basis by the lords

of the mint in order to reissue new coins with different images (what one called *renovatio monetae*). By forcing the customers in the local markets to exchange the devaluated coins against the new series of bracteates and pennies, the lord of the mint and the money-changers earned substantial fees; the customers, on the other hand, had to make sure to exchange the devaluated coin as soon as possible.\(^62\)

Most of Kuno of Münzenberg’s coins show him as a lord standing alone on the coin; our coin was, therefore, recognized as an exception. In a rising money economy with still very few mint houses in the Wetterau and the larger Rhine area, the identity of Kuno’s mint master was most probably known also to Christians. Considering this knowledge, the crucial custom of cancellations as well as the circulation of our coin in cities with rather large Jewish populations, it is a fair hypothesis that Christians as well could have recognized as the Jewish mint master David the person who was sitting next to Kuno on the coin. Somebody might have even explained to them the Hebrew signs’ meaning.

As an initial conclusion, we can assume that to have a Jewish mint master and his Hebrew name on the coin was not considered to be a disadvantage. On the contrary, the *camerarius* Kuno perceived that the public display of his cooperation with the Jew David enhanced the value of his coin. In competition with other lords and their coins on the different markets, Kuno needed and depended on a positive reputation of his coin as trustworthy and of high quality; and he saw this message established by displaying the Jew David in his service. In preference over many other possible motifs, Kuno chose the image of his coin as clearly associated with Jews. If the association with Jews and their dealings with money would have had a negative effect, Kuno would have hardly risked a tarnished reputation of his coin. For a coin to be accepted on the market the selected image necessarily had to have a positive connotation; or at least, the image was expected by the lord of the mint to convey such a message.

This takes us back to the historiographic position outlined earlier: scholarship assumes that Jews had become the stereotypical moneylender in the eyes of most Christians since the middle of the twelfth century, at least in the French area. Judging from statements by Bernard of Clairvaux, this stereotype had definitely pejorative connotations. However, if we weigh the actual acceptance of the bracteate with clearly positive references to Jewish dealings with money against the negative stereotype of the Jewish moneylender, we can question the extent to which the negative stereotype had been adopted and internalized by Christian populations in the Wetterau and the adjacent communities of Mainz, Worms, and

Speyer around 1170. What we can glimpse of the actual and symbolic workings of this regional economy suggests indeed something more complicated.

Jews had been explicitly employed in the Empire as mint masters since the second half of the twelfth century. Their connection with Southern Italy and the Romania as well as their expertise in coinage (directly or indirectly attested since the ninth century) supports the assumption that some Jews also had a specialized knowledge in the skill of minting itself, which was in demand by rulers as Kuno of Münzenberg. In this context, it is remarkable that the famous scholar and liturgical poet Eliezer bar Nathan, who died in 1170 in Mainz, adjudicated a case concerning the collaboration between a Jew and a Christian in a minting business. Such cooperation was not surprising to Eliezer; he was only concerned about how the mint was to be used on a Shabbat. Since Eliezer’s personal realm of experience was not limited to Mainz, but stretched to Cologne, France, and to Slavic countries, the phenomenon he addressed may have been much more common than a local peculiarity.63

In order to evaluate how widespread the positive perception of a coin minted by a Jew, and identifiable as Jewish, might have been, we will now turn to other coins in this category. This is all the more warranted as the bracteates and pennies were innovative coinage that became the ‘small money’ used by people of all social strata. David haCohen’s bracteate was not minted in the highly urbanized areas with their dominant cathedral cities west of the Rhine which was also the home of David, but it was minted in the economically ‘underdeveloped’ region east of the Rhine. In particular in Ostfranken, Wetterau and Thuringia where there was almost no coin production before 1150, the royal minting houses took the initiative and the lead in the development of the minting business.64

Since the end of the eleventh century, burgher families took over leading roles in the urban society west of the Rhine; this translated among other things into a more dominant participation in the coin minting business and in associations of minters.65 This engagement curtailed the political and economic realms of the

64 Kamp, *Moneta regis*, p. 325.
65 In 1111, Henry V granted the citizens of Speyer rights concerning paying customs and minting. These could only be changed by a corporate decision of the cives (communi consilio civium). *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Stadt Speyer*, ed. by Alfred Hilgard (Straßburg 1885), online edition: http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/hilgard1885/0029?sid=9e3f3f886c1947cecefe9f4b1bc9d (accessed 21. 4. 2015).
bishops and the Jews, analogously to prior developments in the cities of Northern Italy where, as a result, only a small number of Jews settled before the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{66} In the areas east of the Rhine and north of the Danube, in the recently established settlements during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, however, the Christian burgers’ chances for such a participation were rather slim. To the contrary, several strata within the nobility, ecclesiastical rulers and – in the imperial lands – also the King himself continued to have many more opportunities. It is due to this social and political constellation that we find more Jewish involvement in the minting business in the Eastern areas from around 1160 till around 1230, i.e., during the early stages of urbanization in the East.

In contrast to the coin of the \textit{camerarius} Kuno of Münzenberg, a penny by the lord of the mint Otto of Lobdeburg, who was Bishop of Würzburg from 1207 to 1223,\textsuperscript{67} bears at first sight a more pronounced Christian reference. On the obverse, the penny shows an image of Otto and a circular inscription in the coin’s outer periphery with his name, and on the reverse a church building with three towers – the Würzburg cathedral – and, below this, displayed in big Hebrew letters, the name Yechiel. (FIG. 2) Here, the Jewish mint master is not juxtaposed to, but literally subordinated to the Church.\textsuperscript{68} The coin circulated in Franconia which borders at the Wetterau; several coins of this kind have been found and preserved (about thirteen in the Staatliche Münzsammlung München, the State Numismatic Collection in Munich).\textsuperscript{69}

In 1168, Frederick Barbarossa had confirmed to the Bishop of Würzburg the exclusive and highest jurisdiction in the diocese and the duchy of Würzburg. Thus, the bailiwick of Henneberg in the Bishopric of Würzburg came to an end, and the Bishop’s policy turned to further strengthen his territorial sovereignty.\textsuperscript{70}

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{69} Shown to me by Dr Martin Hirsch and Alexandra Hylla. For other coins, see Roland Ehwald, \textit{Die Mittelaltermünzen von Würzburg 899–1495} (Nordheim/Rhön: Selbstverlag, 1988), p. 46.

\end{flushright}
In fact, the Bishop even competed with the King by using his ecclesiastical powers; the cathedral became the cultic and political center in the cathedral city and in the diocese. This position of strength also implicated the relationship to the Jewish community, for whom the Bishop was the sole reference when it came to protection. The image on the coin reflects this constellation. The cathedral dominated not only politically and ecclesiastically, but also in the physicality of the architectural framework and urban infrastructure, as it had been conceptualized and executed already in the eleventh century. The cathedral’s immense size (105 meters long and 58 meters wide) as well as the ceremonial wide street leading from the river Main up to the cathedral’s monumental western façade compares well with the imperial overtones of Speyer’s cathedral and that city’s main street. In addition to the religious character of this axis, it was the locus for the markets and annual trade. Since the Bishop’s mint was also situated here, the coin’s image alludes to this close connection between Cathedral, the reign of the bishop, the mint and the Jewish mint master.

Who was the Jewish mint master Yechiel? Rami Reiner, Karlheinz Müller and Simon Schwarzfuchs have identified a tombstone of the Würzburg cemetery.

---

as belonging to one Yechiel bar Shmuel.72 Avraham ben Azriel’s *Arugat haBosem* (thirteenth century) mentions Yechiel and his father Shmuel as scholars; we also know that Ephraim of Bonn relied on these two men’s expertise. In 1180, according to a Latin document, Shmuel had purchased land in Würzburg.73 The date on the fragmentary tombstone is either Nisan 4970, i.e., April 1210, or Nisan 4910 (1150). Thanks to the note in *Arugat haBosem* and the deed, the date must be 1210. We can now connect the note, the deed, and the tombstone with the coin! Thanks to the coin bearing Otto’s image on the obverse, we can now determine the time frame for Yechiel’s leasing of Otto’s mint: it took place between 1207 – the first year of Otto’s rule – and 1210 – the year of Yechiel’s death.

Another detail of the tombstone inscription tells us more about Yechiel, and further supports this identification. Among the about 1500 fragments surviving from the Würzburg cemetery, among all the people mentioned there, Yechiel is the only one who is lauded and praised as איש נכבד (‘honourable man’). איש נכבד might not as much allude to his erudition, as indicate Yechiel’s reputation and important public role at the Bishop’s court.

Yechiel’s relationship to Otto of Lobdeburg takes us to the question of Otto’s interest in Yechiel. Why did Otto allow Yechiel to put his name onto Otto’s coin? In addition to the economic value as quality stamp, similar to the function of the presentation of David on Kuno’s coin, Otto of Lobdeburg could use the coin also for his political aims: In the controversy and fight over the throne between the Staufer Philip and the Welf Otto IV, Otto of Lobdeburg sided with the latter against the former. This very public coin might indicate that Otto’s controversy with the Staufen extended also to the Jews. On his coin, Otto demonstrated his own close connection to the Jews in competition with the highly political reference by the Staufer Emperors to the Jews and the imperial dynasty’s claim that the Jews ‘belong[ed] to the camera’ (*ad cameram attineant*). To employ Jewish mint masters was not limited to the Staufen and their circles.74

On the diocese’s different markets and beyond, the Bishop’s coins competed with the coins of the imperial minting center of Nuremberg. Prior to Frederick Barbarossa’s minting reform of c. 1170/1180, the Nuremberg coin had imitated the Würzburg coin; however afterwards it oriented itself to the Regensburg coin, this until it gained a standing of its own. The Würzburg coin remained a strong and stable currency, and it seems that the zone dominated by the Nuremberg

74 Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg*, pp. 204–06.
The Würzburg coins and Yecheil’s coin were accepted by Christians and Jews alike, and might have attracted Jewish traders from Nuremberg— who probably settled there around 1146— and Jewish distance traders from other places. The Würzburg Jewish community’s living quarters were very close to the cathedral and the market; it was founded sometime before 1147 and after the persecutions of 1096 which had devastated the communities of Cologne, Mainz, Worms, Speyer, Trier and Metz with deadly effects. In the twelfth century, these communities—with the exception of Metz—re-emerged, alongside with Prague and Regensburg (which go back at least to the tenth century).

Our third coin is a penny from the first quarter of the thirteenth century, minted in Regensburg. On one side, it depicts a lord with his sword and the orb and, on the reverse, a person with a typical conical Jewish hat surrounded by two rosettes and small crosses in the margins. (FIG. 3)

Even though this particular mint master’s name does not appear on his coin, we know of another mint master, active earlier, one Schlom, who probably came from Regensburg, and who is attested in a number of sources. He became the

monetarius of Duke Leopold V of Austria in the newly founded mint of Vienna. Two years after the Duke’s death, in 1196, Scholm was murdered by crusaders.79

As Scholm with his expertise already indicates, Regensburg was the earliest and main coin production center in Bavaria.80 The coin’s success was due to the city’s unique, dominant and strong role as a trade center. Regensburg ranked first – owing to long distance trading – among Southern Germany’s trade centers also around 1200. In competition with the imperial Nuremberg coin, the Regensburg coin gained back its leading role in the thirteenth century.81 Already Duke Welf V of Bavaria (reigned 1101–20) was able to obtain from the King the regalian right to mint coins. However, due to the complicated political situation in Regensburg, from the middle of the twelfth century on, the Dukes soon had to share the right to mint coins with the Bishops of Regensburg. This situation lasted until 1409. This shared right was publicly expressed by an obverse image that was either ducal or episcopal and by one reverse motif that was shared by both the Duke’s and the Bishop’s coins.82

In the case of the specific coin under discussion, it was the Jewish hat that constituted the shared reverse motif and indicated the Bishop and the Duke’s shared right over the mint. It was probably also the emblem of the mint master, who most likely was a Jew. He may have been chosen as mint master at the time of the conflict between Bishop Konrad IV. (ruled 1204–1226) and Duke Louis I (1173–1231), which culminated in 1213 with the recognition of the Bishop’s more powerful position by the Duke.83 Emperor Frederick II strengthened the position of Bishop Siegfried of Regensburg (ruled 1227–46) by awarding him the imperial revenues collected from the Regensburg Jews and juridical rights over them; this was confirmed in 1233.84 Thus the symbol of the Jewish hat could have, further, served to demonstrate the episcopal lordship over the Jewish community.

The mint masters of the minting house shared by the Duke and the Bishop worked in teams of two or even three. For 1207 we know of the Christian mint master ‘Rudgerus monetarius’. Rudger appears again in 1243 in a business relationship with the Jew Aaron in which both were providing money for the purchase of

---

80 Emmerig, Der Regensburger Pfennig, pp. 15–28.
81 Kamp, Moneta Regis, pp. 109–10, 122–33, 283, 324, 161.
82 Emmerig, Der Regensburger Pfennig, pp. 17–18.
a house (of Rappoto) by the Dominicans in Regensburg. Maybe this Aaron had served as the second mint master in the first quarter of the thirteenth century. As to the economic and legal situation of the Regensburg Jews, Frederick II guaranteed in 1216 not only their protection but also their right to sell and to purchase ‘gold, silver, and any kind of metal and merchandise’, thus strengthening the status received in 1182 from Emperor Frederick I. This charter further reflects the importance of the Regensburg Jews for the city’s trading center. The Jewish hat on the coin was understood by Jews and Christians alike as a quality assurance; it also indicated their trust in Jewish trade. Jews who came to Regensburg on long distance trade easily recognized the symbol.

As Sarah Lipton has pointed out for depictions in Christian art, by the middle of the twelfth century, pointed hats ‘had become familiar and consistent enough to serve as identifying marks of Jewishness’. It is quite unlikely that Jews typically actually wore this particular kind of hat; although, in the second half of the 13th century the regional church councils of Vienna and Wrocław (1267) as well as the Schwabenspiegel tried to enforce the wearing of this hat. Hats served as artistic signs whose positive or negative meaning ‘depended on the context of their use and the character of their possessor’. On our coin, the hat signified a Jew who probably stood for the mint master. Since it was in the interest of the lords of the mint – the Duke and the Bishop – that the image of the coin stood for the high quality of the coin and communicated its trustworthiness, this hat in context had a positive connotation. This depiction in center stage of the coin can be compared to a medallion in Chartres Cathedral’s stained glass windows: The Legend of Saint Nicholas features a Jewish moneylender marked as Jewish by his hat. There the moneylender’s ‘appearance speaks not of volatility and danger but of stability and authority, even generosity’. Whether the figure on the coin was also interpreted as representing Regensburg’s Jewish community, cannot, however, be determined. Yet it could be that the representation of a Jew reflects

87 Lipton, Dark Mirror, p. 57.
89 Lipton, Dark Mirror, pp. 158–59.
90 Lipton, Dark Mirror, pp. 153–55.
the community’s good standing in the city, and refracts the rather unproblematic relationship between Jews and Christians around the time of the minting of the coin. In the eyes of the Regensburg Jews the depiction of a coreligionist on a coin may have even be a cause of pride and a sign of positive identification with the city. 

While the three coins already analyzed were minted in the context of larger and very old Jewish communities – Mainz, Worms, Speyer, Würzburg, and Regensburg – the following coins were produced further to the East in large regional areas where Jews only gradually settled; in the dominion of the Abbey of Pegau (immediate to the empire since 1135), and the region of the Upper Lausitz with Bautzen (from 1158–1253 under the Kings of Bohemia), and in the Margraviate of Meissen. In the Margraviate of Meissen, there are hints of a Jewish community, i.e., here, of a synagogue, only for the city of Meissen, to c. 1200: unusual synagogue decorations with birds and trees had aroused Jewish scholar Isaac Or Sarua’s objections. Informations about the Jewish community of Leipzig date to the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Mainly in the second half of the thirteenth century, very small communities were established in Gotha, Eisenach, Coburg, and Naumburg. In Bautzen, Jewish presence is documented only from the end of thirteenth century, while for Pegau Jews are mentioned at the earliest at the end of the fourteenth century. North of the lordship of Pegau, Jewish merchants had settled – according to Thietmar of Merseburg – in Merseburg and Magdeburg in the tenth century; a continuous presence of Jews until they first appear again in the documentation – for Merseburg in 1234 and Magdeburg in 1200 – is doubtful. Jews may have settled in Halle in the eleventh century, and are documented from the second half of the twelfth century on. Further West, for Erfurt, Jews are first mentioned in 1212.91

All of the Eastern coins presented here carry only Hebrew letters in their margins, and are unaccompanied by presentations of Jews. Since in most cases the meaning of the Hebrew letters is till today not yet deciphered, they have been interpreted as purely decorative elements designed by Christian mint masters. They are labelled Trugumschrift (‘deception circumcision’) in general, or when focusing on the Hebrew, Zierrathebräisch (‘decoration Hebrew’).92 In my view,

However, the political and economic constellations in the production of each coin as well as the ordered structure of the Hebrew texts still point to Jewish mint masters even if they were not members of a local Jewish community and even if there were only few Jews in the larger regional areas which might have been especially addressed by this script. In future studies probably all scripts will be deciphered.

A very distinct coin with a crutch cross (cross potent, *Krückenkreuz*) associated with the Abbey of Pegau is framed by Hebrew letters, a combination which might imply and intend a theological or in general religious statement regarding the relationship between Christians and Jews. (FIG. 4) However, this combination was mainly caused by a political confrontation between the Abbot of Pegau Siegfried of Rekkin (1185–1223) and Dietrich, Margrave of Sommerschenburg, Rochlitz and Groitzsch (1190–1207). Against the will of the Abbot, Dietrich had been appointed *Vögte* (advocate) of the Pegau Abbey by King Philip of Swabia (1198–1208) in 1198; the Abbot had resisted this appointment, insisting on an earlier agreement with Emperor Frederick I and Emperor Henry VI which gave the advocate’s rights to the King with the stipulation not to give out these rights as fief. In the course of this conflict Dietrich successfully conquered the city of Pegau and drove off Abbot Siegfried who had to take refuge with Duke Bernard of Saxony. The conflict persisted after Siegfried’s return to Pegau a year later, and was taken up on the economic and monetary level as well. When Emperor Frederick I had granted in 1172 the minting right to the Abbots of Pegau, it had been established practice for some decades. Under Abbot Windolf of Pegau (1105–1150), the small merchant settlement near the monastery had developed...
into a city with market and toll under the Abbot’s authority, and Siegfried had expanded the city again around 1190.\textsuperscript{97} An important backbone for this market and monastic revenues was a highly regarded coin, which was easily recognizable by the distinctly large crutch cross (Krückenkreuz) in the center with alternating symbols in the angles and a circumscription. Around 1205/1210, the latter was displaced from the inner circle into the outer margins of the coin.\textsuperscript{98} It became part of the political struggle between the Abbot and the Margrave when Dietrich issued his own coin as soon as he conquered Pegau. In imitation of the abbey’s coin, he took over the symbol of the crutch cross and the attributes of the current coin of the abbey and had his own name (Dietrich) inscribed in the circumscription (in a circle at the periphery of the coin)\textsuperscript{99} – demonstrating the conquest of the city and the taking over of the market with an allegedly as valuable and trustworthy coin as the Abbot’s. At least one kind of these ‘counter coins’ issued by Dietrich until 1207 carries a Hebrew circumscription. It has not yet been deciphered but may hint at a name, either Dietrich’s or the mint master’s. On the basis of otherwise identical symbols (head, cross, star, cross) in the angels of the cross, Schwinkowski identified the ‘Hebrew coin’ – no. 29 in his catalogue – as one of Dietrich’s ‘counter coins’ (another ‘counter coin’ is no. 28). This particular coin was apparently highly regarded; at least it is represented in a very high number (80) in a coin hoard (found in 1933 in Etzoldshain near Grimma) dating from around 1180 to 1230; the coins in this hoard had been issued mainly by the Margraves of Meissen, their neighbors to the West and the royal minting center of Altenburg.\textsuperscript{100} The hoard may point to a merchant or a group of merchants who were doing business on the markets of these regions, and ended up with a relatively high amount of Dietrich’s ‘Hebrew coin’. This coin had also been competing with coins of the royal minting center of Altenburg – founded in 1165 by Emperor Frederick I – that had gained a dominant role in eastern Thuringia around 1190/1200 and had gotten imitated by other minting centers, among them also the one in Pegau.\textsuperscript{101} The array of coins represented in the hoard also sheds some doubt on the effectiveness of the frequent orders of coin cancellations by the lords of the mints. It

\textsuperscript{97} Karlheinz Blaschke, ‘Pegau’, in Lexikon des Mittelalters, VI (1993), row 1856.
\textsuperscript{100} Schwinkowski, Wettinische Lande, pp. 3, 13. Another coin with a crutch cross in the center and with a head, two connected stars, a double-circle and a double imperial orb in the angles of the cross might also carry Hebrew letters in the outer margin. Schwinkowski, \textit{ibidem}, p. 13 no. 34 (according to the coin hoard of Grünroda no. 56, notice also in the same Grünroda hoard no. 59 and 63, c.f. Schwinkowski, \textit{ibidem}, p. 3), groups this coin together with those which belong to the Pegau type but are mostly associated with Dietrich of Groitzsch and other advocates.
\textsuperscript{101} Kamp, Moneta Regis, pp. 309–10, 314.
further is symptomatic of Dietrich coin’s good reputation, since it does not seem to have been affected much by its cancellation.

It is rather probable that the mint master was Jewish. The presence of – very few – Jews in Pegau is documented only from 1388 on, and there are no references to Jews in Groitzsch. Thus, he could have come from the Jewish communities in Merseburg, Halle or Magdeburg, or have been recruited through Dietrich’s contacts at the royal court. But while this remains speculations, the function of the coin seems to become clear once one contextualizes its issuing: in addition to its political statement, the coin was intended to attract merchants to the markets under the aegis of Dietrich, reassured by the Hebrew script of the coin’s high quality – these merchants could have been Christians or Jews. In particular, Jewish merchants – from Merseburg, Halle or Magdeburg or from further away – may have been the new target of these coins, minted to draw them to Dietrich’s markets. In addition, Pegau had attracted recently attention, in the wake of the Translatio Sancti Ottonis initiated by Abbot Siegfried of Rekkin in 1189. It had become an important pilgrimage site, devoted to the veneration of Bishop Otto of Bamberg, which drew many pilgrims from all regions of Central Germany. The Abbot even issued coins with the name of the saint, Otto, next to his own

---

and Saint Jacob’s. Pegau thus became a center of supra-regional importance; this may have fired Abbot’s and later Dietrich’s hopes to attract also merchants involved in long distance trade – Jews and Christians – to their region. Another hypothesis would be an attempt to expand the regional acceptance of the coin by making it accessible and attractive to Jewish merchants in Halle or Merseburg.

This minting policy becomes even more plausible if we follow the chronology of coins minted under the aegis of the Abbot of Pegau as established by Jan-Eric Becker. The characteristics Becker differentiated lead to the assumption that the coin (no. 28), which Schwinkowski used by comparison of attributes to identify and date the ‘Hebrew coin’ (no. 29), and which bears the name Dietrich, was actually issued by his cousin Dietrich the Oppressed, Margrave of Meissen, between 1210 and 1219. This suggests that Dietrich the Oppressed may have hired the Jewish mint master in his struggle with this same Abbot Siegfried. Although he had initially supported Siegfried’s return to Pegau from exile, the relationship had turned very bad when in 1210 Dietrich the Oppressed demanded the advocate’s position over the Abbey of Pegau. Following the Abbot’s refusal, Dietrich sought to harm the Abbot economically by granting nearby Groitzsch the rights to mint, establish a market, and demand tolls. He even prohibited the inhabitants of Groitzsch to undertake any business with the city and Abbey of Pegau. This conflict – in which the Abbot came to demand compensation for the economic losses incurred – lasted until 1219. During this time in Groitzsch, Dietrich the Oppressed also issued ‘counter coins’ in imitation of the Abbot’s coins. He might have had an even more vital interest than his cousin in employing a Jewish mint master and in issuing a coin that stood for quality and trust in the eyes of Christian and Jewish merchants.

The minting of the bracteates or pennies actually had had its beginning in Bautzen and in the Margraviate of Meissen; there they had been minted already from between 1115 and 1125 on; from there they ‘migrated’ to the Western part of

106 Schwinkowski, Wettinische Lande, p. 21 no. 103, refers to a coin with a sitting man with a sword and the typical Meissen shield (Pfahlschild) with four Hebrew letters in the outer margins. See also Walter Schwinkowski, Münz- und Geldgeschichte der Mark Meißen und Münzen der weltlichen Herren nach meißnischer Art (Brakteaten) vor der Groschenprägung (Frankfurt: Adolf Heß Nachfolger, 1931), p. 22 no. 401. This coin is identified with Margrave Konrad of Lausitz (1190–1210), who in 1207 became heir of his brother Dietrich of Groitzsch (1190–1207), including in Dietrich’s position as Vogt (advocate) of Pegau. According to Schwinkowski, the coins could have also been minted under the aegis of Dietrich of Groitzsch or his cousin Dietrich the Oppressed. Depending on further studies, it therefore could turn out that Konrad too employed a Jewish mint master, or that Dietrich of Groitzsch or Dietrich the Oppressed ordered the Hebrew signs not only for their coins imitating the Pegau coin. See also Schwinkowski, Wettinische Lande, pp. 21–25.
Central Germany. A coin with signs resembling Hebrew letters was produced in Bautzen under King Vladislav II of Bohemia. It shows him and his queen, Judith (died after 1174), under an arch with three towers surrounded by these letters. (FIG. 5) In 1158, Duke Vladislav of Bohemia had been crowned king by Emperor Frederick I as reward for his military support against Milan. He also had received the fortress and land of Bautzen, which had previously belonged to the Margraviate of Meissen. From this point on, until 1253, the Bohemian Kings governed it. Vladislav II, however, resigned in 1172 due to growing tensions with another line of the Přemyslid family and a conflict with the emperor over Archbishop Adalbert of Salzburg; he died two years later in Thuringia. The coin minted in Bautzen was probably an attempt on Vladislav’s part to economically develop the region; his minting policy complied with the emperor’s own imperial land policy (Reichslandpolitik) to urbanize and advance trade along the trading routes going out from Leipzig. As potential traders in the region, he might have also in mind the Jews of Prague; they could have been addressed by the Hebrew letters in the outer margins. Furthermore, as the new ruler of Bautzen, Vladislav may have favored a Jewish mint master – the man as an outsider would have been an especially loyal servant.

5 - King Vladislav II of Bohemia, Bautzen. Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Osnabrück, owner of the picture Lübke & Wiedemann, Stuttgart. Equally well established and important as the minting center of Lausitz was the Margraviate of Meissen. When in 1168 lead containing silver was found there, Margrave Otto of Meissen (1156–90) became quasi ‘overnight’ one of the richest nobles of his time. Soon Otto the Rich founded the minting center of Freiberg – moneta Vriberc. Miners, merchants and artisans established a settlement in 1170; already one year later, the Freiberg fortress had begun to be built; it was finished by
1175. Within twelve years after the silver’s discovery, the settlement grew into the largest and economically strongest city in the Margraviate of Meissen. Between 1175 and 1185 – according to Friebe more precisely even between 1180 and 1183 – a particular kind of bracteate was minted under Otto’s aegis or in the name of his brother Duke Dedo V of Groitzsch (1156–1190).114 (FIG. 6) These coins show the fortress of Freiberg and have Hebrew circumscription which might be read as דדו גבר פחה ע(ל) י(די) יוסף נ(רו) י(אר) (Dedo, warrior, duke – by Yosif, his light shall shine) or as דדו כבוד(ו) פחה ע(ל) י(די) יוסף נ(רו) י(אר) (Dedo, honourable duke – by Yosif, his light shall shine).115 As possibly in Pegau or Groitzsch, Otto the Rich


115 Friebe, Arndt, ‘Josef’, p. 22. As to why Duke Dedo V is mentioned on the coin instead of Otto, Friebe, ibidem p. 22, has argued that in Freiberg coins were also minted for Duke Dedo V of Groitzsch. While the technical features of this series of coins point to the minting center of Freiberg, it could also be – in my opinion – that this coin only imitated the Freiberg coin but was actually minted also under the lordship of Duke Dedo V.
employed a Jewish mint master named Yosef in order to boost the reputation of the Freiberg coin and market. While probably no Jews lived in Freiberg at the time, Otto may have had in mind the Jews of Meissen and those Jews involved in the distance trading that could enhance the importance of his new center. Dedo V was the father of Dietrich, Margrave of Sommerschenburg, Rochlitz and Groitzsch (1190–1207), who was discussed earlier as having employed a Jewish mint master. This kind of employment seems to have been a ‘family affair.’

The Freiberg fortress also served as the minting center, thus the image of the fortress refers to both. This composition of Hebrew and the presence of the minting center are comparable to the Würzburg coin’s layout. Freiberg eventually developed into the most important silver mining industry site, whose silver was traded in all German territories as well as in Florence, Venice, the Middle East and

---


Northern Africa. And as a minting center, Freiberg stood on equal terms with the established counterparts in Cologne, Braunschweig, Lübeck, Ulm, and a few others. But it also had to struggle against the imperial coin of Altenburg. The latter increasingly prevailed from the 1170s on. When in 1195 Henry VI occupied the Margraviate of Meissen and withdrew the fief, imperial coins probably began to be minted also in Freiberg.

In conclusion: The different motifs on the so-called ‘Jewish’ coins demonstrated a plurality of different relationships between Christian rulers and lords of the mint on the one side, and the Jewish mint masters on the other. They were first and foremost political and economic statements. ‘Our’ coins were used in a highly politicized spectrum including ministeriales, bishops, dukes, margraves, and the King of Bohemia, always too in their relationship to the Emperor. The minting policies of each ruler were reflections of and means for his establishing of territorial control and his expansion of power. Furthermore, the coins under discussion took part in these developments; they were meant to compete with other ‘Christian’ coins and expand their ambit and region of acceptance against these rival mintings. In all the circumstances and political struggles that we have described, the lord of the mint regarded the presence of Jews, Jewish symbols and letters on their coins as advantageous. These representations were used and accepted as proof of the coin’s high quality. Minting policy also implied market policy. The lord, as lord of the mint, wanted to convey a positive message that would assure the buyers and merchants of a stable and positive value of the currency. In this respect, the ‘Jewish’ coins targeted Christians and Jews alike. The specific markets involved were already frequented by Jews who dealt in distance or long distance trade, or the lords intended to attract them in order to enhance the market’s reputation and importance. The Jewish representations quickly informed the non-local Jews about the currency and its trustworthiness. The role of these coins in general politics as well as minting- and market politics seem to have been unaffected by any pejorative stereotyping process involving the Jews in relation to money. It stands to question if a stereotyping process as documented

121 Friebe, ‘Eine markgräfisch-meißnische Münze’, p. 81, is wrong in assuming a depiction of financial dependency of the mint lord on the Jewish mint master on coins showing a Christian and a Jew. The first argument against it is the goal of the image, which must be positive and convey the ruler’s power, in order to achieve the wanted effect among the buyers and sellers on the markets. Another argument would attribute such depictions to the financial need of the mint lord. But, for instance Otto of Meissen was one of the richest nobles of his time; he was thus in no need to find a financier for his minting business.
122 See above footnote 86.
for the Kingdom of France was indeed even happening in the greater regions from the Wetterau to Bautzen. To the contrary, the coins speak of an economic reality in which the Jewish symbols only functioned as positive incentives for business transactions. The public presentation of the relationship between lord as lord of the mint and Jewish mint master was openly intended; the images speak of a relationship of trust and respect between Jews and Christians on the markets and trade fairs.\textsuperscript{123}

They also testify to the Jewish mint master as a public person whose agency was publicly documented on every coin minted. The pictorial design on the coins was determined by the lord of the mint, but surely with the approval of the Jewish mint master; possibly it was even the result of a negotiation between them. It cannot be determined whether the Jews depicted on, or alluded to in the coins were the mint master or the punch cutter. Punch cutters too left their ‘signature’ on coin images. Their social standing was rather high – some were in great demand and moved in their service from lord to lord.\textsuperscript{124} The \textit{Codex Crusvicense} (twelfth century) of the monastery of Helmarshausen addresses the topic of the Jewish mint master or punch cutter – maybe even in service of a monastery – in several illuminations; they show him in the company of Christians and as presenting his money.\textsuperscript{125} Thus the images on the coins convey to an extent the Jewish mint master’s self-perception.

In general, the depiction of David haCohen on the Münzenberg coin, of the Yechiel-inscription on the Würzburg coin, of the more abstract person with a Jewish hat in Regensburg, and the preference of some Jews for Hebrew inscriptions on coins belong in one category: They are images created by a Jew and a Christian indicating the explicit Jewish identity of the person involved to a Christian and Jewish audience. In the relationship between performer, material and audience, they differ from all other kind of medieval depictions of Jews whose context is religious or theological: Depictions in Hebrew manuscripts were made by Christian artists on behalf of a Jew or a Jewish community for a Jewish audience;\textsuperscript{126} vice versa, depictions in Christian manuscripts, church windows or as sculptures were made by Christians for a Christian audience. Either in a more

\textsuperscript{123} Compare with Lipton, \textit{Dark Mirror}, p. 111.


\textsuperscript{125} For the reference and the images see Friebe, ‘Eine markgräfisch-meißnische Münze’, pp. 82–83.

\textsuperscript{126} Sarit Shalev-Eyni, \textit{Jews among Christians. Hebrew Book Illumination from Lake Constance} (London, Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2010).
concrete or in an abstract way, the images on ‘our’ coins all depict contemporary, not biblical (Old Testament or Gospel) Jews. The political and economic context of each coin is rather clear. Yet despite the ‘secular’ character of the coin, are there any connections to the religious and theological messages about Jews as one finds them, in particular, in Christian manuscripts?

The answer is affirmative. Theology based and – for contemporaries – relative positive perceptions of Jews could enhance the intended message of the coin. In Christian art, Jews were also portrayed as ‘witness to the truth of Christianity’, according to the Augustinian definition. In addition, the hats worn by Jews, ‘by 1155 artistic signs solidly associated with ancient Israelites, confirm their authority to speak to that past, while also signaling the restriction of that authority to purely material matters’. In the context of the coin, these functions could be translated into Jews as witness to the value of the coin; Jews were given the authority to speak to the materiality of the coin. Theological witness to Christian truth turned into economic witness to the quality and stability of the coin. However, in contrast to the theological messages, the supposed ‘stagnancy’ of the Jews could be seen positively; the materiality of the coin and its images only implicitly established the subordination of the Jews. In particular, the figure of David haCohen (who is only wearing a cap) turning in a sitting position towards Kuno of Münzenberg could be viewed that way. All together, the Jewish hat and in particular the Hebrew letters – meaning the name of the mint master (David ha Cohen, Yechiel and Yosef) or any other message – were read by Christians as symbols of this complex understanding of authority and witness.

With all these indications for positive economic relationships between Christians and Jews, another case of minted depiction of Jews puts ‘our’ coins into the right perspective. In a different region, in the Bishopric of Halberstadt, around 1160, a coin included the depiction of the stoning of the martyr (or ‘Protomartyr’) Saint Stephen by Jews. (FIG. 7) On this bracteate, the Jews were additionally signaled by hats. Explicitly religious and theological in contents, this coin would remind the buyers and sellers on the markets of the heinous act of the forefathers of the current Jews towards their patron. It thus implied

127 Compare with Lipton, Dark Mirror, p. 61.
128 Lipton, Dark Mirror, p. 57.
129 Lipton, Dark Mirror, p. 89, also pp. 46–47, 84, 87.
130 Compare with Lipton, Dark Mirror, p. 94.
contemporary Jews’ ability to perform similar acts. It seems that this coin did
not aim at attracting Jewish merchants; instead, it disturbed business relations
between Christians and Jews – Jews are documented in Halberstadt only from
1261 on.\footnote{Urkundenbuch der Stadt Halberstadt, ed. by Gustav Schmidt, Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen 7 (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Wäsenhauses, 1878), p. 103 no. 117.} Here, the religious message was considered to be more important. It
complied with Halberstadt’s self-perception and self-promotion as holy place and
holy city through the assemblage of patrons in imitation of Rome and through
the addition of a number of saints with military background.\footnote{Regarding Halberstadt see Hirschmann, Die Anfänge des Städtewesens, p. 835.}
The coins with a political and economic message regarding Jews which this chapter has discussed were minted between 1170 and c. 1225 (granted that for their dating we must rely on numismatic studies). One may wonder whether their appearance within this particular time frame is a matter of coincidence in transmission and survival; for each of these cases, regional and local reasons in the dimensions of politics and economy can be found that also shed light on the individual circumstances that made each minting opportune. But what about coins minted after 1225? Here further research is necessary, which must also include a more systematic survey through coin collections. However, as far as I know, there is only one – although remarkable – coin with a similar concept dating to the end of the thirteenth century. It shows a ruler with a crown separated from a person with a ‘Jewish’ hat by a sword and a crown; however, both are frontally represented and on a par with each other. (FIG. 8)

134 For a very general survey about Jewish minters from Antiquity to the Modern Era see Daniel M. Friedenberg, Jewish Minters & Medalists (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976), pp. 1–12.

Fig. 8 Picture taken from Heinrich Philipp Cappe, Die Münzen der deutschen Kaiser und Könige des Mittelalters (Dresden, 1850) II, table XVIII no. 193
One of the factors in changing the positive attitude towards the ‘Jewish coin’ and the public display of cooperation with Jewish mint masters may have been the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. Its decisions aimed among others at barring Jews from public offices and from the service of kings and lords. In response to these decisions, the public demonstration of cooperation and of a close relationship between a Christian lord and the Jewish mint master who stood in his service likely became increasingly regarded as untenable and prone to criticism. This shift also meant that such a coin was not to be commissioned, since it likely could no longer be trusted by the general population. The 1220 story by Caesarius of Heisterbach situated in Cologne with which this chapter began may, thus, be a refraction of the first moments in this change in attitudes towards the public presentation of the ‘Jewish coin.’ The Cistercian’s anecdote relies on the stereotype of the avaricious Jew who illegitimately amasses wealth; only now did this stereotype enter the way in which one generally perceived Jewish mint masters. Hence, the absence of ‘Jewish coins’ might indicate the prevalence and acceptance of a new kind of stereotype.

On the other hand, while Jews continued to be employed during the thirteenth and – although to a lesser extent – fourteenth century in connection with the mint, they appear as lessees of the mint (which leaves their active role in the mint open). This task was often combined with other forms of administrative and financial functions performed by these Jews for a lord. In Germany, Bohemia, Moravia, Austria, Hungary and in Poland, the prohibition to employ Jews in public offices was either not headed, or exceptions and compromises were made. For instance, King Ladislaus IV (1272–90) continued ‘to employ Jewish lessees of the royal mint, but forbade them to stamp Hebrew letters on their coinage.’ In Poland, six dukes – Casimir II the Just (d. 1194), Mieszko III the Old (d. 1202), Mieszko the Younger (d. 1193), Bolesław of Kuyavia (d. 1195) as well as Przemysł I (d. 1257) and Przemysł II (d. 1296) – employed Jews as mint masters, who acted very independently as lessees. Altogether 320 different Polish coins have survived, which display a great variety of Hebrew letters and inscriptions as well as Jewish symbols – such as hats – and depictions. Another study of ‘our’ coins would have to compare them with these coins from within the greater Polish regions. In Germany, another factor for the ‘disappearance’ of the ‘Jewish coins’ may have

137 Wenninger, ‘Juden als Münzmeister’.
been the steady and continuous acceptance of the Heller from the imperial minting center of Schwäbisch Hall, which took over many of the regions that had been formerly dominated by the bracteates in Southern, Western and Middle Germany during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{140}

In any case, in the fourteenth century a coin with a distinctly anti-Jewish, denigrating, polemical and aggressive depiction marks the end of any positive connotation in the combination of coins and Jews. It shows the distorted face of a person with a ‘Jewish hat’, a ‘Jewish nose’, and a grotesque open mouth.\textsuperscript{141} (FIG. 9) It reminds us of the \textit{Stimulus Amoris} (‘Goad of Love’), owed to a monk from the Benedictine Abbey of Schönau named Ekbert. This treatise, dating to c. 1155–1180, describes Jews with ‘raging faces and open mouths’, labels Jews ‘bestial’, underlines the ‘beak-like noses and coarse features’.\textsuperscript{142} The theologically and religiously based pejorative depictions of ‘cruel’ Jews and ‘hostile enemies of faith’ – in Ekbert’s case as part of a crucifixion scene – had reached the world of economic and political symbols.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{fig9.png}
\caption{Drawing taken from Hermann Dannenberg, ‘Unedirte Mittelaltermünzen meiner Sammlung’, Zeitschrift für Numismatik 20 (1897), 1–27, table II, no. 40}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{140} Kamp, \textit{Moneta Regis}, pp. 331, 338.
\textsuperscript{142} Lipton, \textit{Dark Mirror}, p. 110, see also pp. 138, 144. Regarding the ‘Jewish nose’, see eadem, pp. 105, 107–09.
ESCHATOLOGY IN THE
CATALAN MAPPAMUNDI
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The Jewish Mallorcan mapmaker Cresques Abraham is associated with several cartographic works; he is also known from abundant documentary evidence, which has been studied in detail by Jaume Riera i Sans, Gabriel Llompart i Moragues, and Jocelyn Hillgarth. These sources not only shed light on his life, his relationship to his patrons, the King and the Crown Prince of Aragon, but also suggest, as Riera i Sans first pointed out, that he is to be identified with 'Elisha ben Abraham Bevenisti, known by the name Cresques', the scribe and illuminator of the so-called Farhi Bible (1366–1383), one of the most celebrated of the extant Hebrew Bibles. This observation can be supported by art-historical study. From

1 In general Cresques’ workshop is associated with the production of portolan charts; literature on this cartographic genre is abundant and listing it all goes beyond the framework of this short paper; for recent surveys, see Ramon Puig i Bataller, Les cartes portolanes. La representació medieval d’una mar solcada (Barcelona: Lunwerg Editores, 2007), chap. 5 (this book also contains a translation into English); L’âge d’or des cartes marines. Quand l’Europe découvrait le monde, exhibition catalogue (Oct. 2012–Jan. 2013), ed. by Catherine Hofmann, Hélène Richard, Emanuelle Vagnozzi (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2012). Both these works offer extensive bibliography on portolan charts.


3 Former collection of David Sassoon, ms. 168; the colophon appears on pp. 2–4. For the identification of Cresques Abraham with Elisha ben Abraham, see Riera i Sans, ‘Cresques Abraham’. These observations were hitherto ignored in research on both cartography and Jewish art history. For the Farhi Bible, see Katrin Kogman-Appel, Jewish Book Art between Islam and Christianity: The Decoration of Hebrew Bibles in Medieval Spain (Leiden and Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004), pp. 150–54, with references to the earlier literature; an exception is Sandra Sáenz López Pérez, ‘El portulano, arte y oficio’, in Cartografía medieval hispánica. Imagen de un mundo en construcción, ed. by Mariano Cuesta Domingo and Alfredo Surroca Carrascosa (Madrid: Real sociedad geográfica y real liga naval español, 2009), pp. 119–30 offering iconographic observations; for a stylistic-technical perspective on the identification of Elisha ben Abraham’s painting with that of Abraham Cresques, see Katrin Kogman-Appel, ‘Observations on the Work of Elisha ben Abraham Cresques’, Ars Judaica, 10 (2014), 27–16.
the Bible’s colophon we know that Elisha was born in 1325. From the documents we learn that he lived all his life in Mallorca as a well-respected mapmaker in the service of the king and that he died in 1387, only four years before one of the most virulent waves of persecution altered Jewish life throughout Iberia. His entire family was eventually forced into Baptism. As mapmaker Elisha Cresques is most prominently associated with the famous Catalan mappamundi in Paris from c. 1375 (Bibliothèque nationale de France, cod. Esp. 30, Fig. 1). Scholars assume that this map is the same work that was commissioned by the Count of Barcelona and Crown Prince of Aragon, later King John I, which was presented to the French court.4

The Farhi Codex is made up of the Bible itself and an additional two hundred pages of various texts. These texts, which are found at the beginning of the manuscript, in fact, represent Elisha Cresques’ private library, so to speak, as the colophon notes that he wrote the codex for himself and his descendants. The Farhi Codex is a highly intellectual project. Not only was Elisha an accomplished and truly professional scribe, but the additional texts portray him as an erudite and knowledgeable man, who was interested in traditional rabbinic learning, was concerned with scientific – primarily calendrical – and philological issues, and demonstrated a great interest in Jewish and, to some degree, non-Jewish history. Apart from his other accomplishments as a scribe, a cartographer, and a generally learned individual, he was a trained miniaturist. The codex reflects a late stage of the Jewish-Islamic cultural symbiosis and contains a wealth of Islamic-style carpet pages and, as common in Sefardi illuminated Bibles, illustrations of the messianic Temple, the latter indebted to Maimonides’ thought on the future messianic sanctuary.5

Whereas the Farhi Codex raised the interest of scholars of Jewish art, the Catalan mappamundi attracted a great deal of attention on the part of historians of cartography. Several facsimile editions have been published, the Bibliothèque nationale de France produced a CD-ROM edition in 1998, and the Library’s Internet site offers images of the entire map in high resolution.6 Naturally, the mappamundi also occupies a prominent place in cartographic surveys, where it is usually described as the principal representative of the so-called ‘transitional

5 Kogman-Appel, Jewish Book Art, pp. 74–88, 146–68, listing the earlier literature on these representations.
6 See n. 4.
Fig. 1 Catalan mappamundi, *Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, cod. Esp. 30, Mallorca, c. 1375: Asia*
phase’ from medieval mappaemundi to early modern scientific maps or as a hybrid of a portolan chart and a medieval mappamundi.7 The map pictures the known world on a broad rectangle (200 × 64 cm) reaching from Iberia and the Canary Islands in the West to China in the East and from Scandinavia in the North to approximately the equator in the South. As common for medieval mappaemundi, it displays an abundance of iconographic subjects. These images are accompanied by explanatory captions in the Occitan language.

Some scholars, including Riera i Sans and Llompart i Moragues, describe Elisha Cresques primarily as a mere colorist, a craftsman who simply put paint on world maps and wooden compass boxes.8 The analysis of his art, his cartography, his scribal work, and the texts he collected put into one framework, however, suggests that he was an erudite member of the Sefardi elite, a man who was perhaps not an active scholar or scientist himself, but one who was well versed in what went on in his intellectual environment.9 In line with Riera i Sans’ approach, Ramon Pujades i Bataller recently argued that the Catalan mappamundi is basically a copy of Angelino Dulcert’s portolan chart of 1339 and that it does not, in fact, exhibit any original features. Dulcert’s chart shows Europe from Iberia to the Black Sea, thus following the common extension of contemporaneous portolan charts. Pujades i Bataller speculates that Dulcert’s chart is actually a fragment of a full mappamundi showing the known world from Iberia to China and that it served as a model for Cresques’ map.10 However, several visual elements – to be discussed in detail elsewhere11 – suggest that Dulcert’s 1339 work was conceived as a conventional portolan chart and not as a full world map, an observation that challenges the assumption that Cresques was simply a copier of portolan charts without any professional background beyond basic training as a miniaturist.

9 Elisha Cresques’ intellectual profile is the subject of a current project undertaken by the author and supported by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation, no. 112/12; the results will be published in Elisha ben Abraham Bevenisti Known as Cresques: The Intellectual Profile of a Medieval Scribe, Illuminator, and Mapmaker in Mallorca (in preparation); see also ‘The Scholarly Interests of a Scribe and Mapmaker in Fourteenth-Century Mallorca: Elisha ben Abraham Bevenisti Cresques’, in The Medieval and Early-Modern Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean: Production, Circulation and Use, ed. by Javier del Barco (Leiden: E. J. Brill, in preparation).
10 For the 1339 chart, see now http://expositions.bnf.fr/marine/grand/por_010.htm (accessed March 2014); Pujades i Bataller, Les cartes portolanes, pp. 482, 487.
11 A detailed comparative analysis will appear in Elisha ben Abraham, chap. 1 and 3.
Moreover, the Catalan mappamundi stands out as a unicum without parallel; Cresques is the only mapmaker of his generation known and documented in the Crown of Aragon, and the richness of documentary evidence is indicative of his high status at court. Despite several features that the Catalan mappamundi and Dulcert’s chart have in common, these observations indicate that Cresques was a knowledgeable professional, who put his own original stamp on the history of cartography.

A wealth of information of historical, political, religious, and legendary nature is included in the mappamundi’s cartography and the iconography, and a profusion of sources, most of them yet to be examined in full, was used to create it: we find echoes of Isidore of Seville, Honorius of Autun, Marco Polo, Abu Abdallah ibn Battuta, and many more.¹² In the following I take a closer look at the most ambiguous image on the mappamundi, a reference to an eschatological realm in the northeastern corner of Asia, and suggest a reading against the background of my contention that Elisha Cresques was not simply a copier of maps, but a knowledgeable scholar with a clearly defined Jewish identity, on the

¹² Much of the earlier literature about the Catalan mappamundi is concerned with the identification of the place names and other elements, primarily of geographic interest, vis-à-vis Marco Polo’s text; see, for example, Grosjean, Catalan Atlas, Einführung; Freiesleben, Der katalanische Weltatlas, chap. 4–15; for a short discussion of the introduction on sheet 2, which constitutes an Occitan paraphrase of parts of Honorius of Autun’s imago mundi, see Edson, World Map, p. 75.
one hand, who coped in a sophisticated manner with the expectations of his royal patron, on the other.¹³

¹³ Recently Philipp Billion suggested some Jewish roots of the portolan method in Iberia, focusing on graphic elements of early portolan charts, in particular in North Africa. Billion, pp. 278–93.

---

*Fig. 3* Monastery at Pedralbes (Barcelona), Chapel of St. Michael, 1343: Fresco attributed to Ferrer and Arnau Bassa (?), The Adoration of the Magi
Religious elements of Christian relevance on the *mappamundi* are of two types: some are conveyed as references to holy sites, including Jerusalem and Catherine’s tomb on Mount Sinai (which is, however, also accompanied by a caption that indicates the Transmission of the Law to the Israelites) and others appear as iconographic references to religious myths. Approaching Elisha Cresques’ treatment of Christianity, one makes the somewhat surprising observation that there is only one reference to the New Testament and that several key Christian elements were taken instead from the famous legend of Prester John. The single reference to the New Testament is a portrayal of the Magi’s journey from Persia to Bethlehem (Fig. 2), but nothing in this depiction relates even remotely to the usual iconography of the Magi venerating Jesus (Fig. 3). Rather, underscoring the Magi’s origin in the East leads to another aspect of their story, namely that the Prester was believed to be a descendant of one of the Magi. Among other allusions to the Prester John legend we find a portrait of King Steven, a Christian ruler in eastern India, and we learn from the caption that accompanies the image of the king that the tomb of the Apostle Thomas is to be found in his country (Fig. 4).

The Letters of Prester John, one letter apparently addressed to Manuel I Komnenos of Byzantium and the other to Frederick I Barbarossa, began to circulate around 1165. These letters describe the country of the Prester in terms of a perfect utopian realm, where there is no sin and nobody suffers any need. They also mention the monstrous races of the East, the ten lost tribes of Israel cut off by a stone river, and close with a meticulous description of the Prester’s fabulous palaces. During the subsequent two centuries the letters underwent a complex textual development. More than two hundred Latin manuscripts have come down to us, most of which do not reflect the original – what scholars commonly call the ‘un-interpolated’ – version, but rather represent an intricate net of textual recensions, all of which were subject to significant interpolations. These recensions led as well to a wealth of vernacular treatments, primarily in Old French and Italian.

---

14 This goes back to the very first mention of Prester John in the West, the chronicle of Otto of Freising from 1145, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus* 7:33, ed. by Adolf Hofmeister, *Monumenta Germaniae Historicae* (Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn’sche Buchhandlung, 1912), pp. 365–66, see now also http://www.dmgh.de (accessed March 2014).


16 A great number of these are discussed in detail in Bettina Wagner, ‘Die ’Epistula presbiteri Johannis’ lateinisch und deutsch. Überlieferung, Textgeschichte, Rezeption und Übertragungen um Mittelalter’ (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2000).
The image in question – the eschatological realm to the north of China – borrows not only from traditions about the realm of Prester John, but also from the similarly famous and popular Alexander romance (Fig. 5). Two large compartments are bordered by mountain ranges. In one of them the people of Gog and Magog are led by their ‘gran senyor’, an emperor underneath a baldachin, who, according to the caption, is to be expected at the End of Times: ‘exirà en temps d’Antichrist ab molta gent (will come forth at the time of the Antichrist with a large crowd of people)’. In the adjacent compartment we find a mature king distributing clusters of golden fruit, which are hanging from leafy branches in his hands, to a crowd of people: secular rulers to the left – we can discern an emperor, a king, and a duke – and clerical authorities to the right. There is no caption near the figures in that compartment. Rather, there are two inscriptions further away, in the ocean, which is an anomaly because everywhere else on the mappamundi the captions appear adjacent to their relevant images. One of these inscriptions, in the upper right-hand corner, quotes Isaiah 67 about spreading the word of God among far-away peoples. A second caption, also placed in the ocean reads:

*Fig. 4* Catalan mappamundi, *Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, cod. Esp. 30, Mallorca, c. 1375: King Steven*
Antechrist. Aquest serà nudrit en Goraym de Galilea e con haurà XXX anys començarà a preicar en Jherusalem e contra tota veritat dirà que ell és Christ fill de Déu viu, e diu-se que rehedificarà lo Temple.\(^\text{17}\)

[Antichrist. He will be raised in Chorazin in the Galilee. At the age of thirty, he will begin to preach in Jerusalem. Against all truth he will claim that he is Christ the son of the living God and that he will rebuild the Temple].\(^\text{18}\)

At the meeting point of the two mountain ranges, we find a picture of Alexander enclosing Gog and Magog and the king with his followers behind the mountains, shutting the area off by means of a castle or a town. The caption, a particularly lengthy one, reads as follows:

Muntanyes de Caspis dins les quals Allexandri viu arbres ten als que les saines tochaven a les nuus e aquí cuidà morir, sinó que Setanat l’en gità per la sua art e per la sua art

---

\(^{17}\) The transcriptions of captions on the mappamundi follow by and large (with some amendments for accuracy) Grosjean; the translations into English are mine.

endo ‘y aquí los tartres Gog e Magog e per èls féu les II images de matall, los demunt scrits. Item encloy aquí molts diverses generacions de gens qui no duputen a manjar tota carn crua, e aquesta és la generació ab què vendrà Antichrist e la lur fi serà foc qui avalor [à] del cel qui ls confondrà.

[The Caspian Mountains, where Alexander encountered trees that were so high that their high ends reached the clouds. He almost died there, would not Satan have assisted him. With the aid of his artistry he shut up the Tartars’ Gog and Magog and set up two painted sculptures made of metal. He also enclosed more generations of people, who are not afraid to eat raw flesh. This is the generation from which the Antichrist will come forth. It will come to an end with fire falling from heaven, destroying these peoples.]

At first sight this illustrates the widespread story of Alexander shutting Gog and Magog up behind the Caspian Mountains. A second look, however, reveals that the image is more complex and, in fact, has some hidden agendas that confront a motif that had grown during the Middle Ages into a blatantly anti-Jewish tradition. I first sketch these traditions from the Christian point of view and follow their journey from an ancient topos of storytelling into a late-medieval anti-Jewish motif. Then I take a look at the Jewish perspective on the same subject matter. Jews, in fact, happened to take an interest in both the Alexander story and the Prester John tradition. I then look at how Elisha Cresques may have made sense of these two legends and created an image of the End of Time that, on the one hand, stood up to the expectations of the Christian monarch who was his patron, but, on the other, did justice to his own Jewish identity. This interplay between two different meanings of the same motif is disguised, so to speak, as part of a scientific endeavor, in a medium that was designed to promote knowledge of the world.

The motif of Enclosed Nations goes back to Flavius Josephus, who reported that on his journey to the East Alexander encountered wild nations who ate human flesh. In order to keep mankind safe from these unclean creatures, *imundas gentes*, Alexander shut them up by pushing two mountains together. Josephus identified the nations with the Scythians and elsewhere in his work with Magog. In a much more elaborate eighth-century version of the life of Alexander, the Revelations of Pseudo Methodius, the nations imprisoned by Alexander were

---

19 ‘Tartars’ was the common popular name for the Tatars (and the Mongols, as well) in the Middle Ages, as they were associated with *tartaros*, for a discussion, s. Felicitas Schmieder, *Europa und die Fremden. Die Mongolen im Urteil des Abendlandes vom 13. bis in das 15. Jahrhundert* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994), pp. 12–13.

identified with the apocalyptic people of Gog and Magog of the biblical tradition, found first in Ezekiel and later in Revelation. The Alexander text also tells us that the man-eaters Gog and Magog will be freed near the End of Time and, together with the Antichrist, who is of Jewish descent, will destroy Christendom just before the Second Coming of Christ. Starting in the thirteenth century the Alexander motif was interpolated into later versions of the Prester John Letters. There we read about man-eaters, descendants of Gog and Magog, who were enclosed by Alexander and that a wall and sixty-two castles (seventy according to some versions) were supposed to keep them imprisoned.

Many medieval mappaemundi show images of Gog and Magog. Christocentric in their basic concept, these maps not only reflect symbolic meaning, but actually function as symbols in their own right. The now lost Ebstorf map, for example, presented the world as the body of Christ. Medieval maps put Jerusalem prominently in the center of a circular world, often with an indication of the Crucifixion or the Resurrection; they display Paradise; show Prester John’s Monstrous Races at the edges of the known world; and depict the Enclosed Nations, Gog and Magog. In the Ebstorf map, to mention only one of the most prominent examples of medieval map making, Gog and Magog are naked, fierce, and ugly; they are shown munching on the dismembered, bloody bodies of their victims (Fig. 6). It is plausible to assume that as a painter of a mappamundi Cresques was expected to include such themes.

21 Ezekiel 38; Revelation 19. 17–18; 20. 7–10.
23 For a discussion of this group of manuscripts and the additional contents in relation to the ‘Ur-text’, see Wagner, Epistola pp. 192–21; for an example, see the edition of Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd. 1, 16, Wagner, Epistola, p. 388.
27 See n. 24 for the Ebstorf map; see also a caption in the Hereford map, Scottt Westrem, The Hereford Map (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), no. 141; for background on the Hereford map, see (selectively) P. D. A. Harvey, Mappa Mundi: The Hereford Map (Toronto University of Toronto Press, 1996); in general on medieval mappaemundi, see Evelyn Edson, Mapping Time and Space: How Medieval Mapmakers Viewed their World (London: The British Library, 1999); Naomi Reed Kline, Maps of Medieval Thought: The Hereford Paradigm (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001).
The fierce and ugly man-eaters of the Ebstorf map can, however, not be compared to the neatly organized crowd of people following the dignified ‘gran senyor’ under the imperial baldachin of the Catalan mappamundi. Only the scorpion on the banner they carry offers a remote allusion to the satanic origin of the Enclosed Nations. Neither can the mature, similarly dignified figure of the ‘Antichrist’ be compared to the deceitful, ugly Antichrist of the Christian iconographic tradition, who often bears clearly visible Jewish features or is shown in association with Jews.\(^{28}\) It appears that albeit their description in the captions, Gog and Magog and the Antichrist in the Catalan mappamundi do not exactly conform to the way they were imagined in fourteenth-century popular Christian belief.

The entire area is separated from the rest of the world by a massive mountain range. These mountains are shown exactly as other individual mountains or larger mountain ranges all over the map, for example, the Atlas Mountains in northern

Africa, the Edom Mountains to the east of Palestine (Fig. 7), the Amol Mountains at the border of Persia, and the Caucasus Mountains between the Black and the Caspian seas. There are numerous individual mountains all over the world. All these mountains were designed basically in one of two ways, and throughout the map Elisha Cresques used these designs to designate mountainous masses of different sizes. The mountains of Edom, for example, have a baseline to the left and a series of mountainous elevations to the right, with the stony texture indicated by the coloring. The same applies to the large mountain range that encloses both Gog and Magog and the ambiguous king distributing the golden fruit. A closer look at the mountain range that separates the king from Gog and Magog, however, shows a somewhat different design, which does not appear anywhere else on the map. Instead of the straight bottom line and the hilly elevations found elsewhere, this mountain range is shown with the same rocky structure, but follows the wavy line of a river. There are many rivers on the mappamundi, all shown as wavy blue lines.
The river between Gog and Magog and the king is much broader, but it follows the same wavy outlines. Within this context the mountain range between them looks like a hugely enlarged river carrying rocks and stones instead of water. One might well assume that what Cresques had in mind applying this particular design to this one mountain range was the legendary River Sambatyon.

As Zvi Ben-Dor Benite explains, it is in post-biblical literature that the lost tribes were assigned a distinct place within world geography and a distinct role in world history. Flavius Josephus located the tribes beyond the Euphrates. Around the seventh and eighth centuries the tribes began increasingly to be associated with the coming of the Messiah. From this point there developed two different narratives, one Jewish and one Christian. According to the latter, the tribes became in Ben-Dor Benite’s words, a ‘superhuman entity coming with the Antichrist’, whereas for the Jews the gathering of the tribes and the return would be the ‘culmination point of [...] a marvelous apocalyptic vision’. According to the Christian narrative Alexander took unclean man-eaters beyond the known world, the oikumene, into distant lands, the eschatiai, whereas from the Jewish point of view the enclosure of the tribes meant that they had chosen an isolated existence, where no outside influence could affect them and they could live according to the Law.

The early Rabbinic tradition discusses whether the lost tribes will have a share in the world to come. According to Rabbi Akiva, they will not return, but according to Rabbi Eliezer, whose opinion became the accepted one in this matter, ‘the future will lighten upon them’. Midrash Genesis Rabbah, finally, reads:

אמר רבי יהודה ב”ר סימון: לא لماם שלן עשרת השבטים של נאם חבירו ומפתחים של שבט יהודה ובניו, שבקים ושבים
גלו למשםาน נור אמתם,闸קם ח災 המפתחים לכל הארץ.

[Rabbi Judah ben Simon said: the tribe of Judah and Benjamin was not exiled to the place to which the ten tribes were exiled, the ten tribes wandered into exile on the other side of the River Sambatyon, but the tribes of Judah and Benjamin are scattered throughout all the land.]

30 Antiquitates X, 9: 16.
31 Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, p. 62.
33 Mishnah Sanhedrin 10:10; for a discussion, see Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, pp. 74–75.
This motif also returns in medieval midrashim associated with the eleventh-century southern French scholar Moses the Preacher. 35

In the ninth century the River Sambatyon figures also in the fictive account of the legendary Eldad Hadani. In a letter that Eldad apparently dispatched to the Jews of Iberia, we read that the tribes are located in various places at the edge of the world between China and Ethiopia. Dan, Naftali, Gad, and Asher, he noted, are found across the River Sambatyon in Ethiopia. The river carries no water, but rather moving stones. It rests only on the Sabbath, but on that day the Israelite inhabitants of the area across the river cannot set out on a journey. 36 Thus, Eldad not only mentions the tribes and the stone river, but, as Ben-Dor Benite points out, he put them into a geographic framework that relied on Arabic geographic knowledge. 37 In fact, like the Catalan mappamundi, Eldad’s world stretched from Iberia to China. Another motif that figures in the texts associated with Eldad Hadani is the protection from the outside world that the stone river offers the tribes: they are independent, secluded, and protected from ritual impurity. 38

As noted, the motif of the ten tribes beyond the stone river subsequently also found its way into the Letters of Prester John. 39 It is found in the ‘un-interpolated’ so-called original Ur-text of the letters; hence it is part of the original composition that defines the realm of Prester John. The letters describe his fabulous Christian realm and go on to explain:

\[\text{...descendit fluvius lapidum codem modo sine aqua, et fluit per terram nostrum usque ad mare harenosum...}\]
\[\text{Ultra fluvium vero lapidum sunt x tribus Iudaeorum, qui quamvis fingant sibi regis, servi tamen nostril sunt et tributarii excellentiae nostrae (...there is a river of stones [...] without water, and it flows through our kingdom all the way to the sea of sand. [...] Beyond the stone river are the ten tribes of the Jews, who, though}\]

35 For discussions of the early medieval midrashic tradition, see Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, pp. 76–77; Micha Perry, Tradition and Transformation: Knowledge Transmission among European Jews in the Middle Ages [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hame’uchad, 2010), chap. 6.
37 Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, p. 99.
38 See, for example, in a letter of the community of Kairouan to the Gaon Tsemah, Epstein, pp. 275–90; Adler, Jewish Travelers, pp. 15–21; Perry, ‘Imaginary War’.
39 Scholars have contemplated the similarities between these two traditions, but have not come up with any conclusive suggestions; for a recent discussion with references to the earlier literature, see Perry, ‘Imaginary War’; after a careful textual analysis on pp. 8–10, Perry suggests that the author of the earliest letter to Prester John indeed was familiar with the Eldad material, and ‘recasts it as counterhistory’; Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, p. 101, on the other hand, implies, without developing the argument any further, that ‘it is clear that there is no connection between the legend of Prester John and Eldad’s stories about the ten tribes.’
they imagine they have kings of their own, are nevertheless our servants and tributaries to our excellency.)

As Micha Perry points out the central point in these discussions about the ten tribes is not merely the different views about their localization in geo-political terms. What seems to be more crucial is, in fact, the question of whether they were politically subordinate or independent. Whereas Eldad Hadani wrote of protection from ritual impurity, even in the early versions of his letter Prester John clearly referred to them as being politically subordinate.Later versions elaborate on attempts to stop the tribes, who threaten to destroy the world, and there are descriptions of large armies led by a powerful king that are stationed in a series of castles near the tribes in order to control them.

Some of the interpolated versions of the Letters, one of them in Occitan, introduced Gog and Magog and the Alexander story. In most these thirteenth-century versions the two are still separate phenomena affecting the realm of Prester John, as they are both found near the borders of his empire. The path from the juxtaposition of the two motifs to the identification of the tribes with Gog and Magog was a short one. In the Occitan version, in fact, Gog and Magog and the ten tribes appear in the same context.

Actually, this path had been taken as early as the middle of the twelfth century by scholars such as Peter Comestor, Godfrey of Viterbo, and Roger Bacon. The anti-Jewish implications of the association of the Israelite (Jewish) tribes with the threatening nations Gog and Magog and its later developments have been described in detail by Benjamin Braude and Andrew Gow. From this perspective, the ugly, naked man-eaters of the Ebstorf or similar maps, that undoubtedly

---

40 Zarncke, ‘Der Priester Johannes’, pp. 914–15. The translation follows Uebel, Ecstatic Transformation, p. 157; in later interpolated versions, this claim is made more forcefully and an Old French version reads: ‘Ja seit içoe ke vos Judeus de la dient k’il aient rel[s] de ça ke sur lur gent seient regnant, de ço n’ai ad tant ne quant, ke tuz sunt en nostre servage e de lur chief rendrunt triwage (I know what your Jews say: that they have a king that rules over their people. This is not the least true. They are all our servants, and we receive tax from their leader’, Martin Gosman, La lettre du Prêtre Jean: les versions en ancien français et en ancien Occitan, texts et commentaires (Groningen: Bouma’s Bookhuis, 1982), p. 130, the quotation in English follows Perry, ‘Imaginary War’, p. 13.

41 This aspect is elaborated on in Perry, ‘Imaginary War’. The political situation touching upon the mythical accounts of the stone river also shines through the travelogue of Benjamin of Tudela; a discussion of this text in the current context goes beyond the scope of this paper and will be considered elsewhere.

42 See, for example, texts that are published in Wagner, Epistolae, pp. 373–87; 398–405 (both in Latin).

43 Wagner, Epistolae, pp. 373–87; 398–405.

44 For the Occitan version, see Gosman, La lettre, pp. 305–31 (p. 307).

circulated, could be (and were) eventually identified not only with the ten tribes, but with the Jewish population in any given European community.

The most elaborate and yet most peculiar version that identifies the tribes with Gog and Magog is found in the fictive travelogue of Sir John Mandeville. Written somewhere in France around the 1350s, it began to circulate a few years before Cresques completed the Catalan mappamundi, but the oldest extant Mandeville manuscript is dated 1371. Mandeville described a land near China, where ‘Jews from the Ten Tribes’ are locked up; they are referred to as Gog and Magog. Mandeville also noted that these people understood no language other than their own. He concluded this section with a mention of the enclosed tribes forming an alliance with the Antichrist, on the one hand, and the Jews living in the Diaspora, on the other, with the ultimate aim of destroying Christendom.

We have no notion as to what degree Elisha Cresques may or may not have been aware of the particulars of these developments. Some modern scholars argue that he used the Mandeville account together with other travel literature. In a recent article Judy Schaaf suggests that the imagery of the Catalan mappamundi conducts a polemical dialogue with Mandeville’s descriptions. Still the time frame is tight, and one cannot claim with any certainty that he could have known of this particular version. However, given the popularity and the wide circulation of this motif from the twelfth century on, there is a very good chance that Cresques was well aware that in the Christian imagination the ten tribes were identified with Gog and Magog. It is more than plausible that he was also aware of the implications of this identification on the real-life contemporary Jewish population of Europe.


49 Judy Schaaf, ‘The Christian-Jewish Debate in the Catalan Atlas in Jews in Medieval Christendom. “Slay them Not” (Études sur le Judaisme medieval 60), ed. Kristine T. Utterback and Merrall Llewelyn Price (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013); This article has come to my attention after I first submitted this chapter. I shall discuss it in further detail in my forthcoming book, Elisha ben Abraham, chap. IV/2. Schaaf’s argument, as far as it concerns the basic idea of polemics is interesting and convincing. My current paper, however, discusses the input of Hebrew scholarship on the way Elisha Cresques seems to have approached eschatology; hence, naturally, in numerous points I disagree with Schaaf; moreover, some of her interpretations are based on misreadings of the Occitan captions.
By the fourteenth century both the Letters of Prester John and the Alexander tradition had aroused the interest of a Jewish readership, and there are several Hebrew versions of both legends. It appears that Cresques shared this Jewish interest and, as we have seen, seems to have related to Christianity specifically through the lens of the Prester John tradition. What then did this tradition imply from his Jewish perspective? On the one hand, the mention of the tribes in the Letters, embedding it specifically in the motif of the stone river, must have raised Jewish interest in the material; on the other hand, the treatment in the Latin and the vernacular versions clearly represented a Christian point of view. Moreover, we know that these versions make a clear claim regarding the tribes’ subordinate position.

The current textual evidence of the Hebrew versions is somewhat problematic. Even though the publishers of these letters, Edward Ullendorff and C. F. Beckingham, assumed that two of these versions were composed in the latter part of the thirteenth century, there is no firm manuscript evidence available for this contention, and Perry, putting such an early date in doubt, argues in favor of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. One of these Hebrew versions, extant only in a print from 1519, produced in Constantinople, seems to confront the particularly Christian elements of the original letters more than the others. It omits a number of these elements and even contains several blatantly anti-Christian points, such as a reference to the ‘unclean corpse of the Apostle Thomas in India’ and the like. This raises the question as to whether the original raison d’être of the Hebrew paraphrases might have served as a polemical confrontation with the original material.


51 Ullendorff recognized a ‘plainly Judaizing tendency’, arguing on the ground of anti-Christian elements and the obvious echoes from Eldad Hadani’s text: ‘The Hebrew Letters of Prester John to the Pope and to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa’, Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Ethiopian Studies, Tel Aviv, 14–17 April 1980 (Rotterdam and Boston: A. A. Balkema, 1986), p. 511. However, the fact that one of the copies of such a Hebrew text is included in Sebastian Münster’s Cosmographia universalis, Book 4, Basel 1550 (see Ullendorff and Beckingham, Hebrew Letters, p. 535) indicates that there was a Christian Hebraist interest as well. For a recent re-visititation of the question of what stands behind these translations, see Perry, ‘Imaginary War’, and Perry, Tradition and Transformation, pp. 74–84.

52 Ullendorff and Beckingham, Hebrew Letters, pp. 17–18.


54 For the Hebrew text with a translation into English, see Ullendorff and Beckingham, Hebrew Letters, pp. 38–71.

55 Ullendorff and Beckingham, Hebrew Letters, p. 41 (דואג טבש אמונא מאשפת').
It has been argued that some of the anti-Christian amendments may have been the work of a sixteenth-century Jewish printer who worked in an Islamic environment and so was not concerned about Christian censure. Although this makes some sense, it is not very likely that a Jewish printer in an Islamic environment invented these amendments, which undoubtedly emerged in the minds of Jews who lived among Christians. This printer, perhaps one who had migrated from Christian Europe, might well have been simply the first to dare to put them on paper. Even though the manuscript evidence does not allow us a full apprehension of these polemical elements, their *Sitz im Leben* was surely somewhere among Jews who lived in the Christian world.

There is further evidence of Jewish dealings with this material. Around the same time that the *mappamundi* was produced, Rabbi Joshua of Lorca confronted a convert known as Pablo de Santa Maria, formerly Solomon Halevi. In his argumentation, it appears that Joshua alluded to the *Prester John* tradition and did so with a particular focus on issues of political independence vs. subordinateness. He noted that even though the Christians claim that the Jews lack political independence, only a small part of the *Israelites* are under Christian domination, and that others dwell in freedom in Ethiopia, where they are the neighbors of *Prester John* with whom they sign an annual treaty. In a recent discussion of the Jewish narrative of the lost tribes in the *Prester John* context, Perry sheds some light on the polemical implications of this relationship. The Jewish narrative, he argues, came as a response to the Christian doctrine that the lack of Jewish political power is clear evidence of Christian triumph. This follows up on Eldad Hadani, who had described the tribes as an independent powerful people who chose isolation in order to guarantee a pristine existence unaffected by any alien influence.

---

57 It was quite common for Italian Jewish printers to move to the Ottoman empire, as there prevailed severe restrictions to the Jewish practice of the profession. For a recent summary of the circumstances with reference to the earlier literature, see Katrin Kogman-Appel, ‘Picture Bibles and Re-written Bibles: The Place of Moses dal Castellazzo in Early Modern Book History’, *Ars Judaica*, 2 (2006), pp. 35–52 (pp. 14–16).
58 To this one can add, that by the early fifteenth century Jewish printers had developed a degree of professional ethics that implied that they were faithful to and careful about the model text that served them for the prints; I am grateful to Elhanan Reiner for his conversation, July 2012.
60 See recently Moti Benmelech, ‘Across the Sambatyon: Early Modern Imaginations of the Ten Tribes and Expectation of their Return’ [in Hebrew]; *Zion* 77 (2012), 491–527 discussing an early modern Hebrew letter reaching Italy in 1432 about the tribes going to war against *Prester John*. 
The same story could mean very different things. According to the Christian versions of Prester John’s letters the tribes are enclosed because they constitute a threat to the utopian society that is ruled by the Prester: ‘Beyond the stone river are the ten tribes of the Jews, who, though they imagine they have kings of their own, are nevertheless our servants and tributaries to our excellency (my emphasis)’.61 The independent tribes of the Jewish narrative had been turned into a people subordinate to the Christian priest-ruler. From the Jewish point of view Prester John’s tale of the subordinate tribes was understood as a tale of politically independent Israelites who chose isolation. Gog and Magog, identified with the tribes in the Christian imagination, turned into a people that would eventually bring redemption for the Jews. According to Jewish expectation, apocalyptic catastrophes of the Christian imagination turned into hopes for salvation and the Christian Antichrist could mean the Jewish Messiah. It is in this context that I suggest revisiting the mappamundi’s ambiguous portrait of Gog and Magog and the king in the adjacent compartment.

Following up on Ben-Dor Benite’s and Perry’s reading of the Prester John material these observations shed light on the dynamics of ‘polemical’ interactions of the sort this image seems to represent.62 Whereas these were not open polemics or matters of theological debate, they did shape Christian and Jewish eschatological expectations. A medieval Christian mappamundi traditionally referenced these matters, but Elisha Cresques integrated his own point of view and showed the dignified emperor of the relatively benignly displayed people across the River Sambatyon. Even though, as expected by his patron, he called them ‘Gog and Magog’, his visual language indicates that he did not envision the fierce and threatening man-eaters that the Christian mind identified with the Jews. Similarly, there is not much malignancy in the representation of the king meant to be understood as ‘Antichrist’; to make matters yet more ambiguous the relevant captions appears at some distance beyond the shores of the ocean.

The imagery of the Catalan mappamundi thus reflects not just familiarity with the Prester John tradition, but speaks of particular Jewish attitudes toward this tradition, attitudes that modern scholars find great difficulty in pinpointing. Elisha Cresques’ Jewish approach to the Prester John tradition is not focused only on Gog and Magog per se but rather makes an attempt to present them as benign, yet powerful, people. Moreover, it is the Prester John tradition in its Jewish garb that determined Cresques’ overall portrayal of Christianity as a utopian one, a Christianity that does not subordinate the Jews, but enters with them into an alliance of equals.

61 See n. 40.
62 Ben-Dor Benite, The Ten Lost Tribes, chap. 3, Perry, ‘Imaginary War’.
Finally, the Hebrew versions elaborate on yet another motif. In the Constantinople print of the Prester's letter, for example, we read:

[And you may know that from that sea of stones there issues a river which comes from Paradise and flows between us and between the great country of the great king Daniel, king of the Jews: and this river flows all the days of the week, but on the Sabbath it does not move from its place, until on the Sunday it returns to its strength. And when this river is full beyond its banks, it carries very many precious stones. And in this river there is no water. And everything that it encounters it carries to the sea Orenoso, and no one can cross it except on the Sabbath. But we are placing guards at the passages, for if the Jews were able to cross they would cause great damage in the whole world against Christians as well as Ishmaelites and against every nation and tongue under the heaven, for there is no nation or tongue which can stand up to them. But I possess in this district sixteen cities built of large stones and fortified and stronger than any in the world, and from one city to the other is a distance of half a mile. And I possess in each of these cities 1000 horsemen and 10,000 foot soldiers and 10,000 archers to guard the mountains and passes, so that the Jews shall not cross; for they are so numerous that, if they were able to cross, they would fight with all the world. And may you know that if I have one fortified city, then the great king, King Daniel, possesses ten. And they have so much gold and precious stones that they adorn their houses with precious stone as we adorn our houses with colored stone. And do not raise objections against me when I write to you, oh great King, that there are under the rule of King Daniel 300 kings, all Jews, and all of them possess countries under the power of King Daniel. And also under his governance are 3000 dukes and counts and great men and we know that his country is unfathomable. And he who has not heard of their community has not heard anything in the world.]
This King Daniel, King of the Jews, appears as a positive counterpart to the powerful destroyer mentioned in the Christian versions. Unlike the Christian tradition, the Hebrew text presents the situation between the Prester and the Israelites not in the sense that the Christians courageously defend the threatened world against the fierce and evil Israelite powers, but rather that the latter are a dominant, mighty force, ‘for there is no nation and tongue which can stand up to them’.

Hence we can take our interpretation yet further and suggest that Elisha Cresques took the motif of the great king known as ‘Daniel, King of the Jews’ and put him up in lieu of the Antichrist, who is mentioned in the captions, but apparently not depicted. In the Jewish mind the Antichrist could, in fact, be identified with the utterly negative image of the עון קריסטו, the evil Christ, which is also mentioned in the Constantinople print:

וכשהעונ קריסטו יולד אלו האנשים יעשו רע גדול בעולם

(and when the evil Christ is born these men [from the tribes] will be doing great evil in the world.)

The king, in contrast, is mature, impressive, authoritative, gentle, and generous. He distributes clusters of gold fruit reminding us of abundant gold and precious stones mentioned in the Hebrew versions of the letters in relation to King Daniel. Under him we find several other kings, rulers, and princes, representing, as it seems, the ‘3000 dukes, and counts and great men...’ Cresques also added the clerical authorities to this motif of dominance, as if to indicate that when the time comes and Israel is free from foreign domination and exile, Christianity will follow the Jewish king.

Faithful – to a certain degree – to the tradition of the medieval mappamundi, Elisha Cresques depicted an eschatological realm in the northeastern corner of the world. He included Gog and Magog and a figure that at first sight was supposed to be associated with the Antichrist. Gog and Magog were placed behind the River Sambatyon, thus alluding to the Christian identification of Gog and Magog with the ten lost Israelite tribes. Against the background of a possible Jewish interest in the Letters of Prester John, however, the meaning of these elements has different implications.

Conclusion

Drawing conclusions regarding this matter is not easy. Apart from the question of dating the Hebrew Prester John material, there is also no certainty about its raison

---

64 Ullendorff and Beckingham, Hebrew Letters, p. 47.
were documents born out of a wide-ranging exchange with Christian culture and the wish on the part of the Jews to enjoy that sort of literature as their Christian neighbors did or were they a polemical response to anti-Jewish elements that were interpolated especially into the later strata of the Prester John tradition? We have seen that Jewish coping with the material was careful and sophisticated, and could, in fact, take a clear polemical turn. Even if the actual written versions known to us today postdate the Catalan mappamundi, as Perry implies, this does not necessarily mean that Jews did not deal with the material earlier on. It is true that there are several possible channels through which Cresques could have familiarized himself with the Prester John legend. Vernacular versions abounded and we have seen that an Occitan text also survived. But we also saw that the latter belongs to those versions that put the ten tribes into the same context as Gog and Magog and the arrival of the Antichrist. Hence, knowledge of this tradition among Jews undoubtedly created reactions to its anti-Jewish elements, even if we cannot prove that the actual surviving Hebrew versions predate Cresques’ work.

In the Catalan mappamundi Gog and Magog stand for the politically strong and independent tribes and the king represents the mythical King Daniel, who was interpolated into the Hebrew versions in order to underscore the motif of expected political independence, as opposed to the original Christian notion of subordinateness. Embedded in a project that was aimed at promoting up-to-date geographical knowledge, this image, ambiguous as it may be, manages to confront official with personal imagery and a royal Weltsbild with concerns of Jewish identity. Fewer than twenty years before Sefardi Jewish society experienced one of its most severe crises, a crisis that forced, among others, Elisha Cresques’ son, Jafudà, and his entire family (including Elisha’s widow) into baptism, this ambiguous representation marks an attempt at coming to terms with Diaspora life accompanied by the hopes of redemption.
IV

PLACES AND ENCOUNTER
L’ATHÉNÉS DES JUIFS : SOURCES HEBRAÏQUES SUR LES JUIFS DE PARIS AU MOYEN ÂGE

Gérard Nahon
École Pratique des Hautes Études (Sorbonne Paris) Section des Sciences religieuses


I. La gestion des espaces du judaïsme à Paris

Paris apparaît pour la première fois dans un responsum de Rashi à Yaqir ben Makhir d’Orléans (?) (fin xi° siècle) : un litige oppose deux juifs qui se pourvoient devant le tribunal rabbinique d’Orléans. Ils se rencontrent à Paris, où n’apparaît alors aucune autorité juive. L’existence d’un ‘rabbinat’ à Paris n’est attestée formellement que vers 1120, lorsque ses maîtres envoient une consultation aux rabbins de Rome. Elle expose les termes d’un conflit interne à la communauté : un nouveau venu à Paris refuse de se soumettre à une taqquana parisienne du type Herem ha-yishuv, restreignant l’installation d’étrangers dans la ville. Aux dires des Parisiens – la réponse romaine ne livre pas leurs noms – cette taqquana s’applique en Ile-de-France, en Bourgogne, en Lotharingie et en Normandie. Les signataires romains Abraham-Ezra ben Mattathias et Menahem ben Juda émettent des critiques sur la forme et sur la fond de la requête. Ils reprochent aussi aux Parisiens de n’avoir pas fourni la teneur de leur taqquana et en réprouvent le principe (Fig. 1)³.

L’espace juif parisien se définit dans les modèles de ketubot et de gittin comme celui de Yehiel ben Joseph et celui de son disciple Peretz ben Elie de Corbeil : « Ici en la ville de Paris sur la Seine et la Bièvre » mentionnant les noms de Bandit, Mosselin, Reine, Rousse et Sephora (Fig. 4). Le modèle de get inséré dans le manuscrit du Talmud babylonien de Munich situant curieusement Paris sur la Seine et l’Essonne, signé : Azriel fils d’un saint rabbin Rabbi Hasmonai ha Cohen Hashmonai témoin, porte la date du 5 Iyar 5068 (26 avril 1308) soit deux ans après l’expulsion de 1306 (Fig. 5)⁴. Il s’agirait, soit d’une pure facétie d’école, soit d’une nostalgie doublée de rancune.

Rishonim, 1962, p. 125, 131–133, 230 ; M. Abraham David a mis à ma disposition son édition en préparation de la chronique d’après le MS de Moscou, Bibliothèque d’Etat de Russie, Günzburg 652 = Jérusalem, IHMM 44.1.07, p. 107 ; j’ai plaisir à l’en remercier.

À la tête de la communauté parisienne des dirigeants dits qetzinim assurent les relations avec le pouvoir royal. Une lettre de ces qetzinim consécutive au drame survenu à Blois en 1171 nous est parvenue : elle relate les péripéties de la tragédie blésoise, l’audience accordée par Louis VII aux qetzinim et la garantie royale en prévision d’accusations analogues (Fig. 9)12.


Dans des maisons juives, le samedi, des domestiques chrétiens font des courses pour la famille, ce qui offusque les rabbins. Rabbi Moïse [de Vienne ?] transmet une relation de Juda de Paris selon laquelle des juifs s’absentèrent de chez eux pour passer la journée entière de Kippour à la synagogue laissant la clef de la cave à une voisine chrétienne ou à la servante de cette dernière au risque de voir leur vin rendu nesekḥ, impropre à la consommation. Compréhensif, Jacob ben Meir Rabbenu Tam – probablement de passage à Paris – avait autorisé le vin17. Quant au lait trait un jour de fête, Rabbi Juda en autorise la consommation, à condition d’y tremper du pain18.

L’espace parisien imprime aussi ses pratiques dans la vie quotidienne, les actes légaux, la mort. Les juifs adoptent des noms français comme Deulesaut (= Joseph fils de Yehiel de Paris)19, Rousse, Sire Fontaine (= Baruch ben Isaac), Sire Léon (= Juda ben Isaac de Paris), Mocelin20, Sire Vives (Yehiel ben Joseph de Paris)... In conspectu resurrectionis on suit la coutume d’Elié de Paris de ne point couper les franges du talith enveloppant le défunt21. Quant à l’endeuillé, Juda de Paris lui permet de faire sa toilette à l’eau chaude, s’il ne le fait point par plaisir (Fig. 11)22.

L’espace parisien s’ouvre vers l’extérieur. Sur la route de Paris, un moine jacobin interpelle Joseph ben Nathan ha-meqaneh à propos de Jacob, un voleur – dit-il – qui acheta à Esai un droit d’ainesse d’une valeur de cent ducats pour un plat de lentilles (Fig. 12)23. Ailleurs Baruch ben Isaac mentionne la mer que l’on traverse pour aller sur la terre de l’île qu’on appelle l’Angleterre : il a arrivé qu’on la traverse en un seul jour par bon vent. On est alors autorisé à s’embarquer le jeudi soir24. Des juifs parisiens se fixent en Angleterre : le rôle fiscal de la Saint-Michel 1191 à Guildford, couche un Jacob de Paris pour dix sous au titre de l’arrérage d’une

16 Livre des Consultations de Rabbi Meir de Rothenbourg (Prague 1668), éd. Moïse Aryeh Bloch et Joseph Sternberg, Budapest, 1895 ; réimpression Tel Aviv, 1969 [en hébreu], p. 159. L’institution de cette amende et son attestation à Paris impliquent selon moi, non Yehiel ben Joseph éminent rabin du XIIIe siècle, mais Yehiel ben Mattitya qui vivait au XIIe siècle.
17 Oxford, MS Bodleian 2696 = Jérusalem, IHMM 12.700, fols 83a et 83b, éd. Gershon Apfel, Sefer ha-Neyar, A Code of Jewish Law written at the end of the thirteenth Century, New York, Yeshiva University, 1960, p. 219 ; ici nouvelle édition, Jérusalem, Makhon Yerushalayim, 2001, p. 120.
18 Sefer ha-neyar, nouv. éd. (note précédente), p. 120 et 54.
19 Selon la graphie מושירא דילשוט Mossire Delesaut attestée par Oxford, Bodleian MS 781 = Jérusalem, IHMM 20.218, fols 67v–68, que certains lisent à tort « Delicieux ».
20 Pour Rousse et Mocelin, modèle dans Oxford, Bodleian MS 781.
21 Sefer ha-neyar, fol. 41v, nouv. éd., pp. 61–62.
22 Sefer ha-neyar, nouv. éd., p. 62.
24 Baruch ben Isaac, Sefer ha-Terumah, Venise, Daniel Bomberg, 1523 ; Zolkiev, Abraham Juda Loeb, 1811, § 225, p. 139.
taille des juifs de Londres. Le 15 novembre 1182 à Lincoln, un Salomon de Paris appose sa signature au bas d’une quittance. Au XIIIe siècle comme au XIIe la destination de la Terre Sainte fait partie des perspectives de voyage. Entreprennent ce voyage Yehiel de Paris et son fils Joseph « lorsqu’il sortit de prison pour monter en Eretz Israel et que son père l’en dissuada par respect pour son propre père qui était encore en vie ». Un mari peut-il contraindre son épouse à le suivre en Terre Sainte ? Rabbenu Hai estime qu’à présent l’obligation d’y résider se trouve suspendue. A l’intention d’éventuels pèlerins, deux guides sont disponibles : d’une part, un itinéraire des villes françaises à traverser avant de s’embarquer à Marseille, d’autre part une description des tombeaux sacrés rédigée par Rabbi Jacob émissaire de Yehiel de Paris (Fig. 6).

II. Le roi

Au XIIe siècle, sous les rois Louis VI le Gros (1108–1137), Louis VII le Jeune (1137–1180), Philippe II Auguste (1180–1226), le pouvoir royal se renforce au détriment du pouvoir seigneurial. Paris devient la capitale du Royaume et la communauté juive s’y trouve au contact du pouvoir. Qu’elle sollicite sa protection en échange de services financiers va de soi. Une proximité – voire une cordialité – entre la personne royale et les rabbins parisiens est suggérée par un *exemplum* recueilli par Isaac ben Dorbelo.

25 Kew, National Archives, Public Record Office E 372/37, Rot.11d', membrane 1, publié dans The Great Rolls of the Pipe of the third and fourth years of the reign of King Richard the First, éd. Doris Mary Stenton, Londres, Pipe Rolls Society, 1926, p. 139.
27 Oxford, MS Bodleian 781, fol. 67v.
28 Talmud de Babylone, Tosaftot Ketubot, 110 b.
A Paris des apostats dénoncèrent un jour au roi tous les Israélites qui jettent de la terre derrière eux au retour des enterrements, les accusant de jeter des maléfices sur les Gentils pour les faire mourir. Le roi accueillit cette calomnie et convoqua le rabbin Moïse fils de Rabbi Yehiel, fils de Rabbi Mattathias le Grand de Paris. Il lui dit : « Quelle est cette méchante pratique que j’apprends à votre encontre ? Vous jetez des maléfices sur les Gentils au retour des enterrements ». Il lui répondit : « Sire le Roi, Dieu préserve qu’il n’y ait rien de tel en Israël ! Mais nous croyons que le Saint Béni soit Il ressuscitera les morts. C’est d’eux qu’un verset dit : “Que les villes voient croître leurs habitants comme l’herbe des champs” (Ps. 87, 16). Nous le récitons en arrachant de l’herbe et en la jetant vers les morts, voulant dire par là que nous croyons que le Saint Béni soit-Il les fait re fleurrir. Ainsi les morts, encore qu’ils soient morts, de même que l’herbe que nous arrachons et qui se fane sur la terre et que le Seigneur fait re fleurrir, le Saint Béni soit-Il les ressuscitera ». Le roi lui dit : « S’il en est ainsi, persévérerez car vous agissez bien. C’est là une croyance grande et bonne car tu es un peuple saint pour le Seigneur ton Dieu. Maudits soient ceux qui vous calomnient car ils ne savent rien du bien de votre croyance. “Car c’est là tout l’homme (Eccl. 12, 13)” ». Puisque le rabbin revint en paix de chez le roi, il raconta l’histoire à la communauté. On rendit grâce au Seigneur et on dit : « Le cœur du roi est comme un ruisseau dans la main du Seigneur. Il le dirige partout où Il veut (Prov. 21, 1)” et le Seigneur agit selon Sa volonté. Béni soit celui qui dévoile Son secret à ceux qui le craignent (cf. Amos 3, 7 et Ps. 25, 14 : l’homme est maître des résolutions de son cœur, mais c’est le Seigneur qui prononce sur elles) ». J’ai ajouté ceci pour raconter la louange du Seigneur d’un fait survenu en France dans la ville de Paris afin que soit connue la raison de cette coutume et qu’à l’avenir le public s’abstienne de l’observer par crainte des Gentils, afin qu’ils ne les soupçonnent point de maléfices et que, le cas échéant, ils sachent répondre des paroles du sage (qui captent) la bienveillance (Eccl. 10, 2) (Fig. 7)\(^31\).

Cet exemplum postule que le roi connaît Moïse ben Yehiel et que, bien qu’ayant d’abord ajouté foi à la calomnie, il veut connaître sa version des faits. Réciproquement, l’auditoire juif du rabbin se montre bien disposé à l’égard du roi que Dieu conduit comme Il l’entend.

L’apologue de la lampe brûlant sans combustible, transcrit par Gedalya Ibn Yahya dans sa Shalsbelet ha Qabbala d’après un ancien qunters met en scène un Yehiel rabbin à Paris. Yehiel fabrique une lampe produisant de la lumière sans

---

huile. Par ailleurs, pour écarter les importuns de sa demeure, il met au point une alarme déclenchant une trappe dans laquelle s’enfonce un intrus. Intrigué par la rumeur sur la lampe magique, le roi veut en avoir le cœur net. Il se rend chez le rabbin et trébuche dans la trappe. Alerté, le rabbin délivre le roi, lui demande pardon et lui expose qu’il tient cette lampe, non d’une quelconque sorcellerie mais d’une invention. Charmé, le roi fait du rabbin un de ses familiers au point de susciter la jalousie des courtisans. On assure en effet au roi que le rabbin tient la personne royale pour impure et qu’il ne boirait pas de son vin. Effectivement Yehiel s’excuse de ne point boire ce vin qui lui est offert par le roi, mais il boit l’eau de l’aiguière dans laquelle le roi s’est lavé les mains (Fig. 8): un topos du folklore médiéval32.

A mon sens, il ne peut s’agir ici de Saint Louis contemporain de Yehiel de Paris. Le pieux monarque nourrissait en effet une détestation absolue des juifs et de la magie : « Quant aux juifs, écrit Guillaume de Chartres, odieux à Dieu et aux hommes, il les avait en telle abomination qu’il ne les pouvait voir »33. Le rabbin du conte s’identifierait plutôt à Yehiel ben Mattathias ha-Gadol de Paris contemporain et parent de Samuel ben Meir, le père du Moïse de l’exemplum funéraire rapporté supra et qui vivait au XIe siècle34. Quant au roi, je retiendrai l’hypothèse Louis VI. La proximité, la familiarité entre le roi et Yehiel apparaît plus sensible que dans l’exemplum précédent puisque non seulement le roi accorde foi à une rumeur le concernant le rabbin mais encore se rend – seul – au domicile du rabbin dont il connaît l’adresse.

Par delà ces historiettes, les qetzinim, les « capitaines » de la communauté ont leurs entrées à la cour. En 1171, après le drame de Blois, dans l’urgence ils se présentent au Palais de Louis VII où ils sont immédiatement introduits : « Lorsque le roi les aperçut, il les salua le premier ; ils répondirent par un salut et se réjouirent en leur cœur. Ils dirent : “Sire le roi, nous souhaitons parler en secret” . Le roi répondit : “Ce n’est pas en secret que je parlerai avec vous mais publiquement” ». Le roi rassure les qetzinim et leur remet des lettres de protection scellées de son sceau35.

Pouvenons-nous comprendre dans cette perspective le responsum dans lequel Rabbenu Tam confie à son collègue Joseph ben Moïse : « Melekhet aberim alay


35 Londres, Jews’ College, MS 28, fols 151–53.
ve-avodat-ha-melekh, les affaires d’autrui et le service du roi se m’incumbent ?
On a supposé que notre rabbin se chargeait de besognes fiscales au profit du comte de Champagne, mais l’hypothèse d’un service auprès du roi – ha-melekh – est aussi à considérer, d’autant que Rabbenu Tam semble bien avoir séjourné à Paris.

Envisageons encore dans cette perspective littérale la taqqana adoptée vers 1160, stipulant le retour de la dot au père dont la fille décède dans l’année de son mariage. L’incipit de l’ordonnance mitáam ha-melekh u-gedolav, « de par le roi et ses grands » reprend certes une citation biblique (Jon. 3, 7), mais l’hypothèse d’une ordonnance intercommunautaire validée par le prince reste plausible.

Cette proximité cesse à l’avènement de Philippe Auguste. En 1181 le jeune roi fait emprisonner plusieurs jours durant les juifs de Paris afin de leur extorquer une rançon. « Mordekhai ben Hillel ha-Cohen 1240 ?–1298) rapporte dans ses notes sur le traité talmudique Avoda zara (idolâtrie) : « J’ai trouvé écrit dans un responsum que, lors de l’emprisonnement des juifs de France, Rabbi Haim Ha-Cohen autorisa le vin bien que des sergents fussent dans les maisons des juifs et les clefs entre leurs mains en train de faire des perquisitions, aucun juif n’étant au logis. Ils y furent plusieurs jours durant et il autorisa le vin alors même qu’il n’y avait pas d’ouverture sur le domaine public. »

Au xiiie siècle, la personne royale est absente des sources hébraïques parisiennes. Cependant la reine mère Blanche de Castille intervient à six reprises avec bienveillance au cours du procès intenté au Talmud en 1240 (Fig. 13). Rabbi Yehiel fait appel à la reine pour garantir sa sécurité et celle de ses collègues. A l’injonction de la reine de prêter serment, le rabbin oppose un refus qu’elle accepte.

On admettre donc qu’au xiiie siècle – et seules les sources hébraïques en témoignent – à la protection politique royale s’ajoute une relation effective ou ressentie comme telle de proximité, d’estime, de compréhension voire d’amitié entre la communauté, ses officiers, ses rabbins et le roi.

38 Talmud de Babylone Mordekhai sur Avoda zara, § 847 et 856.
III. Les maîtres parisiens au XIᵉ siècle

Evènement fondateur de l’autorité intercommunautaire juive dans la France du XIᵉ siècle, le synode réuni à Troyes vers 1150 (Fig. 3) hisse les rabbins parisiens au sommet de la hiérarchie : « Nous nous sommes concertés d’un même cœur, Anciens de Troyes et ses Sages avec les habitants de son ressort alentour, Sages de Dijon et ses alentours, Grands d’Auxerre et de Sens et ses filiales, vénérables d’Orléans et de Touraine et nos frères habitants de Chalons et les Sages du ressort de Reims ve-Rabbotenu-she-be-Paris – et nos Maîtres de Paris – » (Fig. 2). L’intitulé Rabbotenu-she-be-Paris ou simplement Rabbotenu revient fréquemment dans les responsa de Rabbenu Tam témoignant d’une prépondérance indiscutée de Paris sur l’ensemble du royaume. Une taqaggana postérieure vise à empêcher l’abandon des femmes par leurs maris partant en voyage. Elle est contresignée par Rabbenu Tam ‘al pi Rabbotenu she-be-Sarfat, d’après nos maîtres de l’Île-de-France, c’est à dire de Paris. Elle est en fait instituée « par Nous les plus humbles gardiens du troupeau (Jér. 49, 60 & 50, 45) qui nous trouvons à Paris ». Son article 7 confie son contrôle aux Qetzinim de la ville (Fig. 10).

Selon Rami Reiner, le responsum n° 24 de Rabbenu Tam à Rabbenu Samuel ve-Rabbotenu-she-be-Paris est destiné à Elie de Paris, Meshulam de Melun et Samuel ben Meir, lesquels constituent le tribunal rabbinique de la capitale. Rabbotenu recouvrirait dans ce contexte les maîtres parisiens dans leur ensemble, chacun d’entre eux dirigeant une yeshiva. Il arrive pourtant que Rabbenu Tam conteste la compétence de certains des rabbins parisiens : « A nos maîtres – écrit-il justement à Meshulam de Melun – j’ai dit de vive voix que pour certains d’entre eux, il conviendrait de décréter qu’ils ne puissent tenir école »42. À en croire ce responsum, à moins d’admettre un déplacement du corps rabbinique parisien à Ramerupt ou à Troyes, Rabbenu Tam serait venu une fois au moins à Paris : à cette occasion il aurait ainsi apostrophé ses collègues.

Au début du XIᵉ siècle, Elie ben Juda de Paris incarne l’autorité rabbinique parisienne. Par la suite, celle de Rabbenu Tam tend à la supplanter dans le royaume tout entier. En témoigne une tragique péripétie survenue en la ville de Qarnot, un toponyme pouvant désigner Chartres ou Compiègne Voici les faits : « Notre

---

41 Londres Jews’ College, MS Montefiore 150 = Jérusalem, IHMM, microfilm 4642, fol. 54 a.
maître Isaac a dit : il advint que fut assassiné Elie fils du rabbín Rabbi Todros de la ville de Qarnot. Il fut enterré alors que son père ne se trouvait pas dans sa ville et qu’il y rentra trop tard. A son retour, il ne voulut ni manger ni boire avant que les Grands de la génération, notre maître Jacob à Ramerupt et notre maître Elie à Paris ne l’autorisent à évoquer l’âme de son fils par le moyen du Tétragramme. Et toute la communauté lui répondit : Mange et bois. Nous leur enverrons un messager afin qu’ils t’y autorisent.  

A Paris même une séance académique se profile à travers un sermon de Samuel ben Meir sur Nombres 11, 35 « De Kibroth-Hattaava, le peuple partit pour Hacerot et il s’arrêta à Hâcerot ». Samuel ben Meir écrit : « Y avait-il deux Hacerot, une d’où ils partirent et une où ils campèrent ? La chose était douteuse pour nos maîtres et j’ai été interrogé à cet égard à Paris et je l’ai exposé dans un sermon ».  

Deux générations plus tard vers 1224 se tient à Paris une autre séance académique au cours de laquelle les rabbins présents évoquent Elie de Paris et Rabbenu Tam afin d’arbitrer une controverse relative au nœud des tefillin qu’il convient ou non de refaire chaque jour. Le manuscrit de Moscou commence par ces mots : « Cette copie vient de Paris du Midrash de R. Samuel fils du rabbín Elie d’Evreux ». Au delà du problème posé, il apparaît que l’évocation effectuée par le ministère de Metatron impliqua non pas comme prévu Elie de Paris et Rabbenu Tam, mais Moïse en personne et Rabbenu Tam, le premier s’inclinant devant le second. Rabbenu Tam l’emportait finalement sur Elie de Paris.  

En 1200, Juda ben Isaac Sire Léon rétablit de foyer rabbinique de Paris disparu lors de l’expulsion perpétrée par Philippe Auguste entre 1182 et 1198. Pourvu des leçons de d’Isaac ben Samuel de Dampierre, Juda Sire Léon compile la première collection des tossafot du Talmud de Babylone qui constitue la base des études parisiennes. Redevenu foyer majeur des études et de l’élaboration des  


tosafoïtes, Paris accueille nombre de disciples français et étrangers, dont Isaac ben Moshe de Vienne, futur auteur de Sefer Or zar’ua, et Meir de Rothenburg dont les responsa extrêmement nombreux concernent très fréquemment la France et Paris.


Sur le plan liturgique, les rabbins de Paris instituèrent la règle désormais admise en tout lieu selon laquelle le lecteur de la haftarah n’est pas compté au nombre des appelés à la Torah, et ce contrairement à Rashi et à Rabbenu Tam qui le compaient au nombre des appelés. R. Elie de Paris ne le comptait pas ; son avis prévalut et les tosafoïts spécifient à cet égard : « Ainsi l’établit R. Meshullam (de Melun) et ainsi en use-t-on maintenant dans toute la France et on changea l’usage de Rashi, de ses maîtres et de R. Tam » (Tos. Megilla 23 a). On doit encore

---


à Joseph Deulesaut fils de Yehiel de Paris une addition au Mahzor du dernier jour de Pâque.\(^{50}\)

Au xii\textsuperscript{e} comme au xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle les rabbins de Paris – spécialement Elie\(b\). Juda et Juda Sire Léon – se livrent à des calculs complexes pour déterminer, en fonction de l’épisode de Balaam (Nombres 22–24), l’avènement des temps messianiques à partir de l’an 5976 (1215–1216) prolongé sur vingt années.\(^{51}\)

Parmi les écrits rabbiniques parisiens retenons pour le xii\textsuperscript{e} siècle, un commentaire du Qaddish dû à Salomon Gaon de Paris connu par le manuscrit Hebreu 303 du Vatican (fol. 229v)\(^{15}\) et les ouvrages de Jacob ben Samson de Paris, le Sefer ha-Elqoshi et un commentaire des Pirque Avot dont un manuscrit du XIV\textsuperscript{e} siècle est conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hebreu 327. Pour le xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle, les tosafot de Juda Sire Leon, les Pesaqim de Yehiel de Paris s’imposent également.\(^{53}\)

\textit{IV. La forteresse assiégée au xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle : les deux colloques de Paris}

La littérature polémique occupe une place de choix au xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle ; elle entend fournir des arguments pour épondre aux chrétiens lors de joutes amicales ou d’attaques délibérées.

La controverse cordiale est représentée par le Livre de Joseph ha-Mekane qui rapporte des interprétations de versets bibliques et met en scène des interlocuteurs chrétiens, somme toute, amicaux.

Le procès intenté au Talmud marque la montée en puissance de l’offensive chrétienne et vise le Talmud. De la relation hébraïque du procès – manuscrits de Paris et de Moscou –, examinée par nombre d’études, détachons trois traits : la sophistication des attaques chrétiennes et des défenses juives, le climat hostile des séances, entrecoupées d’apostrophes chrétiennes en langue vulgaire destinées à ameuter les assistants contre la partie juive ve-kho amar bi-leshon la’az be-qol.

\(^{50}\) Londres British Library, MS Or. 2735 IV 7, fol. 72, Margoliouth, Catalogue, II, § 661, p. 2902.


ram,

L’issue du procès est connue, la condamnation du Talmud, même si la date du brûlement pose problème. Hillel de Véone composa une relation du brûlement de vingt quatre charretées de livres hébreux, relation que conteste Colette Sirat qui la qualifie de « pamphlet sorti de la plume d’un vieillard amer et haineux ». Cependant, l’élégie de Méir de Rothenbourg et l’instauration d’un jeûne consignée dans le Sefer Shible ha-Leqet de Sédécias ben Abraham ha-rofé de Rome – des témoignages antérieurs à celui de Hillel de Véone – plaident pour l’authenticité de la tradition reçue.

La relation inachevée d’une deuxième controverse tenue à Paris vers 1272, découverte et publiée avec un fac-similé complet de l’unicum de Moscou par Joseph Shatzmiller, porte sur la messianité de Jésus que la partie chrétienne – Paulus Christiani – entend démontrer aux rabbins représentés par Abraham ben Samuel mi-Radom « de Rouen, » une identification que contredit l’apostrophe des officiers royaux aux rabbins : « Nous savons également que la majorité des maîtres de votre loi se trouve en France et en Champagne et qu’ils sont venus ici sur l’ordre du roi » (Fig. 14). La relation hébraïque signale aussi des apostrophes chrétiennes en langue vulgaire. Comme le soutient Chaim Merchavia, ce trait établit avec certitude que les débats se tenaient normalement en latin et partant que nos rabbins savaient le latin. Colette Sirat a tiré d’un manuscrit tardif écrit

56 l’élégie Shaali serufa ba-esh est imprimée dans Abraham Meir Habermann, Sefer gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Sarfar, avec une introduction par Yitzhak Baer, Jérusalem, 1945, pp. 181–85 [en hébreu].
en 1384 quelques vers écrits en français par un scribe étudiant le latin tout en copiant le traité *Gittin*60.

Est-ce dans les lendemains de cette controverse qu’un auteur qualifia Paris de « Ville des sangs où se manifestent de nombreux hérétiques s’attaquant aux paroles des Sages ? »61 Est-ce ce souvenir pénible qui inspira l’élégie *shalfu tsarim horbam libam* chantée sur un air à la mode de Moniot de Paris *zot be-nigun vadure vadure va*, musique dont Raphael Loewe a retrouvé la partition ?62

V. Monuments

Nos sources manuscrites sont pour la plupart enfouies dans des manuscrits conservés à Londres, à Moscou, à Parme, à New York. De quels *monumenta hebraica* provenant directement de Paris disposons-nous aujourd’hui ?

Parmi les manuscrits médiévaux écrits en France au Moyen Age, nous repérons trois manuscrits se rattachant à Paris :

1. Le Pentateuque d’*Abraham ben Jacob*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreu 4.4, fol. 166v, 7 mars 1303 (Fig. 15).

2. Le *Sefer Mitzvot qatan*, Petit Livre des Préceptes, d’Isaac ben Joseph de Corbeil calligraphié par un Joseph Leroy ‘en dehors de Paris’, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreux 643, n° 3. D’après un toponyme inséré dans un formulaire de divorce au fol. 87v. Michel Garel estime que le scribe aurait travaillé à Lövenich, à l’ouest de Cologne entre Aix-la-Chapelle et München Gladbach, et que la formule « en dehors de » renvoie à l’expulsion de 1306 (Fig. 16)63.

3. Le *Sefer Amude Gola*, ou *Sefer Mitzwot Qatan* d’Isaac de Corbeil copié par Abraham de Bagnols emprisonné à Paris c. 1390, New York Jewish Theological

---


Seminary of America, MS Mich 8227 = Jérusalem, IHMM 13.406, fol. 287a (Fig. 17).

A ces manuscrits, joignons un ensemble épigraphique bien connu, provenant de deux cimetières juifs du Moyen Age. Nous en détachons trois inscriptions pour leur apport à l’histoire rabbinique du xiiie siècle parisien. L’épitaphe de Samuel ben Joseph 1247 she-niheg ha-hadarim, qui géra les petites écoles ou les chambres d’étudiants (Fig. 18). L’épitaphe contenant les mots Morenu Rabbi Yehiel, « notre maître Rabbi Yehiel », serait selon Simha Emanuel celle même de Yehiel de Paris décédé, non comme on l’a longtemps cru en Terre Sainte, mais à Paris (Fig. 19)64. L’épitaphe de Salomon ben Juda 1281, maître éminent nulle part ailleurs attesté, aurait-il succédé à Yehiel à la tête de l’Ecole ? (Fig. 20)65

Pour finir, je présente une inscription fragmentaire inédite du Musée d’Art de d’histoire du judaïsme, fragment authentifié par l’expertise archéologique de Claude de Meccquenem (Fig. 21). Je l’interprète comme une inscription synagogue gravée lors du retour des juifs à Paris, peut-être sur une commande de Juda ben Isaac de Paris, réputé avoir restauré l’école rabbinique parisienne :

Je me souviens de Ton nom pendant la nuit Seigneur et j'[observe Ta Loi] (Psaume 119, 55)
Chaque jour je te bénirai, je [célébrerai Ton Nom à jamais] (Psaume 145, 2)
L’an (4)960 li[-ferat Qatan] soit 4.960 AM 1199–1200 AD.

Conclusion

Nos sources hébraïques sont nombreuses mais parcellaires et, pour la plupart, extérieures à Paris. Elles éclairent la vie quotidienne et partiellement le fonctionnement de la communauté66. Elles révèlent une relation spéciale avec la royauté au


66 Le guide le plus sûr à cet égard est l’article de Simon Schwarzfuchs, « La vie interne des communautés juives du nord de la France au temps de Rabbi Yehiel et de ses collègues », in G. Dahan et E. Nicolas (éd.),
XI\textsuperscript{e} siècle, et mettent en valeur les personnalités rabbiniques dominantes : au XII\textsuperscript{e}
siècle, Elie de Paris, au XIII\textsuperscript{e} yedi ben Isaac Sire Léon et Yehiel ben Joseph Sire
Vives. On retiendra leurs décisions halakhiques, leur contribution au grand œuvre des 
tossafot, leur pratique du latin révélée lors de deux controverses. La fin du
XIII\textsuperscript{e} siècle est moins représentée, indice d’un déclin, voire d’un début d’émigra-
tion ? Le naufrage de la Grande Expulsion de 1306 est absent de ces sources. Dans
sa quête exemplaire des traces littéraires hébraïques sur 1306 et ses lendemains,
Susan L. Einbinder n’a pas de rubrique « Paris »\textsuperscript{67}. Si les manuscrits proprement
parisiens sont quasi inexistantes, Paris possède un corpus épigraphique pour le
XIII\textsuperscript{e} et pour le XIV\textsuperscript{e} siècle. Enfin les séquences disséminées dans la littérature
rabbinique, fréquemment représentées dans plusieurs manuscrits aujourd’hui
aisément accessibles, peuvent et doivent faire l’objet d’éditions critiques réunies
dans un corps, un desideratum urgent.

Fig. 1 Responsa des rabbins de Rome à ceux de Paris (c. 1120), Londres, Jews’ College,
MS Montefiore, 98 a 639 = Jérusalem, IHMM 4013, fols 85v–88v.

\textsuperscript{67} Susan L. Einbinder, \textit{No place of Rest, Jewish Literature, Expulsion and the Memory of Medieval France},
Fig. 2 Synode de Troyes 1150, Londres, British Library, MS Add. 11 = Jérusalem, IHMM 4948, fols 256 v–257 v.
Fig. 3 Synode de Troyes (c. 1150), carte.
Fig. 4 Modèle d’acte de divorce parisiens (s. d.), Oxford, MS Bodleian 884 = Jérusalem, IHMM 21.843, fol. 55v.
Fig. 5 Modèle d’acte de divorce parisien (1308 ?). Munich, MS Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 95 = Jérusalem, IHMM 41.375.
Fig. 6 Les signes et les listes des tombeaux de R. Jacob, Londres, Jews’ College, MS Montefiore 492 = Jérusalem, IHMM 6.122, fol. 1.
Fig. 7 Louis VII et R. Moïse b. Yehiel, Londres, British Library, MS Add. 27.200 = Jérusalem, IHMM 5872, fol. 161v.
Fig. 8 La lampe magique de Yehiel, Moscou, Bibliothèque d’État de Russie, MS Günzburg 652 = Jérusalem, IHMM 44.117, fol. 107.
Fig. 9 Lettre des qetznim de Paris, 1171, Londres, Jews' College, MS Montefiore 28 = Jérusalem, IHMM 4699, fol. 103.
Fig. 10 Taqqana parisiene pour la protection des épouses, Londres, Jews’ College, MS Montefiore 130 = Jérusalem, IHMM 4642, fol. 54.
Fig. 11 Lettre de Juda permettant à l’endeuillé de se laver à l’eau chaude, Oxford, MS Bodleian, Hebrew e 17 2696 b 42 c = Jérusalem, IHMM 22700.
Fig. 12 Joseph haMekaneh et un Jacobin sur la route de Paris, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreu 712 = Jérusalem, IHMM 11.581,
Fig. 13 Le vikuah de Yehiel de Paris, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreux 712 = Jerusalem, IHMM 11.581.
Fig. 14 La deuxième controverse de Paris, c. 1272, Moscou, Bibliothèque d’État de Russie, MS Günsburg 1390 = Jérusalem, IHMM 48.942, fols 102a-111b.
Fig. 15 Colophon du Pentateuque copié par Abraham ben Jacob (mars 1303), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreux 44, fol. 166v.
Fig. 16 Le recueil de préceptes de Joseph Leroy, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Hébreu 653.
Fig. 17 ‘Amude Gola, copié par Abraham de Bagnols emprisonné à Paris c. 1390, New York Jewish Theological Seminary, MS Mich 8227 = Jérusalem microfilm 13.406 [ou 43.499], f° 287 a.
Fig. 18 Epitaphe de Samuel b. Joseph, 1247.
Fig. 19 Epitaphe supposée de Yehiel de Paris (s. d.).
Fig. 20 Epitaphe de Salomon ben Juda, 1281.

Fig. 21 Inscription du Parc Monceau, 1199–1200.
ISAAC NATHAN: THE LAST JEWISH INTELLECTUAL IN PROVENCE

Ram Ben Shalom
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The fourteenth century in Provence was termed 'Le siècle d’or' by Bernhard Blumenkranz, mainly in comparison to the three expulsions experienced by the Jews of France. Without ignoring various riots and persecutions, Blumenkranz extended this ‘golden age’ in Provence to include the period in which it was ruled by King René of Anjou in the fifteenth century, particularly for the cities of Marseille and Arles, until the slow decay of the Provençal communities after René of Anjou’s death (1480). Notwithstanding some critiques concerning this notion of a ‘golden age’ in Provence, following Blumenkranz, I will accept in part the idea that an unusual space existed in Provence (and especially Arles) in René’s time, and discuss one prominent feature of this period with Isaac Nathan of Arles (d. in the 1470s), who was the last Jewish intellectual in Provence. In this paper, I will focus on the range of intellectual interests reflected in his literary work, in the context of Jewish social-religious needs of the time.

Isaac Nathan

Isaac Nathan of Arles is best known as the author of the first Hebrew biblical concordance, Me’ir nativ [Illuminating a Path] (1437–1447). He was, at the time, the most prominent leader of Provençal Jewry and the scion of an important dynasty – the Nathan family – whose socio-cultural activities stretched from the thirteenth century to the late fifteenth century. Nathan was the wealthiest Jew in Arles, a drapier and financier with broad commercial interests, who reminds one of the Italian merchants’ activities at the papal court in Avignon, which greatly outstripped those of their Provençal counterparts. He also owned a significant amount of real estate. In the Arles land registry for the year 1437, for example, he is ranked thirteenth among land-owners in general – following ten members of the nobility and two bourgeois anoblis. He was also an important social leader, serving as representative of the Jewish community of Arles in the Jews of Provence’s supreme organization, which decided how the burden of taxation should be

---

divided. Nathan bore the title of procurator of Provence’s Jewish communities, charged with the collection of taxes, and played a central role in the community’s leadership from 1420 to 1462, serving in the capacity of baylon (one among three delegates of the community’s leadership), advisor and treasurer.¹

Here, I will provide a brief summary of three aspects of Nathan’s intellectual activities – religious polemic, messianic-political thought and Jewish-universal ethics – focusing primarily on the originality and innovativeness of his work. I will also try to show that Nathan’s thought and ideas – despite his virtual disappearance from Jewish historical consciousness over the years – had a far-reaching impact on Western European intellectual discourse.

1. Religious Polemic

Nathan devoted much of his intellectual efforts to religious polemics against Christian missionary efforts and to the creation of tools to serve Jewish scholars who engaged in such debates. Foremost among these was his Hebrew concordance project, which he both funded and oversaw, for the benefit of Jewish representatives in religious disputations with Christians over Scripture.² He wrote three lost polemical works (Tokhahat maṭeh [Reproof of a Deceiver], Mivṣar Yiṣḥaq [Fortress of Isaac] and ‘Iggeret piqqurei R. Šemuel [The Heretical Epistle of Rabbi Samuel] – a reply to Alphonsus Bonihominis’ pseudographical ‘best seller’, published in 1339).³ The composition of three polemical works by a single author is, in itself, a matter worthy of study. To the best of my knowledge, no other Jewish polemicist ever wrote more than two polemical works, and even

---

the authorship of two such works was limited to a few exceptional individuals, such as Profayt Duran.5

In his polemical works, Isaac Nathan focused primarily on pressing contemporary issues, such as the missionary activity of the convert Joshua ha-Lorki [Jeronimo de Santa Fe], against whom Nathan wrote Tokhaḥat mat'eb, as well as a sub-chapter in his ethical work, Me'ameš ko‘ah [Fortifying strength].6 He dealt also with the influential and widely-distributed Epistle of Samuel of Morocco. The fact that Nathan concentrated his efforts on the works of apostates (albeit a fictitious one in the case of Samuel of Morocco) indicates that he considered this the most important area of Jewish-Christian polemics.

Although none of Nathan's polemical works have survived, a number of passages from Tokhaḥat mat'eb can be reconstructed through the work of the biblical exegete Isaac Abravanel, who was instrumental in preserving Isaac Nathan's teachings for future generations.7 Abravanel wrote Yēšu‘ot mešiḥo [Salvation of His anointed] [Naples: 1498] primarily as a response to Joshua ha-Lorki's attack on Talmudic aggadah.8 Ha-Lorki used Raymond Martini's Pugio Fidei, and interpreted a number of aggadot from Moses ha-Darshan's Genesis Rabbati in a Christological fashion. Isaac Abravanel suspected Ha-Lorki – unjustly, as Hananel Mack has shown – of having forged the better part of the texts he had ascribed to Moses ha-Darshan.9 Abravanel did not possess a copy of Genesis Rabbati with which he could compare the passages cited by Ha-Lorki,10 and so relied on earlier polemical works, particularly those by Moses Botarel of Avignon and Isaac Nathan, from whom he cited four passages. He used one of these passages to substantiate his claim that Ha-Lorki's had falsified his sources: 'For I [Abravanel] have seen in the words of the sage Isaac Nathan that the assertion that Zion here

7 I will elaborate on this issue in a forthcoming article on Isaac Nathan’s biblical studies: Ram Ben-Shalom, 'Isaac Nathan of Arles’ Series of Biblical Studies and the Phenomenon of Return to Scripture Among the Jews of Provence and Spain in the Fifteenth Century’ [Hebrew], Ṭe‘uda (forthcoming).
9 Hananel Mack, The Mystery of Rabbi Moshe Hadarshan [Hebrew], (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2010).
10 Isaac Abravanel, Yēšu‘ot mešiḥo [Salvations of His Anointed], (Koenigsberg: Gruber ‘et Langriyen, 1861), p. 592.
refers to none other than the Garden of Eden is a falsehood that does not appear in the books. And he [Nathan] was a trustworthy advisor and master of his craft [yo eš ve-ḥākham ḥarašim ve-raʿay lismokh ‘alav].

One of the aggadot of Moses ha-Darshan mentioned in Tokhahat maṭ‘eh is a homily on Genesis 1.1, cited in the Pugio Fidei. It is presented as follows in Yešu‘ot mešiḥo:

As further proof, he [Joshua ha-Lorki] cited another aggadah, which he said was from Genesis Rabbati, by Rabbi Moses ha-Darshan, on [the words] ‘In the beginning God created’, and it appears as follows: In the beginning God created. This corresponds to [the verse] ‘Light is sown for the righteous’. Rabbi Abba said, this is the light of the messiah, and so it is written ‘For with You is the fountain of life; in Your light do we see light’, to teach us that He saw the messiah and his light, and hid him away beneath the throne of His glory […] And from this the apostate [Joshua ha-Lorki] proved that the messiah was God and light itself, and the light dwells with Him beneath the throne of glory, and the sins of his generation brought suffering upon him and he embraced it with love in order to resurrect the dead, that is to rescue the souls from Gehenna and bring them to eternal life. And as I have already noted, I have not seen Moses ha-Darshan’s Genesis Rabbati, but this aggadah also appears in Pesiqta Rabbati.

As Hananel Mack has pointed out, Moses ha-Darshan’s homily on Genesis 1.1 is, in fact, an adaptation of the Pesiqta Rabbati on the verse ‘Arise, shine’ (Isaiah 60.1), which diverges significantly from the original text. Abravanel compared the passage cited by Ha-Lorki from Ha-Darshan’s Genesis Rabbati to the version in the Pesiqta he had before him and which he went on to cite in full. At first he claimed, against Ha-Lorki, that the reference was not to the messiah ben David but to the messiah ben Joseph, who is indeed expected to die and therefore prays for resurrection that he too might arise in the future resurrection of the dead. Abravanel then cited Isaac Nathan’s response to Joshua ha-Lorki:

And the polemicists have already responded in this matter in a general fashion, and we may infer from their words that they did not see that aggadah in the Pesiqta, nor did they remark on the apostate’s interpretation of it. Isaac Nathan, however, explained it that it was meant as a parable and allegory, to illustrate that as the messiah will possess greater leadership over the nations than any of his predecessors – as it is written, ‘and all nations shall flow to [the mountain of the Lord’s house]’ – he will also suffer greater distress, as leadership afflicts those who possess it, for they are burdened with hardships […] and Moses himself said: ‘Kill me, pray, altogether and let me not see my evil fate’. And the greater

11 Isaac Abravanel, Yešu‘ot mešiḥo, pp. 62b–63a and 65a.
12 Isaac Abravanel, Yešu‘ot mešiḥo, p. 62b.
the leadership, the greater the leader’s distress [...] The aggadah may thus also be understood to refer to the messiah ben David, due to the great suffering he will endure in the conquest of the Land of Israel and the wars of the nations, and in performing the wondrous task of resurrecting the dead in his time – that is to say [gathering] the dispersed of Israel, who are [as if] dead in exile. And since he will revive the spirit of the humble and the hearts of the contrite, it [the aggadah] says that he will pray for the dead. And since his leadership will result in peace and tranquillity, glory and beauty, in the salvation of his people [...] And since it is the way of a consummate leader to love those whom he leads, the messiah will therefore wish to help his generation in every possible way. And it [the aggadah] says ‘in my days You will save’ to teach us that the messiah will not have the ability to save them, but God will save them in his days [...] And it [the aggadah] must be understood entirely as hyperbole, metaphor and allegory. These are his [Nathan’s] words, and they are the words of a sage, although I cannot accept the replacement of the resurrection of the dead with a parable or an allegory. 14

Abravanel noted that Isaac Nathan chooses the path of allegorical interpretation but, contrary to Nathan, he was unwilling to go so far as to claim that the reference to the resurrection of the dead in the aggadah is an allegory. He thus went on to suggest an alternative allegorical interpretation. I would like to focus, however, on the passage cited by Abravanel from Nathan’s Tokbhat mat’eh, from which we may gain some insight into his polemical method, imbued with the spirit of allegory and political philosophy. Nathan’s allegorical interpretation of the messiah figure resembles Maimonides’ natural understanding of the messianic era. The messiah is a flesh-and-blood leader who will rule the people of Israel and the nations of the world on an unprecedented scale. The suffering of the messiah is understood in terms of the difficulties posed by world leadership, and as a direct result of the extensive wars he will wage. The resurrection of the dead is not understood in a literal sense, but as a metaphor for the redemption of the Jewish people, whose exile is compared to death. The period of the messiah’s rule will be one of peace and tranquillity, at which time human life will be greatly improved, but redemption (the improvement of human life) will not be wrought by the messiah himself, as he will lack that ability. Redemption will indeed come about in the age of the messiah, but it will be wrought by God.

This brings me to the second aspect of Nathan’s work, messianic-political thought.

14 Isaac Abravanel, Yešuot meliĥo, p. 63a.
2. Messianic-Political Thought

Judging by his *Magdil yešu'ot* [Tower of salvation], which I discussed thoroughly and published in the periodical *Tarbiz*, Isaac Nathan would appear to have disagreed with Maimonides’ view of the messianic era. Although not strictly apocalyptic (contrary to Abravanel), it is on the basis of a harsh rational critique of Jewish society that he rejected the idea of natural messianism, coming down on the side of supernatural messianism, which also lends itself to the preservation of national messianic hopes. In *Magdil yešu’ot*, as we shall see, Nathan takes a natural approach to the figure of the messiah, similar to the one we have observed in *Tokhahat mat’eh*.

At the beginning of *Magdil yešu’ot*, Nathan notes that the work will address the exile’s long duration. He cites an opinion that he characterises as commonly-held, which asserts that there is no longer any hope of redemption and that Jewish exile is eternal. Historical observation, he remarks, reveals that the Jewish people is unlike other peoples, which rise and fall and emerge one from the ruins of the other. The Jewish people, on the other hand, is constantly in a process of decline and degeneration, and is not governed by natural laws. This view was perhaps a reaction to the approach of the provençal philosopher Joseph Ibn Kaspi (1280 – c. 1332) who, in his work *Tam ha-kesef* [The Silver is gone], addressed the practical possibility of establishing a Jewish state given a favourable conjuncture of political circumstance and the generous gift of the Land of Israel to the Jewish people, by its powerful rulers. Similar views to those of Ibn Kaspi were later raised by Hasdai Crescas and, in the seventeenth century, by Baruch Spinoza.

Isaac Nathan, on the other hand, rejected the possibility of redemption by natural means, arguing that redemption will constitute a drastic change in the order of the world, requiring supernatural (catastrophic) intervention:

And for all of these reasons, when we consider the natural course [of events] and its laws, it is impossible that we will obtain salvation or redemption or deliverance if not in a wondrous fashion departing from every natural rule and law. Therefore, we should not wonder if God does not change His order and create new and wondrous things, and destroy the accidents of the natural course [of events]. But when God wishes, in His great loving-kindness, to fulfil the promises of His prophets, then we will wonder, be amazed and astounded.

---

Although his conclusions differ from those of Spinoza, the kind of sober political analysis on which Nathan bases his view anticipates some of Spinoza’s ideas on the Jewish people.\(^{18}\) Isaac Nathan lists eighteen reasons for the persistence of Jewish exile and the Jewish people’s inability to strive for redemption by natural means. In the process, he expresses harsh and unprecedented criticism of the character and nature of the Jews in exile. A number of the topics he addresses appear thoroughly relevant even today, while others may elicit some discomfort and reservations due to their stigmatisation of Jews and the bluntness with which negative Jewish traits are described. I will cite a few examples:

1. According to Isaac Nathan, the Jewish people has lost its unique character as a solitary national group engaged in the struggle against idolatry. Although the non-Jews of his time persecuted the Jews, they believed in a single God, and no longer resembled the idolatrous peoples of the Bible. There was, therefore, no real need for redemption, as there was at the time of the Exodus from Egypt or the return to Zion from Babylonian exile. This position coincided with that of the Provençal scholar Menahem ha-Meiri, who challenged the normative Halakhic view on Christianity (and Islam), wholly rejecting the characterisation of Christians as idolaters. Ha-Meiri coined the term ‘nations that are bound by the ways of religion and accept divinity’,\(^{19}\) and considered Christianity a positive religion.\(^{20}\) Isaac Nathan extended Ha-Meiri’s views on

---

\(^{18}\) See for instance Benedictus (Baruch) de Spinoza, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus: A Critical Inquiry into the History, Purpose and Authenticity of the Hebrew Scriptures*, 3, trans. by Robert Willis (London: Trübner, 1862): ‘Now to me it appears absurd to suppose that Moses should have grudged the presence of God to other nations, or that he would have dared to ask anything of the kind imagined from the Supreme. The truth is that Moses, after he came to know the genius and contumacious temper of his nation, saw clearly that he would never succeed in the course on which he had entered without many and great miracles, and the singular external aid of God; nay, that without such aid the Jews would even perish utterly as a people.’ See also Steven Nadler, ‘Baruch Spinoza’, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta (Fall 2013 Edition), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/spinoza/>.


Christianity from the realm of religious law, primarily concerned with daily interaction between Christians and Jews, to the realm of messianism and redemption.

2. God gave the Land of Israel to the Jewish people in the time of the Patriarchs, due to the idolatry of the peoples of Canaan. The current inhabitants of the land are Muslims, who are beyond any suspicion of idolatry. Therefore, according to Nathan, there would appear to be no reason for their expulsion from the land. Nathan’s sensitivity to the expulsion of a people from its land and his attitude to Muslims are particularly noteworthy:

When the Most High gave estates to nations (Deuteronomy 32. 8) [and gave] the Land to our fathers, the master of the prophets [Moses], peace be upon him, has already noted that it was due to the wickedness of the nations and in fulfilment of the oath He swore to our fathers. And now it has been inherited by the descendants of Ishmael, who have not done according to all the abominations of the Canaanites (following Ezra 9. 1); and all of the seven nations were idolaters, while the descendants of Ishmael who have taken possession of it lack even a hint of idolatry. Thus, they will not be exiled from it on account of their wickedness. 21

Although Maimonides had already made a distinction between Islam and Christianity, ruling that the Ishmaelites are not idolaters, others had rejected that view, characterising Muslims in insulting and humiliating terms. 22 Here too, Nathan extends the Halakhic definition, pertaining to the status of Islam as an idolatrous or non-idolatrous religion, to the point of questioning the very right of the Jewish people to the Holy Land, inhabited by Muslims.

3. According to the prophecy (Hosea 2. 2), ‘And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together, and they shall appoint themselves one head’, the future messiah-leader of the Jewish people will be chosen by a general assembly, convened for that purpose. This is, in Nathan’s opinion, an impossible scenario, as the nations of the world will not permit it. 23 Even if we were to assume, for the sake of argument, that the nations would allow such a congress to be convened, it is inconceivable that such a gathering would succeed in choosing a leader by consensus. Such an eventuality would

23 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 285: ‘For before a single leader can be appointed, there would first have to be an assembly and concurrence […] and that is impossible, because our oppressors [šoveinu; the Christians] will not allow us to reach that point – if not with divine assistance, and that would constitute a sign and complete wonder. And we should not wonder if God does not create a new thing in the land (Jeremiah 31. 21) and upset the natural course of events and [natural] laws, but we should wonder when these things occur. And it will be impossible, if not for a strong, prior cause’.
be precluded by the personal rivalry, jealousy, malice, stubbornness, inconstancy and multiplicity of opinions so common among Jews. Disagreement, argument and debate are highly valued by Jews, even above economic prosperity and well-being. 24 If, nevertheless, for the sake of argument, such an assembly were to reach a joint decision, disputes would immediately break out regarding the correct interpretation of that decision, due to ‘slander and grumbling’. And even if a fitting leader with admirable qualities were to be chosen, the Jews would not listen to him, due to the characteristic Jewish hatred for men of rank:

For even if we were to posit the feasibility of the assembly and an agreement, we would then contest it. We find that they said in his [Moses’] regard ‘And they trusted in the Lord and in Moses His servant’ (Exodus 14. 31), yet they contested him afterwards, [as] he said ‘Yet a little more and they will stone me’ (Exodus 17. 4). And it is said ‘that you should keep acting like a prince over us’ (Numbers 16. 13). [...] For even if it is posited that the assembly and concurrence are truly possible and are not prevented and beset by dispute and slander and grumblings, we would still pay him no heed nor would we accept his authority, even if he were perfectly righteous and a man of truth, for we would despise his actions and loathe him, as he is consummate and of great virtue, for those who are wanting and possess bad qualities are enemies of all virtues and those who possess them [...] for the base temperaments hate their opposites, [as] the Rabbis said, ‘The hatred that the ignorant harbour toward scholars is greater than the hatred that the nations harbour toward Israel’ (Pesahim 49b), and they say ‘Would that there were a scholar [before me] that I might bite him like a dog and not like an ass [should be: like an ass and not like a dog], which does not break bones [when it bites]’ (ibid.). 25 To illustrate his grim political vision, Nathan evokes Jewish life in the diaspora – the Jews’ inability to organise in a satisfactory manner within a community, due to differences, disputes, inept leadership and poor communal organisation. The end result of this political disarray was, according to Isaac Nathan, destruction and apostasy. He notes the demise of a number of communities

24 Isaac Nathan, *Magdil yešu’ot*, in Ben-Shalom, ‘*Magdil yešu’ot*’, p. 285: ‘For even if the spirit [of the Lord] were to descend (following Isaiah 11. 2) upon one of the people, one of the select and exalted few, to make the heroic effort, and stand at the head of the exiles to bring together the dispersed and gather in the scattered ones of Israel (Isaiah 11. 12), we would not heed him or want him as a single leader, to raise up and encourage the entire nation, for the others would envy him and hate him and despise him and slander him, saying that there are many in the land who are more excellent and venerable than he, and that it is unseemly that he should lord over them as chief above them all, out of man’s envy of his fellow (Kohelet 4. 4), and alienation from virtues, and the arrogance of the lowly toward the venerable’.

due to corrupt communal politics and stresses the presence of hatred, animosity and jealousy even in the synagogues.26

5. For the sake of argument, Nathan presumes that even if God were to answer the Jews’ prayers, He would then have to change the base temperament of the people and its negative character – a far more difficult task than creating an entirely new people. In this sense, the Jewish people is like the company of Korah, which was irredeemable and therefore punished with annihilation. The annihilation of Korah’s company was not merely a punishment, but a symbol of its being beyond redemption. It is, therefore, more likely that God will choose to destroy the Jewish people, despite its prayers and repentance, just as He did to Korah and his company.27

Finally, Nathan claims, even if the Jewish people were to form a single nation and return to its land under the leadership of a successful king, the Jewish kingdom would be short-lived, as it would lack the socio-political wisdom possessed by other peoples. And even if the Jews were to learn statecraft, the Jewish kingdom would collapse due to corruption, poor leadership, and misgovernment that would lead to the expulsion of the Jewish people from its land:

For even were it presumed that all of the signs and wonders and transformation of all the aforementioned principles would come about, and we would return to our land and inheritance and become one people with one language (Genesis 11:6), with one king to reign over us as king and prosper (following Jeremiah 23:5), it would still be impossible by virtue of our temperament for us to endure for any length of time in our land, and that is because man is, among his many needs, political in nature, and this people will not dwell apart (following Numbers 23:9), any of them, for they need the company of society, as is the case in every community or congregation, state or commonwealth. And society is divided into three types: a. the company a man keeps with those to whom he is accustomed, [who are] similar or equal to him; b. the company he keeps with those who are lower than him and who are beneath his station; c. [the company he keeps] with those who are much greater than his station. And we, in this long exile of ours, have neither tried nor grown accustomed [????] to frequenting those who are equal or similar to us, because with them our jealousy is ever-present – hostility and animosity persist all day long. Nor have we grown accustomed to those lower

26 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 289: ‘For you see that when we are fortunate in our exile to gather together a certain number of people until we are able to form a community or a congregation, how it is marked by differences of opinion, fighting and grumbling, and great mismanagement and ill order, which leads to the ruin, loss and destruction [of the assemblies]. How many communities have been lost, for having sinned greatly in this matter, for their hatred and envy of one another; and the loathing is great even in the house of God (following Hosea 9:8)’.
27 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 289.
than ourselves, for in our circumstances and oppression and great servitude we were not permitted to buy male and female slaves and servants, and we ourselves were at the bottom of the lowest station, and no one was lower than us. All that remained, therefore, was for us to seek to become accustomed to the company of society and interact only with those who were greater than us and whom we appointed over us as leaders. Even if we [learn] the mode of conduct and [keeping] the company of the society of the other two types, that is the similar and the lower, even then we will suffer mismanagement and ill order that is irreparable and will not endure for long. And since it entails corruption, it will be the reason for our expulsion from our land and from our inheritance (1 Samuel 26. 19), suddenly driven out from among men (Job 30. 5), unless God creates a new thing in the land (Jeremiah 31. 21) and changes our temperament and the nature of our traits. For even with the leaders and the princes of the people we will not know the path of company of society, although we have become accustomed to it, for then each, by his free nature, will aspire to be leader to all, and will not treat the elders and the venerable with deference, and the land will become as one with many princes each a master of men.28

Furthermore, the Jewish state would not have the ability to withstand the many nations that would rise up against it upon its establishment, due to its inhabitants’ lack of military training – not having engaged in martial pursuits while in the diaspora.29

Isaac Nathan concludes the first part of the book with the statement that the eighteen impediments to establishing a Jewish state should, ‘by their nature, virtually preclude any deliverance and redemption for all eternity’.30 In so doing, I believe Nathan sought to emphasise that his list of impediments was by no means trivial – not little more than a scholastic mental exercise, meant merely to stimulate philosophical doubt – although the biblical eschatological prophecies, which had not yet been fulfilled, would, to Nathan’s mind, remove those ‘impediments’. That is not to say, however, that the fulfilment of those prophecies would entirely transform the Jewish people’s negative character. According to Nathan’s sober view, redemption would appear to entail a very significant improvement in
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28 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 287. I have substituted נסכל (niskal) for נשהל (niškal), which is probably a copyist’s error.
29 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 289: ‘For even if we were to presume the removal of all the impediments, and that we were to return to our land and the palace would be inhabited upon its wonted place (Jeremiah 30. 18), we would still have no guarantee that this state of affairs would persevere, because many fight against us, as Ezekiel has already attested with regard to the war of Gog (Ezekiel 18–19) and Zachariah (e.g. Zachariah 12. 14). And how can we escape the fact that we have not been accustomed, these two thousand years or so, to engage in the art of war and the ways of horsemanship and training of forces and increase of valour (Kohelet 10. 10)?’
Jewish conduct and ethics, but not a complete transformation – leaving traces of the character traits of the exilic Jew even at the end of days, perhaps as a necessary reminder of the former state of ‘eternal’ exile.  

There is a clear connection between political messianism and religious polemics. Alphonsus Bonihominis’s Epistle of Samuel of Morocco also addresses questions of exile and redemption. Like Magdil yešu’ot it begins with the problem of eternal Jewish exile. Samuel asks: ‘Why are we Jews persecuted by God in this endless exile in which we find ourselves?’ He replies that it is a punishment for a sin greater than idolatry – the crucifixion and rejection of Jesus as the messiah. In light of the particular importance of the exile argument in Jewish-Christian polemics in general, and Nathan’s own response to Bonihominis’ Epistle, it is reasonable to assume that Magdil yešu’ot was not detached from this polemical context. Based on his harsh socio-political analysis of Jewish society, Nathan concluded that redemption will necessarily be miraculous and supernatural.

Magdil yešu’ot’s opening passage addresses the claims of ‘the many’ who complain of the duration of the exile and the loss of hope in redemption. I believe this should be understood not only in the internal context of biblical exegesis like that of Moses ben Samuel ha-Kohen Ibn Gikatilla (mid-eleventh century), who claimed that most of the biblical prophecies had already been fulfilled (e.g., during the Babylonian exile, in the time of King Hezekiah and in the time of the prophet Nehemiah), or in the context of real expressions of despair within the Jewish communities. It should also be seen as a response to the problem of the Jewish exile’s duration, in a similar vein to Nahmanides’ Sefer ha-ge’ulah (c. 1263) – also written with a dual purpose: against earlier Jewish exegetes (particularly Moses Ibn Gikatilla), and against Christians. Although Magdil yešu’ot deals primarily with internal moral criticism of Jewish life in the diaspora, it also includes an indirect response to the Christian claim that eternal exile is the result of the sin of deicide. In keeping with the prevailing tendency in medieval Jewish biblical

31 Isaac Nathan, Magdil yešu’ot, in Ben-Shalom, ‘Magdil yešu’ot’, p. 289: ‘Not to say that when these impediments are removed they will ‘bring in their hooves’ so that ‘not a hoof will be left behind’ [i.e., no trace of them will remain] (following Exodus 10. 26), but to assert the certainty of the coming of our messiah, absolutely without fail.’

32 Rabbi Samuel Marochianus, De adventu messiae praeertor liber, in Jean-Paul Migne, Patrologia Latina cursus completus, 149, cols. 337–38; Limor, The Epistle of Rabbi Samuel, pp. 177–94; Ora Limor, Jews and Christians in Western Europe: Encounter between Cultures in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance [Hebrew] (Tel-Aviv: The Open University, 1993), III, Unit 5, p. 87. See also Claire Soussen, ‘The Epistle of Rabbi Samuel de Fez, what kind of a new strategy against Judaism?’, in this volume.


exegesis, Isaac Nathan agrees that exile is a punishment for the sins of the Jews, but that these sins have nothing to do with the crucifixion and – perhaps to counter the Christian claim that Jewish exile is eternal – Nathan promises divine redemption, rooted in biblical prophecies.

The primary difference between *Magdil yešu’ot* and earlier Jewish polemical positions is that Jewish exegetes generally blamed the sinfulness of the ‘generation of the fathers’, as in the case of the golden calf, and not the ‘generation of the sons’. Alternatively, as in the *Nizzahon Vetus*, for example, they blamed apostates and wicked individuals, for whose sake all are punished, based on the principle that all Jews bear responsibility for one another. Isaac Nathan, on the other hand, did not hesitate to blame the ‘generation of the sons’, including his own generation, whose sins, he claimed, were the cause of exile’s perpetuation. Nathan made no attempt to portray an ideal moral society suffering for the sins of its forebears (following Lamentations 5. 7: ‘Our fathers have sinned, and are no more; and we have borne their iniquities’), or as the result of a minority of its members’ actions. He sought, rather, to refute the Christian claim regarding the crucifixion by portraying Jewish society as sinful and quarrelsome. Thereby he served two purposes: to refute Christian polemics, and to level sharp internal criticism of Jewish society.

In its social criticism, I believe that *Magdil yešu’ot* closely resembles Solomon Ibn Verga’s *Ševet Yehudah* [Sceptre of Judah], probably written for the most part in Portugal in the early sixteenth century. *Ševet Yehudah* also focuses on the problem of Jewish exile, examining its real causes. As a number of scholars have pointed out, *Ševet Yehudah* is the first Jewish work to raise the question: ‘Why are the Jews hated?’ The author’s answer is not based on religion, but on the laws of nature and the war of the strong against the weak. The Jews are blamed for having brought destruction and exile upon themselves – not as divine punishment, but because they had abandoned military training, preferring to rely on

---


36 From another work by Isaac Nathan one sees that he believed his generation still bore the punishment for the sin of idolatry of the fathers, and that the actions of the generation were such that they were unable to atone for the crimes of the past. See Isaac Nathan, *Maamlehot ha-’elil ‘o hibbur ‘atzabbim* [The kingdoms of the idol or An essay on images], MS Reggio 21, fol. 101r.


divine favour.\textsuperscript{39} Ibn Verga also blames the destruction on negative Jewish traits, such as pride, hatred, discord and the pursuit of power. He accuses the Jews of theft, fraud and embezzlement, and stresses their inability to come to agreement with one another.\textsuperscript{40}

In \textit{Ševet Yehudah}, we thus find the same kind of ethical criticism of the Jews already voiced by \textit{Isaac Nathan} in \textit{Magdil yešu’ot}, as well as an in-depth discussion of the natural order that prevents Jews from attaining redemption. Scholars have rightly called attention to the proto-modern spirit of \textit{ševet Yehudah}. The discovery of \textit{Magdil yešu’ot} confirms that \textit{ševet Yehudah} was not alone in its innovative criticism but that, as Yitzhak Baer surmised, Ibn Verga’s ideas had been developing within Jewish society for some time and that \textit{ševet Yehudah} merely gave them appropriate literary expression. This also explains the popularity of \textit{ševet Yehudah} among Jewish readers over the ages.\textsuperscript{41} The power of \textit{ševet Yehudah} lay in the fascinating literary wrapper in which the author enveloped trenchant social criticism, and in Ibn Verga’s mastery of narrative and dialogue, which helped to mitigate his descriptions of the unpleasant sides of Jewish society. The power of \textit{Magdil yešu’ot}, on the other hand, lay in its intensely critical description of Jewish society. \textit{ševet Yehudah}, recounted the trials and tribulations of the Jewish people, but also managed to entertain readers, and therefore enjoyed wide circulation. \textit{Magdil yešu’ot} would appear, however, to represent a different ethical-literary style – one that sought to shock readers with sternness and pessimism and to hold up a highly-polished mirror to the Jewish public, unflinchingly reflecting its dismal social face. The great success of \textit{ševet Yehudah} – in contrast to fate of \textit{Magdil yešu’ot}, which lay forgotten for many years – may be an indication of just how difficult it was to look into that mirror, and of the fact that critical ideas are more likely to survive in an ironic and light-hearted literary wrapper.

3. Jewish-Universal Ethics\textsuperscript{42}

Nathan’s literary works include an ethical treatise (still in manuscript), called \textit{Me’ame ḳo’ah}. Nathan explained his decision to write \textit{Me’ame ḳo’ah} as stemming from the lack of any comprehensive Jewish ethical work on the subject of the positive and negative traits of the soul:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{39} Yitzhak Baer, \textit{Exile} [Hebrew], translated by Yisrael Eldad (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1980), pp. 69–70.
\textsuperscript{40} Solomon Ibn Verga, \textit{ševet Yehudah}, ed. by Azriel Shohat (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1947) 7, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{41} Baer, \textit{New Comments}, p. 444.
\textsuperscript{42} This section is based on Ram Ben-Shalom, ‘The First Jewish Work on the Seven Deadly Sins and the Four Virtues’, \textit{Mediaeval Studies}, 75 (2013), pp. 205–70.
\end{flushright}
It is my intention in this treatise, to elucidate the qualities of the soul and conduct – some of which are called qualities, perfections and virtues, while the evil ones are called vices. For we have not seen among the words of the ancients that have come down to us any comprehensive treatise on this matter, and they have hardly addressed it at all, although it is a great principle in human life. [...] And if the ancients made any remarks or intimations, these are scattered throughout their works so that they offer no benefit, unless gathered and compiled in a single work [...]. And the extensive treatment of these things by the Sage [Aristotle] in the Ethics is not easily understood by the reader, for it is closed and sealed [to all] but those who are familiar with his works and accustomed to the depths of his inquiries and proofs.43

Isaac Nathan gives three reasons for his decision to engage in ethics: 1. the lack of a comprehensive work on the subject in Jewish ethical literature; 2. to the extent that Jewish scholars did address this aspect of ethics, their words are scattered over many different works; 3. Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics is accessible only to philosophers familiar with his writings.

He was well acquainted with Christian theological literature,44 and knowingly chose the model of the seven deadly sins and the four virtues as the basic structure for his treatise. He was also aware of the audacity and innovation in employing a Christian method in a work aimed at a Jewish readership, but argued that there is no reason to reject a particular model simply because it is Christian. He believed that if there is something of value in Christian literature, it is incumbent upon Jews to adopt it:

I therefore decided to compose a separate treatise, in which I will first include all of the seven universal traits that drive those who possess them to eternal destruction [and are] called the seven deadly sins by adherents of the new faith [i.e. Christianity]. And they constitute universal categories encompassing all of the warnings of the Torah. For although this division does not appear in any of our books, we need not refrain from following others in that which we deem fitting and right. [...] Therefore, inasmuch as the division into these categories is right and proper, it is good to follow them, for universal speculation is the best [literally self: be-nafšo] choice, for it is from these failings that all sins arise, and in this [speculation will be demonstrated] their immediate causes, and a treatise on these [failings] will [also] reveal their counterparts and opposites. The structure of the treatise will then follow the four primary categories of virtues that also serve as universal types for all of the commandments of the Torah. They [the four primary categories] comprise accomplishments and causes, and they are used to describe

43 Isaac Nathan, Me’amāṣ ko‘ah, Moscow, Russian State Library, MS Guenzburg, no. 113/4, fols iv-xx.
the human perfection attained by those who possess them [...] and with them, their counterparts and opposites will [also] be revealed.\textsuperscript{45}

Nathan accepted the two main characteristics of the Christian method previously rejected by the Aragonese Jewish leader and philosopher Hasdai Crescas: the capital nature of the sins – that is their great importance and role as the root and cause of other sins – and their deadly, unforgivable essence. Until the fifteenth century, Christian theology made a clear distinction between mortal and capital sins. Later, the boundaries between the two concepts became blurred.\textsuperscript{47} It is thus not surprising that they are combined in Nathan’s work. In his treatment of each sin, Nathan reiterates the idea of deadliness, thereby demonstrating his identification with the Christian idea of the soul’s destruction as a result of sin – beyond his acceptance of the general method of the sins as a convenient literary tool for ethical instruction.

Nathan’s adoption of the Christian method of the seven deadly sins was not simply a matter of form. He was thoroughly acquainted with the details of the method and thus, for example, arranged the sins in the order commonly used in Latin Christianity: Superbia, Avaritia, Luxuria, Ira, Gula, Invidia, Acedia. This hierarchy of the deadly sins is reflected in the acrostic formula SALIGIA, which served as a mnemonic device – certainly more pleasant to the ear than the competing Gregorian formula SIIAGL or VITAGL, or the Cassian GLAITEVS.\textsuperscript{48} Of course, this mnemotechnical formula was meaningless in Hebrew, and Nathan’s adoption of the order of the sins commonly accepted in the Christian world reflects conformity to the method that dominated in his environment.

Literary works based on the seven (or eight) sins have long been considered part of an exclusively Christian genre, entirely absent from Jewish literature.

\textsuperscript{45} Me’ameṣ ko’aḥ, fols 2v-3r.
\textsuperscript{46} Hasdai Crescas notes the method of the deadly sins and points out its flaws, in his The Refutation of the Christian Principles, 9, trans. by Daniel J. Lasker (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), pp. 73–74, written (c. 1398) to address the wave of conversions to Christianity among Jewish intellectuals, following the persecutions of 1391. Crescas asserts that a perfect faith is one that guides its adherents to (ethical) perfection and (spiritual) felicity with greater simplicity and ease than other faiths. Christianity is not a perfect faith, he argues, because its ethical demands are more difficult than those of other faiths, and are in fact impossible for most people. The concept of deadly sins posits the destruction of the soul as a result of natural behavior such as wrath, gluttony or sloth, which are in fact general human habits, shared by society as a whole. The Christian premise that one may lose eternal life for having committed any one of these sins is thus an erroneous ethical position that must be rejected.
\textsuperscript{48} See Bloomfield, The Seven Deadly Sins, pp. 72 (SIITAGL or VITAGL) and 86 (SALIGIA); Arthur Watson, ‘Saligia’, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 10 (1947), pp. 148–50; Richard Newhauser, The Treatise on Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 68 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993), p. 68.
However, *Me'ameṣ koʾah* subverts this orthodoxy. In the past, I have analyzed a number of historical exempla in *Me'ameṣ koʾah*, which include references to the Tortosa Disputation, to Joshua ha-Lorki (Jeronimo de Santa Fe), and to the missionary activity of Vincent Ferrer; to events surrounding the Great Schism (and especially to the election and figure of Benedict XIII); to relations between Benedict XIII and Vincent Ferrer; to the itinerant preaching of the reformer Thomas Conecte in north-western Europe, and his being burnt at the stake in Rome; as well as to episodes from ancient history, such as the conquest of Athens by ‘Philip’ (should be Alexander the Great) and various stories from Roman times. ⁴⁹

A comparison between *Me'ameṣ koʾah* and other Jewish ethical works shows that Nathan’s treatise was not unusual in its use of exempla to illustrate or reinforce ethical ideas. This literary phenomenon can be observed in the first Hebrew ethical works, dating from the Geonic period. ⁵⁰ Despite these precedents, contemporary literature’s influence on *Me’ameṣ ko’aḥ* is evident. The opening phrases employed by Nathan, for example, recall those encountered in Christian exempla: *fertur* (‘it has been reported’) or *legitur* (‘one reads’) when citing an external source, and *credo me audivisse* (‘I believe I heard’), *ut ego vidi* (‘as I myself saw’), or *sicut ego vidi* (‘just as I myself saw’), when the events described were witnessed by the author. ⁵¹ Furthermore, the topics of the exempla in *Me’ameṣ koʾah* are very similar to those commonly found in Christian exempla literature, such as in Vincent Ferrer’s collected sermons. ⁵²

Nathan may also have been influenced by works of pastoral theology and instruction on the seven deadly sins and the four virtues, composed from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, which mustered exempla from religious and
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secular history, lives of saints, legends, examples from the natural world, and personal narratives. One such work is Dominican friar Guillaume Peraud’s *Summa de viciis et virtutibus* (second quarter of the thirteenth century), which includes some two hundred exempla. This text was widely known, and served preachers and moralists as a source of inspiration. Another example is the encyclopaedic *Somme-le-Roi* (1279), owed to Frère Laurent, another Dominican and confessor to King Philip III (The Bold) of France. This other compendium addresses the subject of the seven deadly sins and the virtues, and was translated from Latin into many vernacular languages, including Provençal. The *Brevilogium de virtutibus* (completed 1265–1275), by the Franciscan John of Wales, may also have served as a model of a treatise on the virtues that incorporates exempla from many different and varied sources. However, among the many books written on the subject in Latin and in the vernacular, it is impossible to identify a single Christian work that could have served as a model for *Me’ameṣ ko’aḥ*.

In the introduction to his concordance, *Me’ir nativ*, Nathan recounts his experiences as a young student, when Christian scholars sought to engage him in religious debate. He identifies two types of Christian polemicists he encountered then: the scholastics, who employed philosophy and logic to prove the Christian faith’s truth; and the Franciscans, who used prefiguration and allegory in their sermons. Among their books, he discovered the Latin concordance of the Bible, recognized its value, and decided to undertake a similar enterprise in Hebrew. In his description, Nathan implies that he frequented a Christian library or libraries, and that he was familiar with Christian literature – particularly that produced by the Dominicans and the Franciscans for a broad, urban readership. (Furthermore, the will of his mother, Venguessone Nathan attests to the presence of Latin works in her library). *Me’ameṣ ko’aḥ* thus followed a literary method similar to the one employed in the mendicant literature on the sins and the virtues. Nathan’s choice of a light, popular style, however (as opposed to pure philosophical speculation), which combines philosophy – Aristotle in particular – with biblical and Rabbinic literature, was part of a broader trend in Jewish thought in Spain and Provence, sensitive to the intellectual and social needs of members of that generation.

Up until recently, we knew of adoptions of Christian theological and ethical methods by Jewish intellectuals only for Italy and this in the latter half of the
sixteenth century. Leon (Judah Aryeh) Modena’s Ṣemaḥ ṣaddiq [Flower of the virtuous] (1600), for example, reproduced the Christian catechism originally published in the well-known medieval florilegium Fior di virtù, and Abraham Yagel’s Leqah ṭov [Good instruction] copied a catechism by the Jesuit scholar Peter Canisius. Me’ame ṣkoḥ ḥ demonstrates that the process began much earlier and in another geographical region. I believe that the explicit incorporation of Christian theology and ethics into Jewish ethical thought was a significant development – attributable, on the one hand, to the unusual personality and courage of one fifteenth-century leader of Provençal Jewry, but also, on the other hand, to a long-term cultural process (longue durée), to which many Provençal scholars had contributed over the years, including various members of the Ibn Tibbon family, Jacob Anatoli, Menahem ha-Meiri, Jacob ben Makhir, Kalonymos ben Kalonymos, and many others. It was this cultural-intellectual process in Provence that enabled Isaac Nathan to arrive, without fear, at his conclusions regarding possible theological and ethical cooperation between Jews and Christians.

Jacob Katz examined the shared values that guided the customs and rituals of medieval Jewish and Christian societies, concluding that in the absence of a common source of moral authority, the relationship between the two societies could not be based on a mutually accepted value system. Jews and Christians necessarily differentiated between inward and outward ethics. Jewish ethicists rarely sought to formulate such common values, at most admonishing their audiences and readers to remember their responsibilities as members of a religious minority. The approach adopted by Menahem ha-Meiri of Perpignan was, according to Katz, a product of the new synthesis between philosophy and the Halakhic traditions of Ashkenaz and Provence. In his approach to Christianity, ha-Meiri deviated from the dominant Halakhic view, clearly establishing, on a fundamental level, that neither Christians nor Muslims should be considered idolaters.

Isaac Nathan’s intellectual output was an integral part of this phenomenon. Like ha-Meiri, Nathan also wrote a short treatise on repentance, and the realm of religious polemic constituted, as noted, the focal point of much
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59 See above note 20.
60 Oxford, Bodleian Library (Neubauer 2232), MS Reggio 21, fols 110v-111r.
of his work. Unlike ha-Meiri, Nathan did not address matters of Halakhah. Like ha-Me’iri, furthermore, he sought to establish universal moral principles. The extensive commercial interaction between Jews and Christians in Provence demanded an intellectual-social solution to the problem of double ethical standards. A work like Me’ameṣ ko’ah offered such a solution, in the form of a shared value system – rooted in the Christian theological method of the seven deadly sins and the four virtues, but devoid of Christology, and therefore also acceptable to Jews. The shared value system was developed by means of the exempla stories, taken both from Jewish, Midrashic tradition, and from the Western European popular and high culture common to Christians and Jews alike. Nathan grounded his ethics in Biblical sources common to both religions, and in Aristotelian ethics, widely embraced in both societies. This innovative approach, which could easily have aroused considerable opposition, benefited from the author’s prestige, as a prominent leader of Provençal Jewry, and a well-known polemicist, defender of his people against Christian missionary efforts.

The popularity of Me’ameṣ ko’ah never extended beyond the limited, intellectual circle of Provençal Jewry. This may have been due, in part, to its radical approach, although its lack of success should probably be attributed primarily to the Jews of Provence’s expulsion (around 1500), and their dispersal throughout the Jewish diaspora. This was a time of general upheaval, in the wake of the expulsion from Spain (1492). After 1500, the vast majority of the Jews, including those expelled from Provence, lived in the Muslim world, particularly in the Ottoman Empire and North Africa. Attempts to bridge the gap between Jewish and Christian values thus became far less relevant than in the past.

In closing, one might mention that while Nathan’s concordance project exerted a decisive influence on the Rabbinic Bible (Miqra’ot gedolot) printed by Daniel Bomberg in Venice in 1525 – and thus on Jewish acceptance of the Christian division of the Bible into chapters as well as Jewish and Christian Bible scholarship to this day – his other treatises remained in manuscript and would appear to have remained relatively unknown. Nevertheless, I recently discovered a lengthy excerpt from one of Nathan’s works on the Bible in Isaac

---

63 Some of Isaac Nathan’s works appear in a list of books that Jacob Roman, a Jewish book dealer from Constantinople, sent to Johannes Buxtorf (the younger) in 1631. See Meyer Kayserling, ‘Richelieu, Buxtorf père et fils, Jacob Roman. Documents pour servir à l’histoire du commerce de la librairie juive au xvii e siècle’, Revue des études juives, 8 (1884), pp. 74–93 (90). The list also includes a number of lost works by Nathan: Meḥah davram, Misvaṭ Yishag, Tokhevet maḥ, and probably his concordance, as well, under the alternative title Ya’ir nativ. See also Adolf Neubauer, ‘Jacob ben Isaac Roman’s Bücherverzeichniss. MS Oxford Poc. 12 (Catal. No. 2314 and Addenda)’, Israelitische Letterbode, 11 (1885–86), pp. 111–93.
Abravanel’s commentary on Exodus. 64 Abravanel generally does not indicate his sources in his commentaries, and this passage is no exception. I believe that a careful examination of Abravanel’s commentaries will reveal further use of Nathan’s works. Thus, in addition to Nathan’s concordance, Isaac Abravanel’s works may afford further insight into the hidden influence of the last Jewish intellectual in Provence.

64 See Ben-Shalom, ‘Isaac Nathan of Arles’ Series of Biblical Studies’ (above, n. 7).
THE PENINSULA AS A BORDERLESS SPACE:
TOWARDS A MOBILITY ‘TURN’ IN THE STUDY
OF FIFTEENTH-CENTURY IBERIAN JEWRIES

Javier Castaño

Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), Madrid

In his 1958 review of Cantera and Millás’ book on Hispano-Jewish epigraphy, Haim Schirmann noted that their study should have incorporated, as well, the few Hebrew medieval inscriptions found in Portugal, and added: ‘Spain and Portugal are today two separate States, very different from each other, but in the history of the Jews, they certainly belong to a single cultural space.’ Schirmann’s appreciation could have been extended, too, to the work of his elder colleague at the Hebrew University, Yitzhak F. Baer, who implicitly had assumed the confines of the State as the territorial framework in his seminal historical book (a narrative that flowed in part from his inquiries in Spanish archives initiated in 1925). Baer’s research led him into the Spain of Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship soon after his teacher Heinrich Finke had completed the publication of his Acta Aragonensia.

The identification of the State’s boundaries with the loose and evolving notion of ‘Sefarad’ as a cultural and geographical entity became consecrated with the institutionalization of Jewish studies after the Spanish Civil War’s end (1939), with its two pillars established in Madrid and Barcelona. Out of conviction, but not without convenience, the Hebraist Francisco Cantera, a Catholic and liberal Castilian scholar, headed with the title ‘De Hispania Judaica’ his exemplary study of the medieval Jewish community in his native town that was published in the first issue of the journal Sefarad. Since 1941 the journal has fostered the publication of local studies on medieval Spanish Jewries based on archival evidence.
Previously, this research had found a place in platforms such as the *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, as well as other publications with a local or regional scope. The goal of these studies responded to the necessity of dealing with an enormous amount of heterogeneous archival material; this challenge was initially met through a positivistic approach that required the support of local scholars, occasionally amateurs who were better placed to gain access to sources than were outsiders, though they often lacked skills and suitable historical methods. Behind this laid the aspiration to track the path of a past to which Spain had been, to a large extent, absent in nineteenth-century Jewish scholarship in contrast to other European countries. Cantera’s further monograph on Spanish medieval synagogues (1955), but especially his joint (with Millás) Jewish and Hebrew epigraphic sourcebook (1956), both understood as an integral piece of the country’s heritage, represented similar requirements of comprehensiveness and erudition though did not endeavor to go beyond a descriptive approach.

It was not until the early 1970s that Cantera announced the launching – and publication of the first provincial installments – of the *Hispania Judaica* project, a ‘historical-geographical dictionary’ of medieval Spanish Jewries (obviously confining himself to the territories of the medieval Castilian Crown), using archival data (and Hebrew sources at random), but also material remnants, if any existed, and local traditions. He had started long before data collection fieldwork. Taking as the basis for the identification of the Jewish settlements the medieval Castilian Jews’ taxation payrolls, he matched it against the modern provincial divisions. The magnitude of the project and the assortment of documentary sources were wide-ranging, and the research facilities available to him scarce. The first explicit mention in his publications to such a dictionary that I have been able to find dates to 1967. This endeavor paralleled (if it was not inspired by) the new *Gallia Judaica* project announced in 1965 by Bernhard Blumenkranz, as well as analogous ongoing endeavors in other countries.

---


It would be wrong however to assimilate the publication of the materials for the dictionary project, however loose this plan was, to what has been rightly termed as the ‘orthodoxy of localism’, a problem that has been pervading Jewish-Spanish historical scholarship, not least in recent decades. Cantera’s demise in 1977 truncated the original plan, yet the advent of a younger generation of scholars did not make it pass out of existence. Rather, it transfigured into diversified projects for the systematic publication of documentary sources based either on regional or typological criteria. This was carried out with uneven success. Thus, the amount of documentation we now have at our disposal is certainly very important, and lays the foundation for more ambitious research on a different scale, that would deal with demographical movements (either of individuals or groups) in an attempt to transcend the currently dominant local scope in the study of Iberian Jewish history. Another issue is that it has been commonplace to characterize medieval Iberian Jewries as long-established communities, though the truth may be the opposite. One only needs to check a recent comprehensive and exemplary study of medieval synagogues in the Crown of Aragon to observe that, in most of the cases, these buildings lasted but a few decades. On the other hand, one may well prefer to stress the continuity of Jewish families between the thirteenth and the early fifteenth centuries; this, however does not contradict the fact that medieval Jews were, in general, characterized by an extreme mobility that is not observed for other social groups.

1. A Matter of Perspective: The Iberian Peninsula as a Borderless Space for the Jews

Alongside the vertical overview of Jewish history resulting from a local approach, we should then consider a complementary horizontal perspective that prioritizes a synchronic scrutiny, and maps the Jews’ mobility in an extended territory, even beyond political boundaries. Currently this perspective has collided with a virtual ‘Cork Wall’ restricting the perspectives of many scholars, thus preventing their exploration beyond their respective borders. A case in point is the study by Henrique de Gama Barros, the historian of the Portuguese administration, whose 1936–37 posthumous articles on Portuguese Jews have been either unknown to,
or ignored by scholars outside Portugal, despite valuable documentary references relevant for a comparative analysis with other peninsular Jewries. It is true, though, that these specific publication years were hardly propitious for scholarly communication. It should be noted that the lack of concern was not at all-pervading in the past, neither among nineteenth-century historians, nor among antiquarians that preceded them, as revealed, for instance, by the keen Portuguese interests of the Valencian Hebraist Francisco Pérez Bayer.

Roughly speaking, the one-century span following 1391 witnessed dramatic demographic changes. During the first decades of the 1400s we see the decline and marginalization of the Levantine (including Catalan), and western Andalusian Jewries, almost to the point of extinction (a tendency particularly evident in urban centers, though with some exceptions). This process resulted in an imbalance in the distribution of Iberian Jewish population in comparison with the previous period, and gave more weight to the communities established in the western areas of the Peninsula: in the case of Castile, especially in the northern plateau, along the (roughly understood) geographical triangle made up by the Duero River, the Central System or Sierras, and the Castilian-Portuguese frontier stripe or Raya. The Jewish presence in Aragon along the Ebro Valley with its center in Saragossa preserved almost intact its demographical and religious-intellectual relevance. The impact of similar demographic transformations among Portuguese Jewry is yet to be assessed globally. At this stage, we can argue that in a similar way to what Saragossa meant for Aragonese Jewry, Lisbon’s Jewish elite enjoyed a political centrality, an intellectual-religious prestige, and an economic dynamism that was attractive to other Jews, even beyond Portuguese borders, not the least in Seville, during the fifteenth century.

By the first decades of the fifteenth century, the weight of Jewish demographics in the eastern and southern regions of the Peninsula weakened, either owing to conversion, or to progressive migrations that drained most, but not all, of their

---

10 Henrique de Gama Barros, ‘Judeus e mouros em Portugal em tempos passados (apontamentos históri-co-etnográficos)’, Revista Lusitana, 34 (1936), 165–265, and 35 (1937), 162–238; José Leite de Vasconcellos prepared the article with the documentary materials and notes left by the author, who was ready to include it in his magnum opus on the history of Portuguese administration.


13 On the role played by Lisbon Jewry in the second half of the fifteenth century, see the concise approach by Joseph Hacker, ‘R. Joseph Hayyun and the Generation of the Expulsion from Portugal’ (Hebrew), Zion, 43 (1983), 273–80.
Jewish population outwards, to Italy, the Maghreb, and via Sicily all the way to the eastern Mediterranean, but also westwards, to Portugal, and inwards, into the lordly domains. In addition, the Jews’ final expulsion from the kingdom of France in the late fourteenth century had secluded physically peninsular Jewries from other European communities. Thus, after 1400, Iberian Jews were living in an ‘island’ disconnected by land from other Jewish communities, and though it has not been calibrated to what extent this relative ‘isolation’ reduced the volume of émigrés arriving from other lands (compared with the migratory trends of the previous century), this may have contributed to strengthen even more the interaction among Iberian Jews, and the feeling of a common peninsular space shared by all them, beyond internal Iberian political borders and despite different backgrounds. It is necessary, then, to mend the torn seams of Iberian history by taking into account Jewish mobility between different regions. In contrast with other fields in the Humanities, the study of Iberian Jewries in the past century has been determined to a great extent by the political borders that have prevented scholarly attempts to penetrate beyond them.14

It is true that political borders were not so easily blurred, even by Jews, and that there were elements that nourished a specific identity attached to territory, such as the tendency towards the development of Jewish political institutions functioning as umbrella for all the Jews of a kingdom, coupled with their use of a vernacular language and allegiance to a royal dynasty. But the opposite could also be true: the Jews were in parallel building an identity as a nation of their own, with borders, too, that were determined by religious or/and ethnic parameters rather than territorial. Moreover, social stratification among Jews on both sides of the political borders existed, and migratory trends, still not studied in detail, were intense enough that we should take them into consideration if we want to reconstruct the puzzle of the Iberian Jewries.

A relevant case is that of the Jews settled in the Portuguese fortified frontier town of Miranda do Douro, located within the hinterland of the Castilian aljama of the Jews of Zamora – a case of the ‘Jewish nation’ extending across political borders. At a distance of twenty-seven miles, Zamora was in the last third of the fifteenth century one of the Peninsula’s key rabbinical centers; it was a gateway into Portugal, and thus, it was not too infrequent to find Aragonese Jews residing both in Zamora and in Portugal.15 Due to the fact that at that time and during

---

14 Recent scholarship has started to question the extent of halakhic and cultural regional areas regardless of political borders, for instance Pinchas Roth, ‘Regional Boundaries and Medieval Halakhah: Rabbinic Responsa from Catalonia to Southern France in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century’, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 106 (2015), 72–98.

15 Besides the case of R. Simuel Marrax (mentioned in note 17 below), Bienvenis de la Cavalleria, the brother of Pedro de la Cavalleria (and uncle of the Aragonese Vice Chancellor Alonso de la Cavalleria), see Fritz Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. Erster Teil: Urkunden und Regesten, Zweiter Band*:
short periods the city of Zamora was under Portuguese occupation and that its Jews paid taxes to the Portuguese king. Zamoran Jews held muddled political allegiances. For some remote Jewish observers, it was not so clear even whether the city belonged to Castile or to Portugal.

Until recently the Jews of nearby Miranda do Douro had gone almost unnoticed, but some wrinkled documents in Hebrew script dated between 1482 and 1496 and preserved within a later inquisitorial file, can shed some light on their social and cultural identity. The content of the documents had not been understood until now, since when they were seized by the inquisitorial officials in 1542, they were given in Lisbon to a Jewish neophyte from North Africa, who was requested to read it. Despite his efforts in guessing the contents, he hardly succeeded, maybe because they were written neither in Hebrew nor in Portuguese, but in Castilian laáaz (vernacular). The file’s documents are very diverse in type, though all of them deal to a greater or lesser extent with a prevalent social problem, the administration of the inheritance of orphans. One of their striking features is that for the most part (as just said) they were written in Castilian, and that they mention Jews from towns located in both sides of the border (we are given the identity of no less than sixty Jews). A careful analysis of the text shows that in some cases it is possible to establish that their settlement in the area was recent. Moreover, familial onomastics concur in some of the cases with the few names we know from the nearby Castilian region. Besides economic motivations, one could reasonably point to political reasons (civil war and Portuguese allegiance of some Castilian Jews in the mid-1470s) behind their recent settlement in Miranda.

The region also attracted other foreign Jews. Such is the case with Abraham ha-Levi, a scion of a Jewish family from the Navarrese town of Tafalla, that settled in Benavente (so at about 272 miles distance). In 1462 Abraham’s father, Rabi Juceu Çarfati, resident in Lisbon (ibidem, p. 493). The reverse was true, though, as sources document as well the presence of Portuguese Jews in Aragon, such as, for instance, ‘Mose Habib portugues’, alderman (adelantado) in 1462 in Daroca, referred by Miguel Angel Motis Dolader, ‘Regimen fiscal de las comunidades judias de Aragon en la Baja Edad Media: la aljama de Huesca en el siglo XIV’, in Homenaje al profesor Alfonso Garcia Gallo (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1995), vol. II, pp. 319–408 (p. 336, no. 86).

16 Before 1482 the Jews of Zamora and Benavente had occasionally contributed taxes to King Afonso V of Portugal, see Barros, ‘Judeus e mouros em Portugal’, p. 191, no. 242.
17 In reference to the Aragonese R. Simuel Marras ‘which has gone in Zamora, in Castile or in Portugal’ (el qual es ydo en Çamora en Castilla o Portogal), see Baer, Die Juden im christlichen Spanien, 1/2: Kastilien, p. 488.
Yosef ha-Levi of Tafalla, bequeathed his grand-daughter with some properties in Navarre, providing she would return, because Abraham (whose untimely death preceded that of his father) ‘had lived in the kingdom (be-Malkhut) of Castile, in the place called (bi-meqom ha-niqra) Benavent’. It is legitimate to think that one of the reasons for having settled so far away was the fact that Abraham had married a local woman. Such cases of Jewish families split throughout different territories are not exceptional.

2. Intra-Iberian Jewish Mobility and the Driving Forces behind Displacement

The question of medieval Jews’ mobility has been recently raised with regard to other geographical areas, this against the background of the ‘spatial turn’ within Jewish studies. Yet how the settlement of Jews in their new environments, their attitudes towards their fellow Jews (but also to non-Jews), and their relation with their former communities affected familial, social, and communal structures, as well as national, cultural, and linguistic identities are subjects that have been hardly addressed by research, that, to the contrary, has prioritized regional static approaches.

Concerning the Iberian regional space, it is true that attention has been focused on the study of long-distance mobility, especially outwards from the Peninsula, not least because of the frequent characterization of the fifteenth-century Aragonese and Castilian Jewish history as an epigonic period in many regards. Less attention has been paid to the intra-Iberian Jewish short-to-medium range mobility, at least, not as a whole; this may be owed more to the scattered nature of the sources, rather than to their dearth. Prior to the fifteenth century, Jewish familial and group border crossing mobility was not an infrequent phenomenon as a result of social transformations, economic development, and the need to foster intellectual and religious contacts. Yet though the phenomenon of intra-Iberian mobility was not new, it now assumed some distinctive characteristics; the dominant migratory trend was now towards the West.

A good example of this westward turning is the migration and settlement of Catalan Jews in Castile (and in Portugal), though the dimension of the

---


20 Another case is the nephew of R. Seneor b. Meir of La Almunia de Doña Godina, ‘a resident in the kingdom of Castile’, see Laura Minervini, Testi giudeospagnoli medievali (Castiglia e Aragona) (Napoli: Liguori Editore, 1992), vol. 1, p. 258.

phenomenon has yet to be assessed. We have for instance the Catalan R. Ferrer Vidal, resident in the Castilian town of Briviesca before his death in 1443. The case is documented in a Hebrew parchment that was used to bind a notarial protocol in the Navarrese city of Tudela. If we bear in mind that his widow Astruga held some properties in Tudela, it is reasonable to assume that she was the scion of a Navarrese Jewish family. Astruga urgently needed money in order to endow her daughter Dolça, and consequently, she tried to pawn her Tudela houses. It was Astruga’s mother-in-law, doña Preçiosa, the widow of R. don Vidal Ferrer, another former resident in Briviesca, who moved to Navarre in order to pawn the houses to one of the most prominent Jews in Tudela and to providing Dolça with the necessary dowry. The matriarch doña Preçiosa agreed to return the money to the lender in Saragossa. Moreover, her guarantor was another Catalan Jew, R. Saltiel, the son of R. Isaac b. Saltiel, a resident in the Central Catalanian town of Agramunt, who had been also present at the transaction procedures in Tudela. Accordingly, we have a Catalan family (at least, its male members) with economic interests and social interactions in four different territories (Castile, Navarre, Aragon, and Catalonia), that preserved some of its preexistent social networks and still maintained a distinctive Catalan onomastic identity over three generations. It did so through the use of given names (Dolça, Ferrer, Vidal), and of the patronimic following Catalan custom, something that could attest to a relatively recent settlement in Castile. These people were not the only Catalan Jews living in Briviesca, a town under the aristocratic lordship of the Count of Haro. Previously, in the opening decades of the century, the Aragonese poet Solomon Bonafed had addressed a poem to ‘R. Zerahya’ in Briviesca, an important rabbinical figure, though we lack any other information concerning his stay in the town. In like manner, another Jew, Sento de Briviesca, a tailor, could also be traced back in 1461 to the town of Monzón in Aragon where he opened a workshop.

In some instances, displacement from one place may have been motivated by economic reasons. This appears to be the motive behind the attempt to leave,
in 1448 and in the following years, by several Jews from La Almunia de Doña Godina, an Aragonese town within the jurisdiction of the Hospitaller Order (though the Jewish aljama belonged to the king). Their attempt to settle in another royal or seigniorial aljama was forestalled through their immediate arrest by the local authorities, and the Jewish community was constrained to threaten individuals with an anathema to avoid further defections. In another case, the predatory taxation decided by a former royal representative (corregidor) in Ávila was inciting many Jews to leave the city to settle in seigniorial areas. This was to the detriment of the Ávila aljama, that was consequently moved, in 1476, to urge the local council to take action.

The dynamics triggered by the victimization of Jews and the regional expulsions entailed their relocation into other regions, though we are not able yet to quantitatively assess the demographic impact. One late instance is the 1483 expulsion of Jews from the Seville district. Two years later, royal fiscal data bearing on the Jewish communities of twelve towns and cities located in a neighboring area, present-day Southern Extremadura and Upper Andalusia, indicates an increase by one-third of the amount of the tax charged to the Jews (the percentage is slightly higher for a couple of exceptions). It corresponds almost exactly to the sum paid by the Jews of Seville before their expulsion. However, the information can barely be translated into demographic statistics, insofar as the coincidence in the increase in most of the cases seems to be the result of a previous compensatory global negotiation and agreement. Furthermore, additional sources document Jewish families that found their way from Seville’s district into communities located in the kingdom’s northern areas.

The incitative policies implemented on a local level by the authorities, following a course of action designed by the nobles (under whose jurisdiction the aljamás were placed), prompted a demographic increase for some Jewish communities. They were offering Jews better economic conditions and fiscal advantages, but also a safeguard. Here, the individual factor was relevant as is revealed in a denunciation brought in the 1480s against a former official (corregidor) in Cuéllar – a Castilian town within the seigniorial jurisdiction of its Duke. It mentioned

27 Since it affected both Jews and Moslems, the grievance was lodged by the representatives of both communities; see Javier Castaño, ‘Subordinación y parcialidades durante los ‘tiempos rotos’: Mosé Tamaño y el juzgado mayor de los judíos de Ávila’, in Cristianos y judíos en contacto en la Edad Media: Polémica, conversión, dinero y convivencia, ed. by Flocel Sabaté and Claude Denjean (Lleida: Editorial Milenio, 2009), pp. 831–57 (p. 825, no. 16).
29 For instance, the Hebrew narrative published by Alexander Marx, ‘The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain’, Jewish Quarterly Review [OS], 20 (1908), 240–71 (pp. 265 and 267).
rumors that had spread to the effect that ‘when the said [official] […] came into town, there were no more than fifty Jewish residents (vecinos), but later [there were] with his support more than two hundred’.

Theoretically, and besides periods of social distress, there were no legal constraints on the mobility and settlement of Jews, beyond the proviso that they duly meet their tax obligations to their communities – to the one departed from and to the adoptive one. It is true that there was a recurrent constraint to their mobility when it came to their transfer from the royal jurisdiction to a seigniorial one, as revealed by royal authorities’ frequent complaints that serve us as a reminder of the demographic dynamic. In addition, the instances I have been able to track in the sources of a hampering to the Jews’ freedom of movement and choice of residency, especially from royal to seigniorial domain, seem to be an exception to the rule; these are linked either to segregatory policies or to fiscal considerations.

One example of the legal barriers to mobility is the royal Provisión enacted in Valladolid in late December 1411, prompted by Friar Vincent Ferrer, primarily intended to deprive the Jews’ existence of any social meaning. And thus, these laws banned Jews from the option to transfer their residency elsewhere, especially into lordly domains, under threat of confiscation of their assets. In addition, the clauses forbade nobles from welcoming Jews as residents in their dominions, and forced them to return them back to their place of origin, under severe penalties. Despite their immediate impact, the laws were short-lived (a milder version of these laws that was enacted soon after was more lenient and did not restrict the Jews’ movements) and they were not (de facto) applied universally throughout Castile.

3. Choice of Residency and Tax Liability

Yet in practice mobility, and choice of residency, became complicated due to the fiscal implications involved. It was required that any transfer of residency be communicated to the authorities, either Christian and/or Jewish, before they would issue their consent. It is precisely the relation between choice of settlement and taxation that was at the heart of a debate that had arisen in relation to

30 Baer, Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. I/2: Kastilien, p. 521, no. 422.
32 See the documented (and prejudiced) study by Juan Torres Fontes, ‘Moros, judíos y conversos en la regencia de Fernando de Antequera’, Cuadernos de Historia de España, 31/32 (1960), 60–97.
34 On the later (Cifuentes) rendering of the 1411 Provisión, see Toribio Minguela Arnedo, Historia de la diócesis de Sigüenza y de sus obispos (Madrid: tip. Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1910–11), vol. II, pp. 620–25, esp. p. 624.
the right of a community to prohibit individuals to move to another place due to their tax status. The debate originated in mid-fourteenth century Catalonia from a question that a Jewish courtier representing the community of Girona had sent to rabbinical scholars. It concerned the case of one individual, who had been previously residing in a place whose taxes were paid together with those of Girona’s Jews, and who wanted to change his residency. Several issues were at stake: Whether it was permissible for an individual to change his residency or whether this would violate the communal ordinances? Whether if someone received permission from external authorities, would it not be the right of the community to decide upon the issue? Was in such a case the community entitled to seize the individual’s properties? And, related to this, what were the means the community was able to use in order to deny the right to leave?

This Jew in question had transferred his residency and that of his family to Perpignan, after reaching an agreement – in force for 5 years – with the newly adopted community for paying his tax-share there, a period during which he would be transferring his properties from the previous place. All the same, his former community contended that he was still liable to taxation as long as he maintained properties in the city. Within this context, a group of unidentified Jews claimed, basing themselves in a recent royal ordinance proscribing mobility and settlement of Jews from royal into noble domain (‘earlier Capitulos’), that the issue fell within the category of Dina de-Malkhuta Dina (the halakhic rule that the law of the country is binding), and that Jewish Law could be enforced by the external authorities, and in consequence, that the community could hold those that wanted to leave and not allow them to be tax-exempted.

The debate served to articulate the positions of several rabbinical experts, for the most part, Catalan, that were made jurisprudence and, in consequence, we can use them for understanding later situations. Bonsnyor Gracian opens by recalling a basic principle which enjoyed the consent of all: ‘the right of every individual to change his residency from one place to another is an assumed principle.’ Nevertheless, he mentions an agreement of the community of Barcelona whereby

36 A background to this debate can be found in Jaume Riera i Sans, Els jueus de Girona i la seva organització. Segles xii–xv (Girona: Patronat Call de Girona, 2012), pp. 99–102.
37 In reference to the Ordinances of 1333 by Alphonse the Benign, see Baer, Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. I/1: Aragonien, p. 275, no. 201, § 15, previously published by Francisco de Bofarull, ‘Los dos textos catalán y aragonés de las ordinaciones de 1333 para los judíos de la Corona de Aragón’, Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, XIII/ 51 (1915), 155–63 (p. 160).
38 Feldman, ‘Teshuot hakham be-’inosim ve-Catalonia’, p. 82.
if someone wants to change his residency, he is not entitled to do so until he settles all his fiscal debts with the former community. Based on previous jurisprudence Shem Tov Falcon clarifies that once the fiscal charges have been imposed on the community as a whole, no one can claim to be exempted, even by the king, and therefore the individual was liable to pay its share over the period the tax was in vigor.

Hasday Crescas, the Elder, sets a ruling by determining that if the individual has left the community before the allocation to every single member of the fiscal charges, he is entitled to move. Otherwise he is liable to pay. Furthermore, he scolds those who oppose the Jews’ free movement and who backed the ‘earlier Capitulos’ that proscribed Jews from moving from royal to seigniorial jurisdiction and settling there. He claims that there was no juridical basis for the ban, even in royal law. He also alleges that the legal procedures initiated by the Girona Jews who turned to the government to strength the ban were sinful and a harsh transgression. According to him, ‘in the courts of the kings and in their palaces, on their tongues and on those of their counselors there is carved a law and a phrase [according to which] all the Jews are free [bene horin] to go wherever they dwell and they may go wherever they choose’.

Vidal de Tolosa harshly criticizes the ‘earlier Capitulos’. He claims that they contradict previous legal traditions granting Jews the possibility to go wherever they wish, and mentions the dictum according to which ‘[…] the juridical standing of the Jews is equal to that of the knights, to dwell wherever they wish’. Finally, he rules that if the decision of a king is cursory and not grounded on previous judgments, or if he punishes people for something his ancestors would not have done, it cannot be included within the category of Din Malkhut, but it should be qualified as a governmental abuse, and therefore Jews are not bound to obey it. Nehemia bar Yishaq bar Nehemia, a rabbi that spent some time in Castile, rules that every individual who wants to leave is entitled to do so after settling his tax arrears, and that everyone who tries to block him is a felon.

The issue was still subjected to discussion a few years later, since the accords of Barcelona drafted in 1354 by some representatives of the Jewish communities included a clause vindicating freedom of movement from royal to seigniorial jurisdiction. The relation between the settlement under seigniorial jurisdiction and tax exemption was explicitly denounced by later Jewish sources, such as the

general ordinances issued in 1432 in Valladolid for the Jews of Castile, decrying those individuals who move their residency in order to be tax-free\(^45\) – a tendency that grew in times of political distress, such as those that affected Castile in the 1460s and 1470s.

A characteristic case of this uneasy relation between internal tax liability and choice of residency is that of Jamila Abenardut, a Jewish widow from the Aragonese town of La Almunia de Doña Godina. She sought to leave in 1480 by claiming that she could not reside throughout the whole year in that town because she had to attend personally some affairs.\(^46\) She was aware, however, that due to certain local communal ordinances, Jews could not leave without paying taxes on everything they owned. As result, she appeared before a Christian notary, explaining the reasons for her departure. She added that it was customary to anyone about to depart to leave someone as guarantor, but that she had not found anyone. Then, she swore 'not to leave the said town [...] unless she has a legitimate reason [for leaving], [...] that would be released to the bailiff of the said town; and to pay her poll-tax every year over the five-year period the tax has been allotted in the said aljama, within one-month notice [...].\(^47\)

If the Jew was living within lordly domains, he had to negotiate his departure with the noble. Such was, for instance, the case with the merchant Juce Ambron, who in 1438 wanted to change residency for the nearby Aragonese city of Huesca, because of royal concession, all residents were tax-free (francos de lezda, peso, peaje, pontaje, mensaje y otros cargos). Juce was a resident in the town of Ayerbe. There its lord, Mossen Felip de Urries, agreed to provide him with a license to move whenever he desired, removing him from all allegiance due, yet making explicit the possibility to match Huesca’s tax exemptions, in order to hold the Jew in the town. However, since Juce would continue holding properties in the town, he still would be liable to Ayerbe taxes every year.\(^48\)

Reaching a deal was certainly bothersome for Jaco Levy and his family, who in late 1485 or early 1486 transferred their residency (biuienda) from Olmedo to the nearby town of Madrigal, about twenty-two miles away, where he became a

\(^{45}\) 'Otros algunos van a morar a algunos lugares de seniores por franquezas', see Yolanda Moreno Koch, *Fontes Iudaeorum Regni Castellae. V. De Iure Hispano-Hebraico. Las taqqanot de Valladolid de 1432: un estatuto comunual renovador* (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1987), p. 71.

\(^{46}\) The case was documented by Encarnación Marín Padilla, 'Los judíos de La Almunia de Doña Godina, villa aragonesa de señorío, en la segunda mitad del siglo XV', *Sefarad*, 50 (1990), 85–127 and 335–71 (pp. 86–87).

\(^{47}\) 'No se yr del dicho lugar pora se fazer vezina ni vassalla de otro... [...] sino que tuviesse escusacion legitima, la qual escusacion haya destar a conocimiento del bayle del dicho lugar, e de pagar su pecha en cada un ayno durant tiempo de los cinco anyos que la pecha es echada en a dicha aljama, un mes despues que le sera manifestada', see Marín Padilla, 'Los judíos de La Almunia', p. 87.

\(^{48}\) Archivo Histórico Provincial de Huesca, prot. 88, fols 2r–3v (26 December 1438). My thanks to Eugenio Benedicto for this information.
resident (vecino). Located in central Castile north of the Central System and in the nearby of Medina del Campo, both towns were placed under the Queen's seignorial jurisdiction. Jaco Levy started paying taxes to the new aljama, but he still held some properties (ciertos bienes) in Olmedo, and after almost one year and a half he was still being charged taxes (encabezado). He had applied to the court of the chief judge of the Castilian aljamas, Abraham Seneor, who had ruled in favor of Olmedo. Jaco Levy decided, then, to appeal to the ordinary instance at the court of the royal representative in town (corregidor), claiming that Seneor's ruling had been taken without proper rabbinical advice (syn deliberación nin consejo e acuerdo de sabio judío puesto por las aljamas). Despite his efforts, his houses in Olmedo were confiscated and publicly auctioned by the local Jewish community. Jaco Levy then appealed to the royal court, which finally ruled, requesting Seneor to review again the matter together with the assistance of a halakhic authority.

4. Jews on the Move

By examining one specific place, one would understand better the phenomenon of Jewish demographic dynamism. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the North Castilian town of Villalón was the seat of an important fair established by its lord. It became rapidly a pole of attraction for the Jews because of the policies by the fourth Count of Benavente that encouraged the economic expansion of the town and ensured the physical protection of the Jews. The growth of its aljama can be studied in some detail thanks to the analysis of a notebook recording the establishment of residency in town. It contains the recognition of residency over a period of sixteen years, between 1471 and 1487, provided to 118 individuals. Out of them, one quarter (thirty) were Jews. Four Jewish physicians are counted among the newcomers (plus another one already living in the town); this density resulted from the general process of Iberian society’s increased recourse to medical care. Others were artisans. For both social categories, this professional choice responds to the particular interests, economic and of prestige, of the local authorities. The positive fiscal and occupational impact of the newcomers would be immediately felt in the town’s economy and society. Such was the case with Abraham Querido, admitted in 1481 for ten years. Two of the most affluent Jews in town, the tax-farmer Abraham Tamar and the silversmith Simuel, 49 A transcription of the document was published by Carlos Carrete Parrondo, El judaísmo español y la Inquisición (Madrid: Editorial Mapfre, 1992), pp. 178–79, no. 12, Archivo General de Simancas, RGS, 27 March 1487, fol. 62.
acted as guarantors, for an amount of 100,000 maravedis. Immediately after, he made a loan to the local council. Another case is that of Abraham Alhanate, who became a physician salaried by the local council, granted residency in 1471 for ten years (with his uncle acting as guarantor). He, in turn, was the guarantor for his mother’s residency (1472) and for his brother’s (1474). He chose, though, to abandon the town ten years later, in the wake of a dispute with the local council which had refused to pay the agreed salary, and moved into the nearby town of Medina de Rioseco.

It is revealing that two-thirds (twenty-two) of the total of these avecindamientos by Jews took place over the short time-span of five years, between 1471 and 1475—a period of turmoil and civil strife. The Jews fell under the supervision of the municipal council, especially in matters of a local nature, such as the granting of residency. The (self-interested) protection of the Count manifested itself occasionally, when he commanded the local council to grant residency to individuals through his endorsement letter. All but four of the thirty new Jewish applicants receive permission of residency for ten years. Though the conditions varied from one case to the other, they were exempted from taxes and other burdens for the first half of their residency.

Twelve Jewish applicants to residency selected a relative (the father-in-law in five cases, and the uncle in two) as a guarantor. The guarantors, all but one male, had to own real estate, have their residency in the town, as well as contribute to the tax. Only in six out of the thirty instances is there mentioned the candidates’ geographic provenance. It may well be that some of the candidates (whether a son or a brother of the guarantor) were already living in town, but took official residency in order to emancipate themselves from their families. Besides Cáceres, located further in the South, the physician Manuel Brudo’s place of provenance, the other places of provenance were small towns located within a close range, twenty-seven miles at maximum.

As we have seen in Villalón, marrying a partner from another place frequently meant changing residency. Some local ordinances banned the settlement of Jews precisely because of marriage, in order to prevent Jewish population’s growth.51 But in the case of liberal professions such as physician or healer, change of residency, in particular if that meant crossing a political frontier, also meant the need to homologate one’s license for the practice of medicine, as it happened to master ‘Abrahão Cabanas’, a Castilian physician from San Felices de los Gallegos, a town across the Castilian-Portuguese border, 66 miles west of Salamanca. Cabanas in the 1480s settled in the Portuguese town of Gouveia (84 miles away) and received

---

51 Thus, in 1483 in the northern town of Valmaseda, see Francisco Cantera, ‘Las juderías medievales en el País Vasco’, Sefarad, 31 (1971), 265–317 (pp. 270–71).
a license to live in the kingdom and practice medicine after having married a local woman.51

A rabbinical scholar is hired by a community to teach and serve as a halakhic expert,52 and this may motivate him to change his residency, affecting his social and familial life. No wonder that at the earlier stages in his career, he marries a local woman. Such was the case with Yishaq Abohab, a single 30-year old when he started his teaching career around 1463 in Buitrago, a town located at the Central System, and the center of the seigniorial jurisdiction of the Mendoza family; there he met his future wife. We do not know his place of provenance, and the family name is not attested in the area, but rather in the region around Zamora on both sides of the frontier. This could explain some of his Portuguese ‘leanings’.54 A bit younger than Abohab was his colleague Yishaq de Leon – maybe related to the homonymous family from Saragossa – who in the same years was teaching at Salamanca, before moving to Toledo as a widower, having lost his first wife. There he contracted a second marriage with a local woman.53 Later on he moved to the town of Ocaña, southwest of Toledo; documentary sources have recorded his visit to Saragossa, where he met socially important persons, both Jews and New Christians.55 Among others, Abraham Cohen of Arándiga was in 1488 his Aragones student in the Castilian town of Ocaña.56

In 1457, Yaaqob Arama was studying in Zamora’s rabbinic school, and copying a manuscript containing Nahmanides’ commentary on the Torah for his brother Yishaq. The later had spent his childhood in this Castilian city, leaving memories...

52 Maria José Ferro Tavares, Os judeus em Portugal no século xvi (Lisbon: Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 1982), vol. 1, p. 240 (Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, Chancelaria de D. João II, liv. 25, fol. 66). Mose Cabanyas of Huesca, one of the witnesses in the inquisitorial process against Abraham Alintienz, is mentioned next to other Aragones Jews settled in Zamora, see Baer, Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. I/2: Kastilien, p. 498; see also Eugenio Benedicto, ‘La aljama de los judíos de Huesca a fines del siglo xv: una nómina de casatenientes de la judería de 1475’, Sefarad, 63 (2005), 227–16 (p. 233, no. 27).


54 On Yuçe Abo (Zamora, 1481), see Mª Fuencisla García Casar, ‘La aljama de los judíos de la ciudad de Zamora en el siglo xv: economía y sociedad’, in Rashi 1040–1990. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach. Congrès européen des Études juives, ed. by Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris: Cerf, 1993), pp. 681–93 (p. 687); and Abraham Aboab (resident in Mogadouro, 1475), see Yaaqob M. Toledano, Otzar Genazim (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, 1959), p. 39; and his homonym Abraham Aboab (resident in Peñafiel, 1462), taxroll unpublished. The possibility would fit well with his Portuguese acquaintances (his relation with Abravanel, or his student Moshe Ibn Danon of Coimbra), and not least the fact that after 1492 he settled in the northern Portuguese city of Oporto.

55 David Fränkel, Sefer Zera‘anitam (Hebrew; Husiatyn: Hevrat doveve shifte yeshenim, 1902), pp. 72–73, no. 43.


of this youth in his writings. Almost three decades later, in 1485, he was employed as a rabbi in Calatayud, when he found a suitable match for his son with the help of a matchmaker who connected him to the daughter of a Saragossan Jew. In about the same years, the Castilian ‘Eli Habillo’ was working as a translator of philosophical treatises in Aragon, in the town of Monzón. He had moved there from the Northern Castilian town of Aguilar de Campoo where he had been a student in 1464.

Finally, throughout this period we still find instances of Jewish students arriving to Castilian schools from the Maghreb. Theirs was certainly a long return journey. Thus, Hayyim Gagin, from Fez, studied with Yosef Uziel, eventually in Medina del Campo, and with Shem Tov Alcahali in Alcalá de Henares. Later, on his return to Fez, he would become the rabbi of the autochthonous Jews. Yehoshua ha-Levi was a Jewish student from Tlemcen, east of Fez, who arrived in 1467 in Toledo, and then received the protection of Vidal ben Lavi, a Jewish magnate.

Summarizing, this article’s aim has been to approach a documented social history of Iberian Jews in the fifteenth century by taking advantage of a multi-variety of sources that complement each other, and by analyzing more in detail than heretofore Castilian, Aragonese, but also Portuguese and Navarrese evidence. Traditionally, historiography has privileged the local perspective for the history of Iberian Jews. However, this ‘vertical’ focus cannot account for the changes Iberian Jewries experienced throughout this period. By the end of the Middle Ages, the Peninsula was a borderless space for Iberian Jews, a permeability that fostered the spread of common shared cultural traits, and what was not least due to their high mobility. Political borders did not necessarily meant separation, and communication became intense on both sides of political frontiers. There remains, however, a pressing need to integrate the study of Portuguese Jewry within the general framework of Iberian Jewries, examining parallelisms and also differences. This chapter represents only a prolegomenon to this necessary transgression of twenty-first century frontiers. Moreover, it should be clear from this introductory presentation that the Jews’ high mobility should stimulate the design of a strategy for the study of the biographical itineraries of individuals who resided in

---

different places through their life-time. Far from being a factor of social instability, mobility strengthened familial structures and helped to elaborate new social structures, resilient to the mounting challenges that Iberian Jewry faced in the so-called Autumn of the Middle Ages.

Indeed, the social and political events that hit Iberian Jewries around 1400 impacted dramatically the demographic distribution throughout the Iberian territories, and brought about an economic transformation. One observes a continuous tendency for Jews to move into the western regions of the Peninsula (western Castile and Portugal) that may partially help to understand the reaction to the 1492 expulsion decree: Jews moved massively westwards, especially in regions close to the Portuguese frontier.

Theoretically, and under normal circumstances, Iberian Jews were free to change their residency. However, this principle collided with social practice, as we can observe when we confront documentary sources. The obstacle lay in the conflict between, on the one hand, freedom of movement and settlement and, on the other hand, the economic interests of the authorities, Christian, and to a lesser extent, Jewish. Moreover, this process took place in a period when aristocratic lords and local councils understood human capital as a source of income (through taxation). Several categories of individuals were characterized by a higher mobility, not least, physicians or rabbinical students, something that certainly left its mark on their identities. Once Jews complied with their tax commitments, it was easier for them to move. In addition, granting residency, which was under the jurisdiction of the local councils, affected the exploitation of the Jews and their resources, as we have seen in the Castilian town of Villalón. Here, by using local history but by submitting it to a horizontal methodology, we could better understand the dynamics of the social history of the Jewish communities over the last century of their legal presence in Iberia.
‘MEET YOU IN COURT’: LEGAL PRACTICES AND CHRISTIAN–JEWISH RELATIONS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Judith Olszowy-Schlanger

In his ground breaking study entitled *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental* (first published in 1960), Bernhard Blumenkranz dedicated considerable attention to legal encounters between these two components of medieval society. Examining Christian sources from the early Middle Ages, he pointed out that ‘introducing laws in the relationship between the two groups transforms the exchange of knowledge and skills into an exchange of hostile attacks’.1 Stressing the role of the Church theologians, and the multiple ways by which theory had been adjusted to the realities of life, Blumenkranz set the legal aspects of Jewish Christian encounters, the ‘déchéance légale’ as he called it, well apart from what he defined as a good neighbourly relationship. In Blumenkranz’s refreshingly un-sentimental approach to the history of Jewish-Christian relations, even religious polemics were portrayed as an occasion for intellectual and scholarly shoulder-rubbing rather than malevolent struggle. Only Christian law was described as constantly hostile to the Jews.

However well grounded, Blumenkranz’s views on the place of the law in Jewish-Christian relations concerned the early Middle Ages, and were strongly dependent on the type of written sources available to him. Blumenkranz’s sources for the early-medieval legal encounters were mostly theoretical and theologically-based decisions, which only rarely portrayed actual legal interactions between real individuals.

The study of Councils and regulations shows the gradual restricting of the privileges and liberties of the Jews. Without seeking to undermine this gloomy image, I would like to focus on another, more pragmatic aspect of legal encounters between Jews and Christians. Rather than examining theoretical statements and approaches to the Jews’ legal status (a daunting task given the notorious plurality


*Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe: The historiographical legacy of Bernhard Blumenkranz*, ed. by Philippe Buc, Martha Keil and John Tolan, Turnhout, 2015 (RELMIN, 7) pp. @@@–@@@ 
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of laws inherent to medieval Europe), I will focus on judicial practices, and notably on the production and use of legal contracts in Hebrew. Indeed, pragmatic encounters in the court of law, though not necessarily friendly occasions as such, certainly constituted a real meeting ground between individuals and cultures.

Indeed, meetings in court were naturally hostile, and their accompanying written documents either reflected problems or were aimed at avoiding or sorting out potential conflicts. After all, as rightly pointed out by diplomatists, written contracts act as much as tools designed to rescue legal transactions from oblivion, as they are weapons in the service of legal proof. What is more, when a legal document concerns individuals belonging to different social or religious groups, its efficiency requires a mutual knowledge of legal status and customs. Canon law texts of the later period, from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, continue in this hostile vein and increase, after the Lateran council of 1215, their evident anti-Jewish stand, calling for segregation and exclusion. In contrast, the study of actual acts of legal practice from the same period shows the frequency of Jewish-Christian legal dealings and their essential role in regulating economic and human matters. Such documents also reveal that legal encounters entailed a great deal of familiarity with the laws and customs of the other and often required important adjustments in both Christian and Jewish legal systems.

In this paper, my concern will be with exchanges and adjustments of knowledge at the level of production or functioning of legal deeds. The paper will touch upon such issues as the validity and status of Jewish documents in non-Jewish courts, their influence on the documents’ material shape, and the knowledge of the other party’s legal language. The examples I will provide originate from medieval England, famous for its exceptional preservation of the records concerning the relatively small and short-lived Jewish community, from its arrival in 1066 to its expulsion in 1290. Hundreds of records and documents concerning transactions between Jews and Christians have come down to us, including a corpus of 316 individual items containing Hebrew writing (258 charters on parchment and 58 wooden tallies). As we shall see, these extant Hebrew documents provide first-hand insights into the organization and legal and economic activities of Jewish communities, including their contacts with their non-Jewish surroundings.

The production and use of documents is of course closely related to the legal and administrative contexts in which they were issued. The legal and

---

administrative framework for the production and use of Hebrew documents in medieval Europe is a large and still understudied topic, but the English situation is relatively well documented. The specific legal situation of English Jews as serfs of the monarch alone had been granted to them in royal charters of privileges.\(^3\) These charters guaranteed a certain amount of legal autonomy for the exercise of Talmudic law within the Jewish community, mostly in the domain of family law (marriage and divorce). Economic matters, for their part, and in particular transactions between Jews and Christians, were carried out under the supervision of the Crown administration. From the late twelfth century onwards, the legal documents which concerned transactions between Jews and Christians, but also between Jewish parties alone, came to be managed through specific registries created during the administrative reorganization of the country inspired by Archbishop and Chancellor Hubert Walter (1193–8) under Richard I.\(^4\) With some modifications, this system remained in operation till the expulsion of the Jews in 1290. It required that copies of transactions be deposited in special wooden chests (archae) set in main towns of Jewish settlement and closely supervised by both Christian and Jewish officials (chirographers) appointed by the Crown (locally represented by the sheriffs). Throughout the thirteenth century, the officials of the local chests were answerable to a central ‘bureau for Jewish affairs’, the Exchequer of the Jews at Westminster.\(^5\) The initial framework of the

---


archae centres described by the contemporary chronicler, Roger of Hoveden, stipulated that these centres were each to be jointly managed by four officials called chirographers, two Christians and two Jews, assisted by two clerks. All the transactions were to be contracted in their presence, documents had to have a specific format of the chirograph, and their copies had to be deposited and ideally also registered in the archae centre. The wooden chests were provided with three locks, whose three keys were entrusted to the Christian and Jewish chirographers, and to the royal clerk. The holders of the keys sealed the locks with their respective seals. While a close supervision by the Crown of transactions involving the Jews did limit their autonomy, it also provided an additional measure of security and possibilities of enforcement of financial agreements, notably of repayment of the debts.

It is not our purpose here to dwell on the archae system as such. It is however essential to stress that the creation of the dedicated system dealing with Jewish transactions, locally in the archae centres and centrally, at Westminster, at the Exchequer of the Jews, necessarily entailed the emergence of a group of professional clerks, both Jewish and Christian, who daily worked together and jointly solved complex cases involving individuals belonging to the two communities. Jewish and Christian clerks working for the archae or the Exchequer of the Jews were obviously literate. While not always rabbis or scholars, the Jewish chirographers were highly trained professional scribes with an intimate knowledge of legal formularies, and at least some aspects of Jewish law. Working daily with clerks who mastered the Latin documentary and legal tradition, and having to supervise transactions which had to conform to both Jewish and non-Jewish law, these chirographers undoubtedly acquired at least some knowledge of the Latin tradition. And vice-versa, it can be expected that the Christian chirographers working for the archae and the Jewish Exchequer would be daily exposed to documents in Hebrew and to various issues of Jewish law. Therefore, the case can be made that this privileged group of professionals of literacy – the legal clerks – was in the best position to access the skills and knowledge of their colleagues belonging to the other religious group. They were also the best placed to figure out specific arrangements which would make legal documents issued by their care acceptable in terms of both Jewish law and the law of the land.

The Validity of Documents in Hebrew in Non-Jewish Courts

Initially, the privileges granted to the Jews by the monarchs explicitly accepted Jewish documents as a valid legal proof, alongside Jewish testimonies and the oath pronounced holding a Torah scroll. It is indeed the case that in England, just like in Southern France or Italy, legal documentary tradition and language of a small minority were recognized as legally binding by the non-Jewish majority. The English rulers, despite their overall control, have granted the Jews the binding status of various Talmudic laws and customs. For instance, it is well known that when a Jewish moneylender died, his chattels became the property of the King. They could be secured by the family of the deceased only after they paid a tax or ‘death duties’ of about a third of the total value of the belongings, which included unredeemed loans. However, Latin records show that before the King took over, in accordance with Talmudic law the widow of the moneylender had a priority to collect her ketubbah – the sum stipulated in her favour by her husband at the time of the wedding to be collected at the marriage’s dissolution (by the husband’s death or divorce).

As attested by the records of the Exchequer of the Jews, the documents written in Hebrew (or rather a mixture of Hebrew, used in operative and narrative sections, and of fossilized traditional Aramaic formulae of the standardized general part of the deed, the ṭofes) they were indeed often produced and accepted as proof. In some cases, it seems that the Hebrew language and handwriting were considered to be an additional guarantee of the documents’ authority. This appears from the confirmatory dockets found in some twenty documents recording transactions between Jews and Christians. In such cases, if a charter is written in Latin, the Jewish party sometimes confirms his understanding and acceptance of the terms of the agreement. The closing formulae of the Latin deed (usually written by a professional Christian clerk) indicate that the Jew agreed to the terms and certified the document by an autograph inscription in Hebrew, ‘litera mea ebrayca.’ The Latin text is followed by a short fixed Hebrew formula: אני החתום מטה מודה את שכתוב בלשון לטין הוא אמת, ‘I, the undersigned, declare that all that is written in Latin is true’. In some cases, the creditor specified the number of lines of the Latin document: בעשבה תשנים חצי, ‘in seven lines and a half’, sometimes he specified who the Christian scribe was: בכתיבת ריקרט הגלח דנוטיגהם, ‘in the handwriting
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7 Thus, the charter of King John of 1201, see Rigg, Select Pleas, p. 1: Et si querela orta fuerit inter Christianum et Iudeum, ille qui aliquam appellaverit ad querelam suam direcionandam habeat testes, scilicet, legitimum Christianum et legitimum Iudeum. Et si Iudeus de querela breve habuerit, breve suum erit ei testis; et si Christianus habuerit querelam adversus Iudeum, sit indicata per pares Iudei […] Et si Iudeus ab aliquo appellatus fuerit sine teste, de illo appellatu erit quietus solo sacramento suo super librum suum. Et de appellatu illarum rerum que ad Coronam nostram pertinent similiter quietus est solo sacramento suo super Rotulum suum.
of Richard, the clerk of Nottingham. In some of the documents we find a mention that the Latin document does not contain erasures or corrections: בלא מחק ובלא הגהה, ‘without erasure or correction’ (e.g. Westminster Abbey Muniments (WAM) 67299), or a short description of the physical characteristics of the Latin deed (for example, that the text is written on the flesh side of the parchment, לעד יין, ‘on the white side’ (British Library, Lansdowne Charter 301) corresponding to the formula found in Latin documents, ex parte alba or ex carne10).

Pictavin ben Benedict le Jovene (the Young) of London releases the Abbot and convent of Bardeney from claims to a piece of land in Lincoln, for ten marks. The Latin validation clause (l. 11–14) contains a mention of the Hebrew signature:

> Et ut hac donacio concessio et quiete clamancia rata et stabilis in perpetuum permaneat, hanc presentem cartam meam cyrographiam, litera mea ebraica signauit una cum sigillis Benedicti filii magistri Mosse et Manasser Iudeorum tunc cyrographorum Lincolnie, cuissus una pars ponitur in archa cyrographorum Lincolnie et altera pars remainet penes predictos abbatem et conventum de Bardeney.

[And in order this donation, concession and quitclaim remain valid and stable in perpetuity, I have signed this present chirograph charter with my Hebrew letter, together with the seals of Benedict ben Master Moses and Manasser, the Jews, the chirographers of Lincoln at that time; one part of it (the chirograph) is deposited in the chirographs’ archa in Lincoln, while the other remains with the aforementioned Abbot and Covent of Bardeney.]

The Hebrew confirmatory docket reads: 

אני החתום מטה מודה כל מה שכתב למטה (I, the undersigned, declare that all written above in the Latin language, in 17 lines, without erasure or correction, is true. And what I have declared, I have signed: Peitevin ben Benet) (followed by the signatures of the witnesses).

Such dockets, expressed in the Jewish declarants’ legal language and handwriting, testify to their understanding of the Latin document. However, they also seem to be an added measure of authentication and validity of the deed, a deed between Jewish and Christian parties which will be dealt with by a non-Jewish court, if necessary. It is remarkable that the confirmation of the validity in Hebrew is thus addressed to the non-Jewish tribunal. Such use of Hebrew handwritten acknowledgements is found elsewhere in medieval Europe, when Jewish and Christian individuals, moneylenders, merchants or neighbours meet to contract a transaction or carry out a joint business venture. The Hebrew acknowledgement formulae appear for instance in the commercial ledgers of Christian merchants, such as Ugo Taralh, a draper of Forcalquier in Provence, or, as shown by Ingrid Houssaye, in the records of the commercial company of the Florentine merchant Francesco Datini of Prato. In these and other examples, the Jewish clients or business partners wrote their Hebrew texts in the non-Jewish account books. These texts in Hebrew characters – in Hebrew in the case of the account book of Hugo Taralh, and in Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic in the Majorcan account
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books of Francesco Datini – are formulated as acknowledgments of debts or quit-claims, and thus assume the form and role of legally binding deeds. Indeed, in the 14th-century Europe, merchants’ account books could be presented as evidence in court.12 Here again, just like in 13th-century England, Jewish documents were recognized as valid.13

It can be argued that in England the creation of the centralised archæe system had a restrictive impact on the validity of Jewish documents: only those documents drawn up in the presence of the chirographers and deposited and registered in the official archæe centres were legally binding in the Crown courts. The status of any documents not deposited in an archa was open to doubt. The system had not questioned the validity of the documents written in Hebrew according to Jewish formulation and reflecting some Jewish laws and customs. Nonetheless, their probative value required from these documents the conformity with the official legal system. Consequently, the documents in Hebrew language and script answered the requirements of King’s administration and the law of the country, while complying at the same time with the letter of Jewish law. In other words, these documents were produced in such a way that they would be recognized as valid by both Jewish and non-Jewish legal institutions.

**Shape of the documents in Hebrew: a diplomatic compromise**

The most spectacular result of requirements and restrictions related to the functioning of Jewish documents in Hebrew within the framework of the Crown administration concerns their external shape. According to the rules governing the archææ, agreements had to be written in the format of a chirograph, a format widespread in English documents since Anglo-Saxon times.14 The term ‘chirograph’ designates a document written in duplicate or triplicate on a single sheet of parchment. In Jewish chirographs, the copies are separated by the word צירוגרייפא, a Hebrew transliteration of the French ‘chirographe’ (chirographum

13 It was also the case with documents written in other minorities’ languages. In Norman Sicily, for example, Greek, Latin, Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic were all recognized as valid languages of the law, and were used in actual documents. For a Judaeo-Arabic document from Sicily, see Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily, Cambridge* 2002, n° 25 (1187).
in Latin documents), written across the blank space between them. The copies are then separated in such a way that the chirograph inscription (or *divisa*) is cut horizontally, most frequently by an irregular cut with wavy, serrated or ‘indented’ edges. Each party keeps one copy (called in Latin *pars*, ‘part’). In order to prove or ratify a transaction, the copies had to be fitted together. The perfect match of the irregular edges was a guarantee of the document’s authenticity. To judge from the description of the procedure at the time of Richard I, the chirographs were made in duplicate; one part was to remain with the Jewish creditor while another was to be deposited in the common *archa*. In 1233, Henry III requested chirographs to be made triplicate, with a third part given to the grantee of the transaction. Intended initially for the deeds recording transactions between Jews and Christians, the chirograph format became the norm also for the contracts drawn up between Jewish parties. Indeed, more than 40% of extant medieval English parchment documents containing Hebrew are top, middle or lower (foot, *pes*, לַעֲג) parts of chirographs, and their overwhelming majority are deeds of conveyance formulated in Rabbinic wording (FIG 2).

The adoption of the characteristic chirograph format for the Hebrew documents is not merely a cultural marker, a way Jewish documentary tradition imitated the models used by their non-Jewish environment. The chirograph format was compulsory, and was used by the Jews despite its implications for the document’s validity. Indeed, in England the very shape of indented charters was used as a means of authentication. In early Anglo-Saxon tradition, to prove the bona fide of a document it was sufficient to put together its two parts: if the dents fit together puzzle-like, and if the cut inscription can be read again the document is valid.

Needless to say, the chirograph format is foreign to the Jewish legal tradition, and the validation of a legal deed and transaction through this means cannot be recognized as binding by Jewish law. Jewish law requires the signatures of two witnesses to validate a contract. However, this discrepancy in the essential legal practice does not hinder the use of the chirograph format, which is not only generally accepted in the non-Jewish environment (which does not practice the witnesses’ signatures on their documents), but is imposed on the Jews by the Crown administration. To comply with the required practice without infringing the Jewish law, Jewish documents in medieval England proceed by accumulation of means of validation. By adopting the required chirograph format and, in some cases, of the seals appended by the grantors, the Jewish deeds conform to the King’s rules. But, in addition to these foreign means of authentication, Jewish documents contain the handwritten signatures of two witnesses as prescribed by Jewish law.

Fig. 2 WAM 6795: example of a middle part of a chirograph, with the divisa inscriptions on the top and bottom of the document. The document, drawn up on 19 November 1251, probably in Canterbury, is an acknowledgement of a debt.
Familiarity with the legal language of the other

Non-Jewish documents in 13th-century England are mostly expressed in Latin, despite the growing importance of the vernacular French in legal contexts. Jewish documents or documents involving a Jewish party are also most often written in Latin, but also in Hebrew. As we saw, the Crown courts recognized all these languages as legally valid. On the Jewish side, the economic existence depended on transaction mostly contracted in Latin. However, neither the knowledge nor the official recognition of the other party’s legal language is self-explanatory. After all, the main purpose of recording a legal transaction in writing is to insure its durability and effectiveness in eventual conflicts through a generally recognized legal form, which is supposed to be understood by the parties involved. This necessity of understanding the terms of the legal deeds is often mentioned in Jewish and non-Jewish normative texts. However, both with Hebrew and Latin we face the problem of the use of non-vernacular languages, which can normally be acquired only through a formal education. While in medieval England Jews could easily function in the environing society using their vernacular French, the schooling and acquisition of literacy skills were still, on both sides, the domain of the religious institutions. We will have to leave aside the important and relevant question of how much Latin non-Jewish lay individuals could know, and how accessible was the Latin legal tradition to those who did not have the chance of being literati (mostly clerks), and contain ourselves to the Christian professional classes which, in the thirteenth century, had some knowledge of Latin or at least of the juridical and official jargon. As for the Jews living in their midst, there exists a quasi-universal scholarly consensus today that the two learned traditions – Latin and Hebrew – were virtually two separated worlds, with few contacts between them. If any, these contacts were reserved to the rarified sphere of intellectual debates or translations of scientific works. To state it bluntly, it is believed that except for a few individuals, Jews in medieval Europe did not know Latin. However, when we leave aside the intellectual world and get into the much more down to earth pragmatic literacy, we realize that some knowledge of Latin was a sheer necessity for the Jews. Of course, what I called elsewhere the ‘money language’ does not require the same level of education as the Latin of the learned. Nonetheless, as already stated by Robin Mundill, 'the fact that the majority of the documentary evidence regarding the Jews was in Latin is, in itself, evidence that they were

fluent in it’. Indeed, in addition to the daily dealings with intricate legal matters and contracts in Latin, we know that royal exchequer’s notifications addressed to Jewish communities were read out in synagogues in Latin as well as in Hebrew. We do not know how and to what extent Jewish individuals acquired Latin, but it seems that they would not be able to function in the economic world in which they lived without this vital knowledge.

The question of the knowledge of Latin among Jews and Hebrew among Christians becomes even more essential when we try to picture the daily functioning of the administration. The clerks and officials belonging to both cultures are thrown together, notably in the framework of the chirographers’ archæ, to carry our common tasks, most of them involving Latin and Hebrew documents. I have studied elsewhere an interesting case of a Christian clerk from York who imitated Hebrew writing when entering a Latin document with Hebrew signatures into the cartulary of the Vicars Choral (York Minster, VC.3.1.1, fol. 25v). It has been also suggested that some extant documents in Latin script were written by Jews.

Another relevant example of the place of Hebrew in the framework of the archæ, and maybe another argument that at least some of the Christian chirographers had a smattering of Hebrew, are the official letters, mostly licentiae (authorisations of a withdrawal of a document from an archa) in Hebrew, explicitly addressed not only to the Jewish but also to the Christian chirographers. As we saw, when a debt was contracted, the creditor and later also the debtor kept a copy of the agreement each, while an additional copy was deposited in the archa. The chirographers were personally responsible for the documents in their custody. When the debt was fully or partly repaid, the debtor received a quitclaim (or a receipt for a partial repayment) from the creditor. But the creditor also needed to make sure that the chirographers of the archa were notified of the repayment and annulled the records of the debt. To cancel the debt in the archa, the creditor presented his copy of the original loan document (often his part of the chirograph). This pars was cancelled by a visible damage, and the copy deposited in the archa was removed from it. This cancellation of the debt was obviously essential for the debtor, but also for the creditor: the presence of a record of a debt in the archa could entail a tax on this debt. Indeed, the assessment of the share of taxes to be paid by the individual Jews to the King was carried out through the scrutiny of the contents of the archæ by specially appointed royal controllers. The records

20 See e.g. Rigg, Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. i, pp. 112–13; Rigg, Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. ii, pp. 103, 165, 277.
of such inquests have been preserved for several levies. The amount of the tax to be paid by a Jewish individual was calculated on the basis of his possessions including his unredeemed bonds. Removal and cancellation of the records of the debts in the *archa* was therefore a matter of urgency.

In addition to a number of such *licentiae* in Latin, twenty seven extant *licentiae* were written in Hebrew by Jewish moneylenders and addressed to chirographers, to officially authorize them to remove the bonds from the *archa* or to inform them that the debts had been repaid in full or in part. It is relevant that several of the Hebrew *licentiae* are explicitly addressed to both Jewish and Christian chirographers of a given *archa* centre. The Christian chirographers are designated *ערלים* , 'uncircumcised' (e.g. WAM 6752; WAM 6753) or *ארמאים*, 'Arameans' (WAM 6754).

It is, of course, possible that the authorization in Hebrew addressed to all the chirographers of a given *archa* was read and translated by Jewish clerks for the benefit of their Christian colleagues. However, in some cases, the official missives in Hebrew were addressed to named Christian individuals. Such is the case with a Hebrew note on the verso of a Latin document, British Library, Lansdowne Charter 30. This document concerns the debt of *Radulph de la Newland* owed to a consortium of three prominent Jewish money lenders, *Benet Crespin, Jacob Kohen* and *Solomon Kohen*. The debt was repaid by one *Hugh of London* in exchange for a long-term lease of the lands in *Newland*. The verso of the Latin deed of lease contains two Hebrew deeds. One is written directly on the verso and contains a quitclaim by the three Jewish creditors in favour of *Hugh of London*. The second document is of particular interest for our purpose. It is signed by the same three Jewish creditors, *Benet Crespin, Jacob Kohen* and *Solomon Kohen*.

---


24 The designation of non-Jews as 'Arameans' is found in rabbinic literature in Northern Europe, e.g. Rashi ad BT, Shabbat 130a; *Hagahot Mordechai*, par. 861. Its use to designate non-Jews goes back to early rabbinic literature, e.g. BT, Shabbat 129a, Baba Batra 21a, etc.

25 *Licentiae* in Latin also mention both Jewish and Christian chirographers as their addressees, see e.g. Christiani et Iudei, in WAM 9110.

The missive is addressed to William le Breton who was the Justice of the Jews at the Exchequer in the 1230s until shortly before February 1241, when an action was brought against him about a manor in Sporle, in Norfolk. It is interesting for our purpose that this letter contains very personal address to William le Breton. The addressee is called אדון יקרינו, 'our dear lord', and the expression יקר אדון, 'dear lord', is repeated again in the letter. The letter is official and respectful but

quite direct in the way the instructions concerning the annulment of the debt are expressed. It would be of course far-fetched to claim categorically that William read the letter in person rather than calling upon a Jewish secretary who would read and translate it for him. However, the unusual formulation of this particular document still shows the facility with which the Hebrew writings function among Christian officials.

The few examples presented here, as modest as they are, constitute an undeniable evidence of the contacts between Jews and Christians in the court of justice. They show how Jews and Christians accepted or even adopted the practices of each other, and learned the other party’s language and skills. It seems indeed that the field of legal practice, as hostile as it was by definition, was not a place of segregation but rather a fertile ground for intercommunity meeting and exchanges.
ÊTRE HISTORIEN DES JUIFS MÉDIÉVAUX EN FRANCE APRÈS BERNHARD BLUMENKRANZ

Claude Denjean et Juliette Sibon
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Introduction

« Voir un mien écrit agir, c'est la plus belle récompense que je puisse souhaiter »¹. Les lignes qui suivent ne répondront peut-être pas au vœu tel que l’a formulé et pensé Bernhard Blumenkranz. Elles témoigneront cependant de la manière dont nous le comprenons aujourd’hui, historiennes des juifs dans l’Occident latin du bas Moyen Âge, qui ne sommes pas les récipiendaires directs, ni même indirects, de son travail. Aucune filiation n’est avérée, en effet : les périodes et les espaces que nous étudions, les sources que nous pratiquons, suffisent à en convaincre. L’approche présentée ici ne saurait donc être un hommage des disciples au maître. Elle n’en sera pas moins subjective, voire empathique, grâce à une lecture de l’œuvre enrichie du paratexte, à savoir des avant-propos, préfaces, avertissements et notes des diverses publications qu’il a réalisées ou coordonnées.

Comment les chercheurs actuels et à venir peuvent-ils recevoir l’héritage de Bernhard Blumenkranz ? Quels profits peuvent-ils en retirer, tant sur le plan de la quête historique à proprement parler – à savoir des méthodes, des outils, des objets et des problématiques – que sur celui, institutionnel, du développement de l’histoire des juifs en France ?

Renouveler les réponses aux vieilles questions, faire émerger de nouvelles problématiques, se départir des anachronismes et des généralisations, exhumer des documents inédits, mettre en lumière des sources méconnues et toujours renouveler le corpus, tels sont les axes majeurs qui guident l’œuvre de Blumenkranz. Il met l’érudition et l’extrême rigueur scientifique au service de l’histoire des juifs, jamais perçue comme périphérique ni particulière, mais bien au contraire conçue comme intimement insérée dans l’histoire de la société médiévale globale. Parmi ses maîtres, les plus importants et les plus directs sont des spécialistes d’histoire des religions, tel Marcel Simon et son directeur de thèse, Henri-Irénée Marrou.
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En outre, dans le champ de l’histoire des juifs, il s’inscrit incontestablement dans
le sillage de Salo Wittmayer Baron, qui signe d’ailleurs la préface du collectif
_Art et archéologie des juifs en France médiévale_ ainsi que celle des mélanges en
son honneur², et qui plaide, bien avant lui, pour une histoire décloisonnée, voire
« déghettoisée »³.

Inscrire Blumenkranz en aval de ses maîtres ne doit pas conduire à minimi-
ser son apport, en tant qu’historien des juifs, d’une part, et en tant qu’acteur
dans le champ de la recherche en France, d’autre part. Il ouvre et défrique des
chantiers négligés, voire ignorés jusqu’à lors, élabore des outils ou instruments de
travail – par exemple, la _Bibliographie des juifs de France_ ou encore les _Documents
modernes sur les Juifs, xvi^e-xx^e siècles_⁴ –, établit une méthodologie et remporte
les conquêtes institutionnelles pérennes – la Commission des Archives juives,
dont il est l’un des trois cofondateurs, et l’équipe de la Nouvelle _Gallia judaica_
(désormais NGJ)⁵, et occupe ainsi une place significative dans le développement
de la « science juive » (S. Baron) en France au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre
mondiale⁶.

Parce que ses travaux sont bâti dès l’origine à partir de sources « non juives »,
à savoir des Pères de l’Église et de saint Augustin en particulier⁶, Blumenkranz
promeut le postulat fondateur d’inscrire les juifs dans l’histoire de la société mé-
diévale globale, sans se limiter à observer l’antijudaïsme. Parallèlement, il devient
l’un des principaux artisans du décloisonnement et de l’insertion institutionnels
des « études juives » françaises, et de l’histoire des juifs en France en particulier.
Il développe des collaborations avec les plus grands historiens de son temps, tel
Jacques Le Goff, et bien sûr Georges Duby, à l’occasion, notamment, des soutes-
nances des thèses de Joseph Shatzmiller et de Danièle Iancu-Agou notamment⁷.

De son amitié et de sa collaboration avec Albert Soboul naissent trois volumes
consacrés aux juifs dans la tourmente révolutionnaire, dont l’un parait à titre

---

² _Art et archéologie des juifs en France médiévale_ et _Les Juifs au regard de l’Histoire. Mélanges en l’honneur
⁴ En collaboration avec Monique Lévy, _Bibliographie des juifs en France_, Toulouse, Privat, 1974 et
⁵ Salo Wittmayer Baron, _Les Juifs au regard de l’Histoire. Mélanges en l’honneur de Bernhard Blumenkranz_,
⁶ _Die Judenpredigt Augustins. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten
Danièle Iancu-Agou, _Les juifs en Provence. De l’insertion à l’expulsion_, préface de Georges Duby, Marseille,
Institut historique de Provence, 1981, et _Juifs et néophytes en Provence. L’exemple d’Aix à travers le destin
de Régine Abram de Draguignan (1469–1525)_, préface de Georges Duby et postface de Gérard Nahon,
posthume. L’organisation et la publication du colloque *Juifs et judaïsme du Languedoc* dans les *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* sont réalisées en collaboration étroite avec Marie-Humbert Vicaire.

La reconnaissance par la société de la pertinence de cette démarche heuristique doit naturellement s’inscrire dans les institutions de l’enseignement et de la recherche. Si le CNRS a reconnu son travail, ce versant de l’œuvre, non le moindre, n’a pas conduit à un progrès linéaire. La commémoration du centenaire de sa naissance offre l’occasion d’examiner l’œuvre et le parcours d’historien de Bernhard Blumenkranz, de souligner ses réussites et d’en cerner les limites. Plus généralement, c’est le portrait et le travail d’un historien à l’œuvre que nous présentons ici, sans viser l’histoire de son parcours intellectuel, sans encore moins envisager sa biographie. Nous livrons ici un dialogue amorcé entre nous depuis quelques années déjà.

**1. Le maître au travail**

Dans *L’histoire continue*, Georges Duby souligne combien les ouvrages de Marc Bloch comptent dans sa formation et s’interroge :

« M’aurait-il, par sa conversation, ses conseils, guidé plus fermement qu’il ne l’a fait par ses seuls écrits ? Je n’en suis pas sûr. Ceux de mes amis qui furent ses élèves m’ont dit qu’il n’était pas de commerce facile. Il me suffit pour me proclamer son disciple de l’avoir lu. Le relisant, je ne cesse d’apprendre ».

En relisant Blumenkranz, dont nous n’avons recueilli aucune tradition directe puisque nos maîtres n’étaient pas de ses élèves, nous ne cessons d’apprendre également. C’est l’œuvre qui a d’abord nourri notre connaissance de l’histoire des juifs lorsque nous préparions notre doctorat ; c’est l’œuvre qui, encore aujourd’hui, alors que nous avons mûri nos projets de recherche personnels, nourrit nos réflexions. Force est de constater combien elle enrichit notre pensée de façon souterraine. Nous lisons dans les travaux de Blumenkranz un engagement à la fois

---


rigoureux et passionné. Les choix qu’il a défendus, sources de perspectives riches mais aussi parfois d’apories alimentent sans cesse nos questionnements.

Cette filiation intellectuelle choisie siérait-elle à Blumenkranz ? À plusieurs reprises, il exprime le souhait que ses chantiers soient prolongés par des « recherches et études nouvelles » 12. Le choix qu’est l’acte de lire libère des difficultés quotidiennes de la relation entre le maître et son élève – on rapporte que son commerce valait celui de Marc Bloch –, et donne naissance à un autre type de transmission d’homme à homme, celui du legs intellectuel de l’auteur à ses lecteurs. La relation entre texte et paratextes n’est-elle pas fondatrice d’une forme de tradition 13 ?

Les affinités électives ont l’avantage de laisser éclore, par l’observation de son travail, certaines propositions qui parsèment ses textes. Nous n’avons pas choisi celles qui se placent au cœur de son travail concernant les sources patristiques, mais les pistes concernant la vie économique et sociale des juifs au milieu des chrétiens. À partir du paratexte – le sien et ceux de ses maîtres et de ses élèves –, nous accédons à un discours sur la méthode défendue au fil de la plume. Nous reconstruisons le parcours d’un auteur qui ne s’attache pas à son ego-histoire, contrairement à plusieurs de ses contemporains 14. Si Blumenkranz s’efface devant son travail, c’est sans modestie cependant. Il affirme au contraire hautement être son travail, et le « je » qu’il clame nous rappelle que l’homme, qui a du caractère, conduit un atelier.

Blumenkranz est un maître, un magister, tel un artisan. Il suit le cursus traditionnel, avec les meilleurs professeurs, quoique privé de l’insertion universitaire classique par l’absence d’agrégation 15. Il est donc un chercheur avant d’être un enseignant. Il travaille patiemment à son chef-d’œuvre, Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, appuyé sur le dossier de preuves Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Âge, avant d’envisager largement l’histoire des juifs. Bien qu’il ne l’exprime pas aussi fortement que Marc Bloch, il considère son travail comme un travail artisanal 16.

Il s’affirme historien français de langue française. Quel que soit le cheminement qui le conduit à formuler son sujet de doctorat puis son projet d’équipe de recherche, il les définit avant tout comme des objets de questionnement scientifique, à l’instar de n’importe quel autre thème. Cette attitude nous semble essentielle dans sa démarche : elle interdit tout soupçon de supposée empathie identitaire. De remarques en remarques, Blumenkranz définit l’Histoire, inscrivant celle des juifs dans la discipline née autour de 1820, loin de toute visée communautaire. D’ailleurs, il affirme sa judéité avec la plus grande simplicité, comme une évidence imparable, n’imposant ni revendication publique ni déni. C’est selon le calendrier grégorien, la datation courante faudrait-il dire, qu’il choisit de clore son avertissement aux *Auteurs chrétiens latins*, depuis Jérusalem et Bagneux-sur-Seine simultanément. Il ne défend pas des études juives au sein d’une communauté mais place son thème favori au cœur de l’histoire religieuse. Il étudie les relations entre juifs et chrétiens en milieu chrétien.

L’érudition reste pour lui la condition première de tout travail mais n’est naturellement jamais le but ultime. L’œuvre du savant, ouvrage d’orfèvre, doit aider à approcher l’essence de l’histoire et à saisir la césure entre un ancien temps et une période nouvelle.

Au moment où, dans les années cinquante, l’histoire des juifs connaît une nouvelle période de développement, cet homme né à Vienne dans un milieu

qu’avec un peu de tremblement intérieur : quel artisan, vieilli dans le métier, s’est jamais demandé, sans un pincement de cœur, s’il a fait de sa vie un sage emploi ? Mais le débat dépasse, de beaucoup, les petits scrupules d’une morale corporative. Notre civilisation occidentale tout entière y est intéressée ». Et, parlant de son texte : « Je ne puis le présenter que pour ce qu’il est : le mémento d’un artisan, qui a toujours aimé à méditer sur sa tâche quotidienne, le carnet d’un compagnon, qui a longuement manié la toise et le niveau, sans pour cela se croire mathématicien. ».  


religieux étudie le premier Moyen Âge, avant 1096, époque à laquelle les juifs conservent leur statut de citoyens romains et sont loin d’être passifs, tandis que la notion d’intégration n’a alors aucune pertinence20. Bref, les juifs en situation normale ne sont pas victimes de la violence ; il n’est même pas possible de présupposer un antijudaïsme permanent dans ce monde haut médiéval « en plein mouvement, en pleine transformation »21. Si à cette époque, la plupart des victimes n’évoquent pas les camps, l’attitude du jeune historien diffère de celle d’Yitzhak Fritz Baer qui, avec Galout, revisite la compréhension des relations judéo-chrétiennes durant « l’âge d’or » aragonais médiéval22.


L’ego de l’auteur se dit ainsi d’une voix haute et ferme, sans retour sur lui-même, et, si l’on peut dire, sans chaleur vis-à-vis de sa personne. Il n’en est pas moins fier des résultats obtenus par l’engagement énergique de son « moi au travail », comme il le souligne dans la préface aux Inscriptions de Gérard Nahon : « ... je pouvais d’autant moins me soustraire à de telles sollicitations [d’aller voir des trouvailles] que je me sais largement responsable du renouveau de la curiosité du passé juif en France... »25.

Retraité, il poursuit sans relâche sa tâche et souffre visiblement de se retirer, gagné par une impatience qu’il livre sans détours : « ...je ne cacherai pas que je

20 Comme le souligne Gilbert Dahan dans sa préface à la réédition de 2006 de Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, op. cit.
23 Art et archéologie..., op. cit., p. 8.
24 Les auteurs chrétiens..., op. cit., p. 12.
n’aime pas rester dans l’attente passive d’une découverte plus ou moins accidentelle »

Lui, dont la présence vivante s’affirme d’abord par sa méthode historique et sa boullemie de découvertes, parle des hommes qu’il étudie, les juifs médiévaux, avec un mélange de distance et de connaissance intime, mais loin de l’expression de tout pathos. Ainsi nous dit-il (sommes-nous autorisés à voir un léger sourire se dessiner dans cette proposition ?) : « Sans nulle propension à l’apologie des Juifs, je me crois en droit d’affirmer… »

Mais, à la différence de Carlo Ginzburg, il ne défend pas exactement un éloge de la position « à distance », bien que très marqué par l’analyse des textes littéraires. Là aussi, il se pose plutôt en scientifique avant tout qui allie l’intérêt pour les détails à une vaste culture.

2. Du paratexte au texte

C’est de cette posture que part l’œuvre toute entière. En effet, elle n’est pas un point de vue, un sentiment, une façon de voir… bref, une opinion. Elle est la garantie que l’auteur se veut historien avant tout, sans se laisser aveugler par un corpus de dates et de faits téléologiquement sélectionnés, sans se résigner au résultat aléatoire des pertes documentaires que cause le temps. Blumenkranz s’évertue à répeter combien il faut se méfier, être prudent, chercher encore les sources manquantes, quitter à perdre son temps, pour obtenir des séries pertinentes, saisir les modalités de la sélection des documents pour en comprendre l’équilibre et le sens.

Et de s’emporter contre l’usage incongru, voire délirant, des statistiques portant sur des ensembles réduits. Et de souligner avec humour les bienfaits de

26 Idem pp. 9–10.

27 Idem, p. 4.


29 Il le redit par exemple dans son Avant-propos à Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, op. cit. pp. VI–VII où il rappelle que l’enquête sur des sources dispersées a porté ses fruits, ne serait-ce que pour montrer la présence des juifs dans l’agriculture ; Idem p. IX où il regrette de ne pas avoir embrassé plus largement le problème étudié ; dans sa note préliminaire à Art et archéologie… op. cit, p. 10 ; dans sa préface à Inscriptions hébraïques et juives de France médiévale, Paris, 1986, p. 8.


31 Idem p. 4.

32 Idem p. 6 : « Voudrais-je prouver par l’absurde l’inanité de statistiques établies avec un matériel trop restreint… », où, parlant de Loudun, il nous livre un amusant syllogisme à l’usage de ceux qui refusent
la « contre-sélection » des inscriptions et de la protection – involontaire – accordée aux inscriptions synagogales33.


Bon érudit, il suit à la lettre la méthode « à la française » lorsqu’il introduit le travail de Gérard Nahon par la définition d’« inscriptions » puisée dans le Littré35. L’importance donnée à l’étude lexicale et le goût pour la collection de divers types de corpus se lit, par exemple, dans un petit article sur la *perfidia* des juifs36. La notice est sans prétention mais dit tout de sa méthode : l’érudition est première. Le travail, publié dans le Bulletin du Cange, contribue à la constitution du dictionnaire latin du Moyen Âge, grand projet auquel de nombreux spécialistes collaborent. Le corps du texte est constitué de notices où la qualification des juifs, des chrétiens, des hérétiques est mise en balance37. Cet inventaire, précédé d’une brève introduction, est conclu de manière lapidaire : « *perfidia* » n’est pas associée à la trahison de Judas ; surtout, il est impossible de distinguer une évolution de son usage dans les textes38.

Ne croyons pas que cette conclusion brève, voire frustrante, relève d’une incapacité à dépasser l’érudition. Bien au contraire, elle témoigne une fois de plus combien Blumenkranz refuse toute vision téléologique de l’histoire des juifs, et combien il réfute le postulat de l’augmentation linéaire d’une parole stigmatisante à leur égard. Il montre que la plupart des auteurs n’emploient pas le terme en dehors du champ religieux, même si certains se servent de ce terme polyvalent dans un emploi équivoque.

L’introduction souligne que le but de l’article est non seulement de rassembler des matériaux collationnés au fil du temps pour combler une lacune, mais surtout de reprendre des études anciennes dont seules les bonnes intentions sont louables car « l’idée préconçue ne favorisait guère la recherche ». Les études
d’observer le contexte : on a trouvé trois inscriptions juives et pas une chrétienne, donc Loudun est une ville juive au début du Moyen Âge.

33 *Idem*, pp. 4–5.
34 *Idem* p. 4.
35 Préface à Gérard Nahon, *Inscriptions hébraïques et juives de France médiévale*, p. 3.
38 *Idem*, pp. 169–70.
privilégiaient les versions actuelles des textes sans suivre l’évolution de leur rédaction39. Bernhard Blumenkranz reprend chaque traduction pour analyser la citation au sein du texte, voir par quel synonyme le mot est remplacé dans une rédaction postérieure et éviter ainsi erreurs et contresens, niant toute généralisation abusive.

Il a comme passion, en effet, de collationner des données. Il accumule les fiches et est ainsi capable à la fois d’être très précis dans son travail et de couvrir le plus large spectre possible. Peu à peu, sans abandonner les sources textuelles qu’il connaît bien, il développe des études novatrices à travers l’attention portée aux documents iconographiques, archéologiques, artistiques. Il peut ainsi étudier les représentations, le discours sur les juifs, mais aussi s’attacher à une vision plus concrète, mettant en valeur, sur la longue durée, une histoire matérielle et culturelle des juifs en milieu chrétien, une histoire plus objective.

Ce goût de la collection conduit à un autre engagement fondateur. Il est conscient que l’histoire des juifs dépend de la constitution de corpus car les sources sont éparpillées, et des pans entiers n’ont pas été conservés. La réponse à cette difficulté consiste en un travail systématique qui développe la curiosité pour le passé juif et renouvelle les points de vue. La collection « Franco-Judaïca », outre son nom emblématique, promeut un travail encyclopédique. Après les textes ronéotypés, le directeur de la collection passe à de beaux ouvrages. Au-delà des aléas et des difficultés de l’édition, c’est l’aspect systématique, la présentation normalisée – autant que faire se peut – mais aussi l’alliance de la base de données avec l’analyse, la synthèse et la réflexion. Un socle solide est ainsi constitué, qui marque le début d’une nouvelle ère dans le champ de l’histoire des juifs.

Dans le même temps, il publie. Le travail ne s’achève jamais et il conçoit ses publications comme des mémoires d’étape, des points toujours provisoires dans la progression. Il remet sans cesse sur le métier. Il reprend ainsi ses articles parus entre 1949 et 1958 et refond l’ensemble pour une nouvelle publication à l’origine de Juifs et chrétiens, à laquelle il ajoute des textes et des références bibliographiques. Il demande sans cesse l’indulgence à ses lecteurs, certain d’avoir omis tel document qu’on ne manquera pas de retrouver, de n’avoir pu lire tel ouvrage40.

Ses travaux sont toujours explicitement destinés à susciter de nouvelles recherches, à entrainer de nouvelles découvertes41. L’histoire des juifs dans l’espace français gagne une visibilité et une cohérence remarquables. Les synthèses la rendent accessible à tous. Les recueils collectifs s’insèrent aussi dans les...

40 Par exemple dans Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, op. cit. p. XIII ; Les auteurs chrétiens..., op. cit., p. 8. Ces captatio benevolentiae ne sont pas de pure forme, on en trouve des échos continus dans les pages de ses ouvrages.
thématiques particulières. Cette histoire est au cœur de l’histoire religieuse, de l’histoire culturelle, de l’histoire de la vie matérielle alors en plein développement. L’ouvrage de Blumenkranz *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental* fait écho et poursuit le *Verus Israël* de Marcel Simon42. Le spécialiste de l’histoire des juifs collaborant avec des collégiens non spécialistes, développant ainsi une voie qui n’avait pas encore été aussi explicitement ouverte, et de manière novatrice, très différente de la collaboration développée à la fin du XIXe siècle entre Ernest Renan et Adolphe Neubauer43. Outre Soboul et Vicaire, l’interdisciplinarité avant la lettre se marque aussi par la collaboration avec Freddy Raphael qui fait œuvre à la fois d’historien et de sociologue44. Ainsi en 1977, l’histoire religieuse s’affiche à Fanjeaux alors que l’ouvrage concernant l’Alsace paru la même année reprend la tradition des « folkloristes » comme Jacobs pour développer une histoire culturelle45.

Cette capacité à insérer la thématique qui l’occupe dans un champ et une tradition plus ample reste une des leçons principales de Bernhard Blumenkranz. Il s’agit de rassembler non seulement des érudits et des savants capables d’analyser les sources hébraïques et les sources latines plus abondantes, mais aussi des universitaires de tous horizons, dont l’origine et l’appartenance religieuse doit être indifférente. Il s’agit d’inscrire cette histoire à venir dans l’Histoire. Il faut donc en assurer la rigueur et la pérennité au cœur des institutions universitaires, seul moyen pour en assurer la qualité scientifique.

3. *Héritages institutionnels, perspectives scientifiques*

L’apport historique de Blumenkranz est indissociable des conquêtes institutionnelles entreprises au cours de sa carrière. Son intérêt appuyé pour la démographie des juifs de la France médiévale le conduit à dresser un programme de recherche ambitieux, grand œuvre nécessairement collectif, fondé sur une prosopographie étendue46. Ce programme bénéficie de supports financiers et institutionnels, qui donnent naissance à la NGJ, unité propre de recherche (UPR 208) fondée à Paris en 1972 – en lien étroit avec l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, dont la

46 « Pour une nouvelle *Gallia judaica*. La géographie historique des juifs en France médiévale ». 
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vières section est alors dirigée par Jacques Le Goff. Son objectif scientifique premier est de dresser une géographie historique des juifs de France, tout en privilégiant le Moyen Âge, afin de prolonger, à partir de sources écrites hébraïques, latines, françaises, manuscrites et imprimées, ainsi que des vestiges archéologiques et de l’épigraphie, le travail d’Henri Gross, publié à la fin du xixe siècle, intitulé Gallia judaica, Dictionnaire géographique de la France d’après les sources rabbiniques47. Gross n’a pu dresser son inventaire qu’à partir des sources hébraïques éditées dont il disposait en Allemagne ; il faut élargir le corpus afin de compléter ses données déjà précieuses.

Transformée en Équipe de recherche (ERS 13) en 1977, les objectifs de la NGJ s’étendent aux autres aspects historiques que Blumenkranz considère négligés jusque-là. Quelques années auparavant, en effet, dans l’Introduction à l’Histoire des juifs en France, il annonce dépasser les deux curiosités alors prééminentes dans le champ de l’histoire des juifs médiévaux, à savoir l’événement et le fait littéraire, en réservant la plus grande place à la géographie historique et démographique, aux conditions économiques et sociales, au droit et aux institutions, aux structures communautaires et intercommunautaires48. En outre, d’autres périodes sont désormais à l’honneur, l’époque moderne principalement, et la Révolution française en particulier, en collaboration avec Soboul, on l’a vu.


La NGJ doit enfin fournir aux chercheurs des outils savants, à savoir des inventaires, des bases de données et une bibliothèque spécialisée, en croissance régulière jusqu’à ce jour, et qui comprend notamment le « fichier Blumenkranz », composé de milliers de notices bibliographiques dont la mise à jour n’a malheureusement pas pu être poursuivie au-delà des années 1980.

Dans ses écrits programmatiques, Blumenkranz stigmatise régulièrement le manque de main d’œuvre. En ouverture d’Art et Archéologie, il déplore qu’il y ait « trop peu d’ouvriers pour un trop vaste chantier »49. Son constat est le même au moment de lancer le projet de sa nouvelle Gallia judaica, bâti, en théorie, sur le travail d’une équipe nombreuse50. Toutefois, l’impulsion est donnée et les collaborateurs et successeurs poursuivent le grand œuvre. Ainsi, la réalisation du

49 Art et Archéologie..., op. cit., p. 9.
50 « Pour une nouvelle Gallia judaica... », art. cit., dans Écrits dispersés..., op. cit., ici p. 39.
monumental *Dictionnaire de géographie historique des juifs en France médiévale* avance, avec la publication de la *Provincia judaica, Dictionnaire de géographie historique des juifs en Provence médiévale*, établi par Danièle Iancu-Agou à partir de la mise à jour d’un travail de jeunesse, et paru en 201051. Notons qu’un nouveau tome, consacré à l’Alsace et à la Lorraine médiévales, vient de paraître52.


Puis, en 1992, avec la prise de direction de Gilbert Dahan, la filiation est directe. Blumenkranz dirige sa thèse. S’opère alors un véritable retour aux sources : Dahan est avant tout spécialiste de l’histoire des religions55. Avant de se consacrer exclusivement à l’exégèse et à l’herméneutique dans les commentaires chrétiens de la Bible au bas Moyen Âge occidental, il poursuit l’étude des rapports entre juifs et chrétiens dans le sillage de Marcel Simon et de Bernhard Blumenkranz et offre ainsi une synthèse sur les relations intellectuelles entre juifs et chrétiens pour les XIIe-XIVe siècles. Le projet initial de la NGJ se pérennise dans le cadre de grands colloques, désormais publiés dans une nouvelle collection fondée par Gilbert Dahan aux éditions du Cerf56.

L’héritage est repris en 2002 par Danièle Iancu-Agou, et se trouve ainsi confié à une spécialiste des sources latines, non plus exégétiques, mais notariales. L’histoire des rapports entre juifs et chrétiens au bas Moyen Âge au sein de la NGJ est désormais envisagée sous l’angle de la pratique, à savoir de la vie quotidienne à l’aune des dispositions principalement économiques – dont les reconnaissances de dot et testaments –, prises par les juifs médiévaux et les néophytes auprès des notaires latins. Danièle Iancu-Agou réalise sa thèse sous la direction de Georges Duby, à partir des notaires provençaux de la seconde moitié du XVe siècle et du début du XVIe siècle, temps des conversions et des expulsions locales puis

générales57. Les archives latines provençales sont alors promues comme sources fondamentales et principales pour l’histoire des juifs du Midi de la France, voire de l’Occident latin méditerranéen en général58. La topographie des quartiers juifs du comté de Provence, on l’a vu, donne un second souffle au projet du grand dictionnaire.

Au-delà de ce travail, l’histoire des femmes et de la famille, des intellectuels, de leurs manuscrits et de leurs comportements en tant que néophytes, s’inscrivent pleinement dans le sillage de la méthode et des objectifs assignés par le fondateur de la NGJ. Ainsi, l’étude des juifs convertis provençaux, à travers le destin de Régine Abram de Draguignan, exhume des cas de conversion dans les milieux médicaux bien plus précoces qu’on ne l’avait pensé jusqu’à lors, c’est-à-dire dès les années 1460, aux temps d’une présence juive encore tolérée en Provence59. Cette thèse contribue à repenser le bas Moyen Âge dans son ensemble, période souvent comprise comme celle d’une dégradation croissante des rapports judéo-chrétiens, qui aurait inéluctablement conduit au bannissement général des juifs de Provence en 1501.

Rattachée au Centre d’études des religions du livre de Villejuif en 1995, aujourd’hui Laboratoire d’Études sur les Monothéismes (UMR 8584), sous tutelle principale de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, la NGJ est accueillie, depuis janvier 2014, dans les locaux de Villejuif, après dix ans de localisation à Montpellier.

Dresser l’état des lieux des « études juives » médiévales en France à l’aube de cette nouvelle page de l’histoire de la NGJ ne peut se faire sans subjectivité. D’aucuns déplorent leur crise, d’autres – dont nous sommes – s’attachent à souligner leur dynamisme en dépit des difficultés actuelles que traversent l’Enseignement supérieur et la Recherche en France. En effet, l’histoire des juifs au Moyen Âge intéresse toujours plus de chercheurs, à partir de pôles dont la multiplicité est parfois dénigrée car perçue comme une faiblesse institutionnelle. Quoi qu’il en soit, la dispersion engendre des formations variées et complémentaires, soutient des vocations et offre des carrières au sein d’institutions différentes, à savoir, sans exhaustivité, l’École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, l’Institut Rachi de Troyes, l’Institut de Recherche pour l’Étude des Religions, l’Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes, ou encore le CNRS. Dans le paysage institutionnel français, l’université ne fait pas

57 Danièle Iancu-Agou, Les juifs en Provence…, op. cit.
exception : l’élection de maîtres de conférences en histoire du Moyen Âge, et récemment, d’un Professeur des universités l’atteste significativement. Est-ce le signe d’une réelle possibilité d’inscrire le plus naturellement du monde cette histoire au cœur de l’enseignement d’une histoire de l’Occident médiéval, d’une histoire de France, selon la voie montrée par Blumenkranz ?

Car au-delà du parcours et du travail de ses héritiers directs et indirects, l’œuvre de Blumenkranz essaime largement. Sa méthodologie et ses grands principes irradient en dehors et en aval du cercle de ses contemporains et successeurs. La NGJ demeure forté de ses héritages qui conservent toute leur pertinence plus de quarante ans après sa naissance officielle.


60 Claude Denjean a soutenu sa thèse à l’université de Toulouse 2. Après avoir occupé un poste de maître de conférences à Bordeaux 1 puis à Toulouse 2, elle est élue Professeur à l’université de Perpignan en 2014 ; Claire Soussen-Max a réalisé sa thèse sous la direction de Michel Zimmermann et est actuellement maître de conférences à l’université de Cergy ; Juliette Sibon est actuellement maître de conférences à l’université d’Albi, Danièle Sansy, à l’université du Havre, et Capucine Nemo-Pekelman, à l’université de Paris Ouest-La Défense, se prévalent de parcours similaires.

61 Histoire des juifs en France, écrits dispersés, p. 5.


Enfin, les décennies antérieures ont vu paraître de nombreuses monographies, qui sont autant d’instruments de synthèse et de comparaison de l’histoire des communautés juives de l’Occident latin du bas Moyen Âge. Parallèlement, le développement d’Internet a suscité la mise en œuvre et en ligne d’ambitieuses bases de données aisément accessibles64. Une nouvelle histoire des juifs médiévaux insérés dans la société chrétienne occidentale peut s’écrire, entreprise nécessairement collective. Centrée sur la France, ses limites géographiques peuvent toutefois être repoussées par-delà les frontières des entités politiques médiévales et par-delà les frontières culturelles qui séparent Ashkenaz, Tsarfat et Sefarad. Un tel ouvrage livrerait une synthèse précieuse et fondamentale, non seulement au grand public, mais aussi aux historiens non spécialistes des « études juives » et à leurs


étudiants. Le « décloisonnement éditorial » pourrait accompagner ce nouveau grand œuvre, plaidoyer cher au cœur de professeurs qui inscrivent l’histoire des juifs dans leurs enseignements dès le niveau généraliste de la Licence d’Histoire.

Conclusion

Vaste et bouillonnante, l’œuvre inspire toujours les questionnements actuels et guide le choix d’avoir rédigé ce texte au présent.

Être historien des juifs médiévaux après Blumenkranz est en quelque sorte confortable, grâce à la belle voie qu’il a contribué à tracer, grâce aux leçons de ses succès. Mais l’optimisme hérité du maître ne doit pas masquer les pierres d’achoppement qui demeurent. En 1977, Marie-Humbert Vicaire introduisait le volume de Fanjeaux par cette question, somme toute limitative en ouverture d’un colloque qui envisageait aussi les aspects juridiques, économiques et sociaux de l’histoire des juifs :

Est-il nécessaire de justifier, à l’intérieur de la recherche la plus vaste sur l’histoire religieuse du Languedoc au XIIIe siècle et au début du XIVe siècle, d’avoir fait une place au sujet « Juifs et judaïsme » ?


Réussite de par sa longévité, animée et développée par les brillants successeurs de Blumenkranz, la NGJ, dont le credo fondateur est le décloisonnement de l’histoire des juifs, n’en contribue pas moins, par son particularisme institutionnel au sein du CNRS, à faire du champ une discipline « exotique », encore trop souvent perçue comme marginale, peu ou pas enseignée à l’université. La sortie du ghetto n’est pas achevée, loin s’en faut. L’histoire des juifs médiévaux n’a pas encore connu le développement dont l’histoire de l’Islam médiéval a bénéficié à l’université depuis les deux ou trois dernières décennies.

Maitre d’atelier omniprésent et avide d’aller de l’avant, Blumenkranz prônait sans cesse le travail en collaboration, qu’il regretta difficilement « spontané ». En dépit de son aura et de sa stature dans le paysage scientifique, il semble avoir

---

été toujours frustré de ce point de vue et déplorait souvent, on l’a vu, d’être abandonné à ses seules forces, bien qu’il estimât avoir fait de son mieux 67.

Enfin, il se plaignit souvent de la politesse des savants collègues qui ne prenaient pas la peine de corriger ses fautes, de souligner certaines de ses erreurs, ni d’exhumer les faiblesses de son argumentation. Aux remarques qu’il distilla dans les préfaces et avertissements, on imagine que sa générosité le poussait à ne négliger aucune critique vis-à-vis de ses collègues et élèves, refusant de se laisser aller à ce que Montaigne appelait cette « merveilleuse lâcheté » 68, impitoyable d’exigence envers lui-même et les autres, sans jamais rien sacrifier à son optimisme.

67 Les auteurs chrétiens..., op. cit., p. 8.
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