

PARALLAX  RE-VISIONS OF CULTURE
AND SOCIETY

Stephen G. Nichols, Gerald Prince, and Wendy Steiner,
SERIES EDITORS

Rethinking the Medieval Senses

Heritage / Fascinations / Frames

EDITED BY

*Stephen G. Nichols,
Andreas Kablitz, and Alison Calhoun*

The Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore



Christian Sovereignty and Jewish Flesh

DAVID NIRENBERG

In the fall of 1449 a university graduate of obscure lineage and no previous literary experience took up his quill in Toledo. He was writing under pressure. Outside the gates were ranged the forces that would tomorrow capture the city. But today he wrote in defense of his actions and those of like-minded compatriots. He wrote, that is, in defense of Toledo's rebellion against its king, and of the peculiar form that rebellion had taken: the killing of neighbors descended from the many Jews who had converted to Christianity over the past sixty years, and the passage of a municipal ordinance barring any such people from ever holding public office.

The "Bachiller Marcos" knew himself to be in a difficult position, one so difficult that even his choice of address was a tortured one:

[I address this letter] to the very Holy Father . . . , and to the very high and powerful king or prince or administrator to whom, according to God, law, reason and right there belongs the administration and governance of the realms . . . , and to all other . . . administrators in the spiritual and temporal [affairs] of the universal orb, in the Church militant, which is the congregation and university of faithful Christians, [that is, those] truly believing in the birth, passion and resurrection [etc.] . . . , [but I do not address it to] the unbelieving and the doubtful in the faith, who are outside of us and in confederation [*ayuntamiento*] with the synagogue, which is to say a congregation of beasts, for since such bind themselves like livestock to the letter, they have always given and still give false meaning to divine and human scripture. [In short, I address this letter to those] attesting to the truth and saying: "the letter kills, the spirit vivifies (2 Cor 3:6)."¹

In the Bachelor's discriminating salutation we recognize a political distinction between a community that lives the purely carnal and material life of animals, and one that exists for the sake of a higher good.² The Bachelor writes only to "administrators" in the latter community, the "congregation and university of faithful Christians." Specifically excluded are those who live as "Jewish" beasts. Creatures of carnality, they have lost the human right to participate in the republic, and whatever power they wield is by definition tyrannical, not sovereign. We know exactly who he had in mind: the royal favorite cum prime minister Alvaro de Luna, the King Juan II who supported him, and even the pope, if he ended up rejecting the Bachelor's appeal and ruling in favor of the king.

Onto the oppositions of "Jew" and Christian, beast and human, material life and spiritual life, tyrant and legitimate magistrate, the Bachelor maps yet another: killing letter and vivifying spirit. Through this formulation, borrowed from St. Paul, the Bachelor proposes a literacy test for citizenship.³ Those who read like Jews, literally after the flesh, deprive themselves of legitimate authority and exclude themselves from the human community, becoming beasts of the synagogue. If no prince can be found who reads like a Christian, the treatise concludes, then the city should place itself directly under the governance of the Holy Spirit.

The royalists soon retook Toledo, and the Bachelor was hanged in the public square. His treatise became a founding document of the Castilian ideology of "purity of blood," hence of importance to anyone interested in the history of racial ideologies in Spain and its colonies. But it is as an example of a particular logic of revolution that his claim on our time is both more urgent and more general. Sovereignty and freedom, as the Bachelor expounded them, required the "spirit" to achieve the political subjection of flesh and the hermeneutic subjection of letter. The reverse produced, not sovereignty, but tyrannical materialism. Within the Bachelor's political theology this materialism was best understood as "Jewish," and the struggle for sovereignty could best be represented as a struggle against the "Jews." The political perfectibility of the world therefore required, as a very different revolutionary put it more famously some four centuries later, "*the emancipation of society from Judaism.*"⁴

The quote from Marx is meant only to suggest the degree to which variants (sometimes secularized) of the Bachelor's political theology saturated Enlightenment and Modernity. With the triumph of "American materialism," the globalization of economic systems, and the emergence of the state of Israel as a focal point for the aspirations to sovereignty of Muslims across the world,

that saturation is in some ways even more complete today. It may well be that at present more people than ever before understand their struggles, whether against racism, the institutions of global capitalism, or political oppression, in terms of resistance to domination by materialist "Jews" and their "agents." All the more pressing is the need for a history of the terms, ideas, and discourses through which this understanding is conceived and expressed.⁵

It should already be evident that this history has deep philosophical and theological roots. In order to uncover these roots I will describe how the fruitful flesh of the Jew nourished the growth of a theory of reading into a theory of politics central to the expression of early Christian (and early Islamic) aspirations to sovereignty.⁶ We will then explore briefly some implications of this exceptional status of the Jew for the development of Christian politics in the medieval monarchies of Western Europe.⁷ My claim, of course, is that this history is crucial to any understanding of the places assigned to Jews and Judaism within later Christian (and Muslim) ideologies. The modern trajectory of these ideas I leave to extrapolation, but the Bachelor himself dictates our starting point. "The letter kills, but the spirit gives life": we must begin with Paul.

Reading through Jewish Flesh

Saul's fall upon the road to Damascus, and his subsequent recovery as Paul, transformed the meaning of Jews and Judaism forever. As soon as he was healed he began to preach, first to the Jews and then to the gentiles, about (among many other things) the relationship of the Jews to Jesus. The interpretation of the textual records of this preaching (i.e., the Pauline Epistles) bristles with complexity.⁸ Paul, like other early Christians both Jewish and gentile, confronted two important "Jewish questions." The first had to do with the past. How was the ancient covenant given to Abraham, and its textual expression in the form of the Hebrew Bible, related to the new promise of Jesus? Could it be appropriated? Rejected? The second was a subquestion of the first. How should followers of Jesus act in the present? Should they, or should they not, observe Jewish practices and rituals?⁹

Paul's letters to the Galatians and the Romans provide the earliest surviving treatment of these questions. In them he articulated a fierce universalism aimed at all the particular identities that his society held most sacred.¹⁰ "God shows no partiality" (Gal. 2:6). "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in

Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). Such universalism was not entirely novel. It was underwritten both by Pharisaic beliefs in the messianic ingathering of gentiles, and by a widespread philosophical dualism (often called "Neoplatonic") that stressed the existence of an idealized brotherhood in the spirit, and emphasized the superiority of that spiritual state over the many differences of body and of circumstance that marked the flesh of living beings. But Paul (or at least his later readers) came to define his universalism against one particular status that had previously been almost entirely ignored by the Greek philosophical tradition. Not gender or condition of liberty, but Judaism, served as the constant target of Paul's eloquence. This is clear even in the structure of Galatians 3:28 cited above, which concludes in pointed fashion: "And if you are Christ's then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise." Of all the antinomies of identity from which it was constructed, the category of Jew, of descendent of Abraham, most needed to be expanded in order to make room for other "heirs." Paul's universalism was articulated in terms of a struggle for control over the Jewish past and future. It is in this struggle that later generations carved out the exceptional space occupied by Jews and Judaism in Christendom.

To the extent that Jews refused to surrender their ancestors, their lineage, and their identity, they became emblematic of the particular, of stubborn adherence to the conditions of the flesh, enemies of the Gospel. Paul did not believe this enmity to be permanent.¹¹ It was necessary that the Jews stumble, for their "rejection meant the reconciliation of the world." But they will receive mercy, be grafted back again, and their reacceptance will mean "nothing less than life from the dead" (Rom. 11:1-15). His is a message of a necessary but temporary blindness, a hardening of heart like Pharaoh's, produced by God for the salvation of the world (Rom. 9:17). Hence Paul's extraordinary conception of "Jewish enmity": "As regards the Gospel, they are enemies, but for your sake; but as regards those who are God's choice, they are still well loved for the sake of their ancestors" (Rom. 11:28). Jews who do not recognize Jesus as Messiah are the exemplary enemies of Christ's followers, but also the beloved foundations of their salvation: a charitable enmity whose political depths will be plumbed in the following pages.¹²

Paul's position was motivated in part by the tension between two convictions: that of the ongoing relevance of God's promise to Abraham, and of the extension of that promise beyond Abraham's descendents in the flesh. Had Paul desired to abandon Judaism or condemn its scriptures as false (as many would soon do), Judaism might have become no more important to ancient

Christians than any other of the myriad ethnic identities they were capable of ignoring as spiritually insignificant. But he did not, and Judaism became a key term in Christian hermeneutics. Paul's letters were primers for a practice of reading meant to transform the meaning of Abraham's biography:

For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman. But the son of the slave was born according to the flesh, the son of the free woman through promise. Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery: she is Hagar . . . she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother. . . . Now we, brethren, like Isaac are children of promise. . . . But what does scripture say? "Cast out the slave and her son; for the son of the slave shall not inherit with the son of the free woman." (Gal. 4:22-30)

Abraham's families, one slave, one free, here unleash a chain of allegorical significations. Hagar and Ishmael represent flesh and slavery, Sarah and Isaac promise and freedom. Thus far the reading would not have shocked. But next comes an earthquake. Hagar and Ishmael, flesh and slavery, are associated with the law given on Mt. Sinai and historical Jerusalem. Sarah and Isaac are a new covenant and a heavenly city. One allegorical stroke reverses the traditional readings of this story. The Mosaic Law and the people and polity that observe it are, insofar as they reject Jesus, not the heirs of God's promise to Abraham, but are condemned as "of the flesh," sentenced to slavery and exile. This terrestrial Jerusalem is replaced by the spiritual Jerusalem set free by faith in Jesus. The same technique Paul applies here to the covenant with Abraham he applies elsewhere to the specific practices through which that covenant was announced. Abraham's circumcision, for example, emerged from under the pressure of Paul's stylus as merely a "sign or seal of the righteousness which he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised" (Rom. 4:11).

The style of reading through which Paul achieved this translation from promise in the flesh to promise in the spirit was not a novel one. Word and meaning were arrayed against each other in a hierarchy explicitly parallel to that of flesh and spirit. The task of a reader was to penetrate beyond the "letter," the sign, the outer body (*soma*) or literal meaning of a text, and into its inner or spiritual meaning. Such reading practices were standard amongst both Jews and gentiles familiar with Hellenistic philosophy.¹³ What was surprising about Paul were not his methods but his conclusions: once the inner meaning was understood, the literal meaning could be dispensed with. As he put it in Romans 7:5-6, "For when we were still in the flesh, our sinful pas-

sions, stirred up by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. But now we are fully freed from the law, dead to that in which we lay captive. We can thus serve in the new being of the Spirit and not the old one of the letter." It is not just the law that is left behind by the spiritual believer and reader, but also the companions that Paul everywhere associates with it: the letter, and even flesh itself.

Paul valued the spiritual world much more highly than the phenomenal one through which it was perceived. He was convinced that the end of the material and the beginning of the messianic world was near. But he did not represent the material world and its organic necessities as evil. In his letters to the Corinthians, for example, the body (*soma*) appears, not as the "tomb" (*sema*) favored by so many authors, but as a sheltering tent (2 Cor. 5:1-4). And if on the one hand, Christians "long to be exiled from the body" and "look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen" (2 Cor. 5:8, 4:18), yet conversely the spiritual requires the physical. "If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body. . . . But it is not the spiritual which is first, but the physical, and then the spiritual" (1 Cor. 15:42-50).¹⁴ Still, on the topic of Judaism Paul's dualism was more systematic, his condemnation of flesh more severe. The first of two difficulties that pushed him toward extremes has already been mentioned: the need to distinguish between the fleshly and the spiritual heirs of Abraham. To this end Paul characterized the many Jews who did not believe in Jesus as pure flesh. This Israel could not even be said to be truly alive. A branch cut from the vine (Rom. 11:17-24), she was an inanimate form, a body without spirit. Into this vessel Paul repeatedly poured the dangers of reading and believing "after the flesh."

The carnality of Israel comes into sharpest polemical focus only when Paul confronts a second difficulty, the question of gentile Christian adherence to the mandates of Jewish law. Among Jewish believers in Christ such adherence was for Paul at best commendable—perhaps even required—at worst a matter of indifference.¹⁵ Among gentile converts, however, it was a horrifying symptom of literalism, evidence that they had not understood Christ's message, nor the practice of interpretation that conveyed it. When, for example, the non-Jewish Christians of Galatia circumcised themselves they placed significance in the sign rather than in what it signified, and thereby revealed themselves as "severed from Christ" and Spirit by the "desires of the flesh" (Gal. 5:4, 16-18). Gentiles, Paul insisted, ought to become heirs of Abraham in the spirit without becoming Jews in the flesh. "To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. For the mind that is set on the

flesh is hostile to God . . . and those who are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8:6–8).

It is not the evils of Judaism that Paul is here concerned with, but those of gentile *Judaizing*. Paul himself invented the word in Galatians 2:14, in order to describe gentile Christian observance of Jewish laws and rituals.¹⁶ As he presents it in Galatians and Romans, the danger is not that Jews seduce Christians to their ways, but that gentile Christians are attracted to the old honors of Israel: "the glory was theirs and the covenants; to them were given the Law and the worship of God and the promises. To them belong the fathers and out of them, so far as physical descent is concerned, came Christ who is above all" (Rom. 9:4–5). These privileges are real, but the gentile who yields to their attractions expresses doubt in the power of Christ's grace, and thereby becomes infected by the flesh. As Paul put it in a different context, "do you not know that only a little yeast leavens the whole batch of dough?" (1 Cor. 5:6). Paul's rhetoric against Torah grows most heated when he attempts to quarantine its temptations for gentiles. It is only in those moments that Judaism emerges as the antipode of spirit, as dead letter, killing flesh.¹⁷

Sharpening Enmity: Gospel Hermeneutics and Jewish Hypocrisy

There is a vast and contentious literature on how the authors of the Gospels, all writing after Paul, after the destruction of Jerusalem and its Jewish Temple in 70 CE, and for an audience now largely gentile, transposed and amplified these themes.¹⁸ For our purposes we need remember only three points. First, all the Gospel authors stress the prophetically ordained enmity of those Jews who rejected Jesus (or some representative subset of them, such as the Pharisees) not only toward the Messiah and his followers, but also toward God. Their hatred proves the truth of Jesus's message, and defines his community as one of spirit. "You stubborn people . . . you are always resisting the Holy Spirit. . . . Can you name a single prophet your ancestors never persecuted? They killed those who foretold the coming of the Upright One, and now you have become his betrayers, his murderers" (Acts 7:51–53. Cf. Acts 28:28; John 8:44–47).

Second, that enmity is conceived of hermeneutically, in terms of a disjuncture between seeming and being, outer and inner moral state, form and meaning. Matthew and Luke explore this disjuncture repeatedly through the theme of the Pharisees (mentioned twenty-nine times in Matthew, twenty-seven in Luke) and their hypocrisy. In the Sermon on the Mount, for example, Jesus

preaches "the seven woes of the Pharisees," seven indictments that describe in deafening crescendo the different ways in which the Pharisees confuse appearance with reality (Matt. 23:25–32). Let the sixth be representative: "Alas for you, scribes, and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs that look handsome on the outside, but inside are full of the bones of the dead and every kind of corruption. In just the same way, from the outside you look upright, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness." The Pharisees pride themselves as heirs of the prophets and guardians of their tombs, when in fact they are tombs themselves, about to prove their own corruption and hypocrisy by sending yet another prophet to his grave. Here, as elsewhere in the Gospels, the tension between body and spirit resolves in the direction of the empty carnality, the living death, of the Jews.¹⁹

Third, the conception of Jewish enmity in terms of hypocrisy allowed Matthew and Luke to develop what we might call a theory of infection, an anxiety about the ease with which "Pharisaic" attributes could overwhelm the Christian. They summarized this theory in an apt biological metaphor: "Be on your guard against the yeast of the Pharisees—their hypocrisy. Everything now covered will be uncovered, and everything now hidden will be made clear" (Luke 12:1–2). Matthew uses similar words, but provides a terrifying example:

The disciples, having crossed to the other side, had forgotten to take any food. Jesus said to them, "Keep your eyes open, and be on your guard against the yeast of the Pharisees and the Sadducees." And they said among themselves, "It is because we have not brought any bread." Jesus knew it, and he said, "You have so little faith, why are you talking among yourselves about having no bread? Do you still not understand? . . . How could you fail to understand that I was not talking about bread? What I said was: Beware the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees." Then they understood that he was telling them to be on their guard, not against yeast for making bread, but against the teachings of the Pharisees and Sadducees. (Matt. 16:5–12)

Here, at the very moment that Jesus warns his closest associates about the dangers of "Pharisaism," they act like "Pharisees" themselves. Rather than understanding his statement metaphorically and spiritually they understand it literally and materially, in the context of their own bodily hunger. The danger is inherent in the nature of language itself. How can we know if Jesus spoke literally or metaphorically of "yeast," of "bread," or of "Pharisees"? Because the authors of Matthew and Luke understood the relationship between the "thing" a word referred to and its "higher meanings" (metaphor, allegory, etc.) in terms of the relationship between perishable flesh and eternal spirit, these

linguistic questions encapsulated for them the difficulty of understanding the relationship between the material world and the divine Word. At the crossroads of these questions, representing the possibility of confusion in its purest form, they placed the Jews.

Dualism versus Incarnation: The Theological Labor of Jewish Flesh

For the Gospel authors this confusion may have been sociological as well as exegetical. The fourth Gospel's stark vocabulary of Jewish enmity, for example, is often attributed to the trauma of the Johannine community's expulsion from their local synagogue.²⁰ The utility of Jewish enmity for the Christian communities of the second and later Patristic centuries, however, derived much more exclusively from philosophical questions about the relationship between matter and spirit that had little to do with real Jews, though they were expressed in terms of Judaism. One of these many questions concerned the status of the Messiah himself. Was Jesus Christ a man or a god? The question was in some ways as difficult for the increasingly gentile and Hellenistic believers of the second century as it had been for the Jews of Jesus's day. Readers in the Greek Platonic and Aristotelian philosophical traditions were not accustomed to thinking of the highest deity in material terms, or as suffering change. How then to approach Jesus Christ? Many pathways were proposed. At one extreme were the various groups who held that Jesus was a human being of flesh and blood, not born of a virgin, who was chosen (or adopted) by God to carry out His will on earth. At the other were those who believed Christ to be entirely a god, incapable of suffering or death, only appearing human for the sake of His audience. In between were many communities holding a variety of positions, including some that seemed to many contemporaries paradoxical and incoherent but that we now think of in retrospect as orthodox, namely, that Jesus was both fully man and fully God.²¹

Perhaps the most influential opponent of such paradox was a second-century Christian named Marcion (fl. 139–156). The tension that Marcion saw between flesh and spirit was so severe that it called for complete separation. Not only could the highest god not assume a corruptible body, he could not even produce one, for to do so would be to suffer change. An evil "creator" god was the author of the flesh and everything material. The savior god was a "stranger" to the world, concerned only with soul and spirit. And just as there were two creations there were also two scriptures.²² The god of matter's scripture was the Hebrew Bible. The Stranger's scripture was a Gospel (Luke, ac-

ording to Irenaeus) and ten Pauline Epistles, all purged of any "Jewish" traits (such as quotations from the Hebrew Bible) that might lessen the starkness of the oppositions Marcion understood them to contain.²³

Marcion read Paul as a dualist. What we today may want to characterize as Paul's ambivalence toward flesh, Marcion and many others saw as utter condemnation.²⁴ Marcion systematically expressed his rejection of material creation in terms of a rejection of letter, law (meaning Jewish scripture), and above all, Judaism. In this again he believed he was following Paul, whose clear opinions had been obscured by the textual tampering of Judaizing Christians intent on concealing the message of the savior god. So far as we know, Marcion's predilection for distilling the evils of flesh into Judaism had nothing to do with his experiences of, or competition with, real Jews. Rather it was driven by his readings of those Pauline passages, especially in Galatians and Romans, which described the existence of a "law of the flesh" and expressed the dangers of that law in terms of Judaizing. The importance of this reading cannot be overemphasized, for it turned Jews and Judaism into a popular arena for contests over the relationship between matter and spirit, man and God, and over the texts and sacraments that mediate between them.

One of the most important of these contests was over the content and the meaning of scripture. Marcion entirely rejected the books of the Jews, attributed their authorship to the evil creator of the material world, and purged his own collection of any references that obscured the sharp distinctions he saw between the scriptures of spirit and the scriptures of flesh. His was, in fact, the first systematic attempt to delineate the form and boundaries of a Christian scriptural canon, and it precipitated an explosion of debate and activity, ranging from forgery to philology, out of which the canonical "New Testament" was born.²⁵

The largest question Marcion raised about the shape of the Christian canon was over the status of the Hebrew Bible. As Tertullian put it in 207 CE, "The separation of Law and Gospel is the primary and principal exploit of Marcion. . . . For such are Marcion's *Antitheses*, or Contrary Oppositions, which are designed to show the conflict and disagreement of the Gospel and the Law, so that from the diversity of principles between those two documents they may argue further for a diversity of gods."²⁶ It was in its response to this separation, and in defense of the unity of scripture both Old and New, that Christianity elaborated its most fateful attitudes toward the Jew. Justin Martyr, a contemporary and outspoken opponent of Marcion's, is exemplary in this regard. His rebuttal of the dualists, an inspiration to like-minded polemicists for centuries

to come, was staged in the form of the "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew" (circa 150 CE). According to Justin, the dualists reject the Hebrew Bible and its God because they do not know how to read it. Understood literally, the Law is indeed carnal. God gave it in this literal form because of the Jews' hardness of heart, but meant it to be read allegorically, and its true meaning was always spiritual. The circumcision of the heart, the Sabbath in Christ, these were the true messages revealed through the ancient prophets. The Jews themselves had never grasped this. Because they read literally and believed carnally, they failed to see that the preincarnate Christ had authored their scriptures (or "rather not yours, but ours") in order to proclaim His truth, and failed as well to recognize their God when He walked among them in the flesh. The dualists, in their literal reading of the Law, simply repeat this error. Tertullian's later formulation of this position was characteristically pithy: "Let the heretic now give up borrowing poison from the Jew."²⁷

The Jewish focus of these antidualist polemics was a strategy to defend an "orthodox" Christian reading of Hebrew scripture from the dualists' charge of Judaizing and demonic carnality, and to return that same charge to the dualists themselves. For Justin, Tertullian, Origen, and others, the Law understood literally was indeed a curse, but spiritually a blessing. Because the Jews had never understood this, they had never been the true Israel. The Law's spirituality was concealed only by the blindness of its readers. If the Marcionites could not see it, this was because they were like the Jews, creatures of pure carnality.

In short, these theologians saved the prophets from the dualists' attack by using allegory to deprive the Jews of their scriptures, and the scriptures of their Jews. From their point of view such thoroughgoing "de-Judaization" had two great, if somewhat contradictory, virtues. On the one hand it countered dualist readings of the Law's carnality, casting such readings as themselves "Jewish." On the other, it widened the gap between literal meaning and spiritual truth, and therefore served as a powerful antidote to the concern with Judaizing that preoccupied Christian exegetes of the Law since the days of Paul. But the reader who would hold these virtues together in one hand had to fend off irony with the other. For insofar as they radically devalued the literal, historical, and carnal meanings of scripture, the allegorists themselves risked becoming dualists.²⁸

Exiling the Jew into Letter and Flesh

That this risk was keenly felt is evident in the controversy over the biblical interpretations of Origen (ca. 185–252/3). According to Origen biblical texts often did not make sense, or even proved false, on a literal level. This was especially true of large parts of the Old Testament, but also of bits of the New. Their divine Author clearly meant us to understand that these texts had no literal sense or truth, but only a spiritual one.²⁹ These truths Origen set out to provide. His allegories, first in Greek and then in Rufinus's Latin translation, crashed like waves over the fourth-century Church.³⁰ It is upon their crests, for example, that St. Jerome, author of the standard Latin translation of the Bible, rode to prominence. Others, however, emphasized the danger rather than the sport inherent in such readings. Chief among these was a young North African bishop, a fervent debater of heretics and himself a recovering dualist, the future saint Augustine.

Augustine entirely agreed with his predecessors about the dangers of language, and expressed them with characteristic clarity in his *De doctrina christiana* (III.9): "The ambiguities of metaphorical words . . . demand extraordinary care and diligence. What the Apostle says pertains to this problem. 'For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.' That is, when that which is said figuratively is taken as though it were literal, it is understood carnally. Nor can anything more appropriately be called the death of the soul than that condition in which the thing that distinguishes man from beasts, which is the understanding, is subjected to the flesh in pursuit of the letter." Like Justin Martyr before him and the Bachelor Marcos after, Augustine concurred that to read *carnaliter* was to become a beast like the Jews. But he disagreed strongly with those who would solve the problem by eliminating literal meaning, and by extension the Jews who symbolized it. The nature of this disagreement becomes especially evident in the series of letters (dating from 395 to 404) he exchanged with Jerome, letters that reveal the dangerous potential of the fleshy Jew lurking in the Christian text.

Augustine insists that passages of scripture can never be accounted literally untrue, lest "nowhere in the sacred books shall the authority of pure truth stand sure" (Ep. 28.4, cf. Ep. 40, 3.3). Denial of literal truth opens the door to heretics like the Manichees, "perverse men" who dismiss Pauline passages awkward to their cause as falsehoods uttered for some strategic purpose rather than literal truths. "I would devote all the strength which the Lord grants me, to show that every one of those texts which are wont to be quoted in defense

of the expediency of falsehood ought to be otherwise understood, in order that everywhere the sure truth of these passages themselves may be consistently maintained" (Ep. 28, 3.5).³¹ Augustine concentrates his efforts upon a text often cited by the allegorists precisely because it synthesized the problem of Judaizing and the problem of reading into one conflict both potent and apostolic. The text was Paul's exhortation to Peter in Galatians 2:11-14: "If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to Judaize?" Following Origen, Jerome denied that Peter could ever have required gentile Christians to live according to Jewish law (Ep. 75, III.7, citing Acts 10:10-16). It was absurd to believe that either Paul or Peter would have recognized the ongoing validity of the Law and its practice, either for Jewish Christians or for gentile ones. Paul had merely said these things in order to "soothe troublesome opponents," just as he sometimes pretended to observe Jewish law, not out of principle but in order to escape persecution (Ep. 28, 3.4; 40, 3.3).³²

Augustine's position was a radically different one. "Paul was indeed a Jew; and when he had become a Christian he had not abandoned those Jewish sacraments which that people had received in the right way, and for a certain appointed time" (Ep. 40, 4.4). Paul, like Peter, observed Jewish laws, "but with this view, that he might show that they were in no wise hurtful to those who, even after they had believed in Christ, desired to retain the ceremonies which by the law they had learned from their fathers." Peter's error consisted only in this: out of fear he had agreed to compel gentile converts to observe Jewish ceremonies, and in so doing gave the false impression that these were "still necessary for salvation."

Perhaps the best evidence for the sting of Augustine's argument was the grace with which it was met. For years Jerome did not answer Augustine's letters, judging them "tainted with heresy" (Ep. 72, I.2). When in 404 he finally did reply, it was ungenerously. Augustine was insisting, Jerome claimed, that Jewish law remained binding on all Jews, even after they converted to Christ. In this he was "reintroducing within the Church the pestilential heresy" of the Ebionites and other Judaizing sects. If such opinions were countenanced, Jerome warned, the ongoing conversion of Jews to Christianity would destroy the Church. "If . . . it shall be declared lawful for them to continue in the Churches of Christ what they have been accustomed to practice in the Synagogues of Satan, I will tell you my opinion in the matter: they will not become Christian, but will make us Jews" (Ep. 75, IV.13).

Jerome's ferocity was symptomatic but unwarranted. Augustine did not

claim that observance of the Law was binding on converts from Judaism. What he did say, most clearly in the treatise "Against Faustus the Manichee" (*Contra Faustum*) of 398 as well as in his correspondence with Jerome, was that such observance was not prohibited to the apostolic generation; that it was understandable as the product of habit and custom; and that the apostles had favored it as a theologically advisable approach toward the Torah, "lest by compulsory abandonment it should seem to be condemned rather than closed" (CF XIX.17). The ritual practice of the apostolic generation served as widow's weeds, a reminder of the Law's place in sacred history and a reproach to those who would deny that it had ever been beloved. But such behavior was acceptable only for these first generations. After the burial of the Synagogue, Torah observance became a type of necrophilia, the fruitless loving of an empty letter.

Augustine claimed Hebrew scripture for Christianity by turning Jews into the living dead. Jews after the killing of Christ were like Cain after the killing of Abel, both hypercarnal and alienated from the world (CF XII.9-13). Not even their Law would give them fruit any longer: "they continue to till the ground of an earthly circumcision, . . . while the hidden strength or virtue of making known Christ, which this tilling contains, is not yielded to the Jews. . . . The veil which is on their minds in reading the Old Testament is not taken away." Carnal as they are, the Jews are in the end alienated even from their own mortal flesh, as Cain had been: "So Cain . . . said: . . . 'I shall be a mourner and an outcast on the earth, and it shall be that everyone who finds me shall slay me.' . . . 'Not so,' [God] says; 'but whosoever shall kill Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.' That is . . . not by bodily death shall the ungodly race of carnal Jews perish. . . . So to the end of the seven days of time the continued preservation of the Jews will be a proof to believing Christians of the subjection merited by those who . . . put the Lord to death."³³

The Marcionites, Manicheans, and other dualists had stripped Christ of His flesh and Christianity of Hebrew scripture. Their "orthodox" opponents retained both flesh and scripture, but did so by stripping the latter of its Jews, that is, of its literal and historical meaning. Against both of these Augustine posed a historical realism, one that restored a literal and spiritual value to the Torah and its people.³⁴ His hermeneutic domesticated (though it could not entirely tame) the tendency of letter and meaning, flesh and spirit, "Old Testament" Jew and "New Testament" Christian, to fly toward opposite poles. But it did so by alienating the Jews who walk the earth after Jesus from their own texts and history, converting them into corporeal shells of flesh without

spirit. A series of linguistic metaphors drives home the point. "Like milestones along the route the Jews inform the traveler, while they themselves remain senseless and immobile." The Jews are "living letters of the Law," "desks" of the Christians, adhering fruitlessly to "Jewish form" (*forma Iudaeorum*) but knowing as little of its content as a blind man knows of his face in the mirror.³⁵ More than any other Church Father Augustine was master of the paradoxical union of material and divine. Yet he achieved his alchemy in the same alembic as Paul, Marcion, or Jerome, distilling the danger of flesh and letter into an exceptional condensate of the Jew.

From Language to Politics: Sovereignty of Spirit, Tyranny of Flesh

Thus far the focus has been semiotic, the goal to explore some hermeneutic consequences of the dialectical tension in early Christian thought between the visible, carnal, and literal, on the one hand, and the invisible, spiritual, and nonliteral, on the other.³⁶ Throughout, the claim has been that ideas about "Jews" and "Judaism" play a crucial role in this dialectic. The same centrality of "Judaism" is evident in early Christian political thought. This centrality should not be surprising, given that Hellenistic political thought was fashioned out of the same distinctions of body and soul as Hellenistic hermeneutics. Aristotle articulated a key distinction, between the corporeal politics of bare life and the higher politics of the good: "Men form states to secure a bare subsistence; but the ultimate object of the state is the good life."³⁷ The "natural" relationship of soul to body as ruler to subject provided a powerful political analogy. "[A]lthough in bad or corrupted natures the body will often appear to rule over the soul, because they are in an evil and unnatural condition. . . . It is clear that the rule of the soul over the body . . . is natural and expedient" (*Politics* 1254b). For Aristotle and the tradition that followed him, the chief function of the sovereign was to guide politics away from the demands of the body toward those of the immortal soul. As Aristotle put it in the *Nicomachean Ethics*: "we must not follow those who advise us, being men, to think of human things, and being mortal, of mortal things, but must, so far as we can, make ourselves immortal" (1177b). He realized, of course, that many rulers did indeed reverse these priorities, placing worldly gain ahead of a common and immaterial good, and he represented this reversal not as sovereignty but as its most basic distortion, tyranny. Tyranny, in other words, consisted of a perverted preference for self-interest over the commonwealth, for the mortal over the immortal, for flesh over spirit.³⁸

These distinctions had long been commonplace in Hellenistic and Roman political thought by the time they were translated into Christian terms, and the relationship in early Christianity between the politics of flesh and the politics of spirit proved every bit as dialectically tense as that between carnal and spiritual hermeneutics. The energy released by this tension, like its hermeneutic analogue, had a tendency to seek ground in the Jew. We can see how great the potential force of this tension was by focusing on an important early Christian debate, that on the relationship of secular to divine power. There were many apostolic positions available in this debate. Paul, in Romans 13:1ff., had refused to distinguish between the two, treating secular magistrates as God's appointees and agents: "Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities."³⁹ The author of Matthew 22:21 drew a clearer distinction: "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, but unto God the things which are God's." The Gospel of John went further, and imagined sharp conflict between the power of the Word and the "prince of this world" that would only be resolved with the defeat and disappearance of the latter (12:31, 14:30, 15:18). Early Christian exegetes developed these positions and many others.⁴⁰ All, however, shared a tendency to think of the princes and principalities of this world in carnal terms. And all mapped their distinctions onto the same dualities of flesh and spirit, Old Dispensation and New, which had pointed hermeneutics so fatefully toward the Jew.⁴¹

Origen, for example, adapted the same distinctions that informed his exegesis to the question of politics, dividing mankind into three classes: the hylic (from *hylē*, "matter"), or materialists, who were pagans and Jews; the psychics (from *psychē*, "soul"), who corresponded to the average Christian; and the pneumatics (from *pneuma*, "spirit"), who included only the most spiritual and ascetic of Christians.⁴² Caesar's claims were only on the body, and only those who were of the body had to render unto him: Jews, pagans, and average Christians, but not pneumatics, not those who dwelt truly in the Spirit. Hence Peter and John had nothing to render unto Caesar ("Gold and silver have I none," Acts 3:6), for they had no business in the world.⁴³

It has been justly said of Origen that "in his politics the state is related to the Church, very much as in his exegesis the letter is related to the spirit." The same general claim could be made of many other theologians, both Latin and Greek, who came after him. One seldom noted consequence of this analogy is the tendency to discuss political error (that is, an improper balance between material and spiritual) in the same terms used to assess hermeneutical error: Judaism and Judaizing. Origen himself occasionally did so.⁴⁴ But the most

famous example of such slippage, and the most revealing, comes from more than a century later, when the conversion of the Empire, or at least of its emperors, to Christianity had sharply raised the stakes involved in questions about the relationship between Princely and Episcopal power.

Judaizing Secular Power

In 388 a crowd of monks burned down a Jewish synagogue and a Valentinian (heretical Christian) church in the town of Callinicum. The military Count of the East ordered their punishment, and instructed the local bishop, who had apparently incited the attacks, to pay for the reconstruction of the synagogue. The incident would have remained a local and minor one, were it not for the intervention of St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, teacher of Augustine, and leading churchman of his age. In letter and sermon addressed to Emperor Theodosius, Ambrose opposed these orders. The first five paragraphs of Ambrose's letter sketch the outlines of a model of sovereignty with which Christian political history would become familiar. The monarch has the power to compel obedience "in state causes," the priest has the obligation to state the will of the King of Kings, "one whom it is even more perilous to displease" (Cf. Matt. 10:19-20). "For this is the difference between good and bad princes, that the good love liberty, and the bad slavery. And there is nothing in a priest so full of peril as regards God . . . as not freely to declare what he thinks."⁴⁵

Only once he has established this framework of dual offices, imperial and priestly, with their incipient dual sovereignties and freedoms, does Ambrose take up the case at hand. It is not some overzealous bishop in an obscure province who ordered the synagogue burning. The synagogue "began to be burnt by the judgment of God." Behind this judgment stood the entire Church. The bishop and his monks were but the instruments of God's justice, their violence a proclamation of His sovereignty, for insofar as the synagogue represented a space outside the law of Christ, its existence diminished that sovereignty. Ambrose transforms a conflict over the relative power of governor and bishop, emperor and church, into a struggle for sovereignty between Judaism and Christianity. Should Theodosius rebuild the synagogue "the . . . Jews will set this solemnity amongst their feast days, . . . in memory of their having triumphed over the people of Christ." Any defense of the Jews, no matter how small, represents a Jewish victory that must not be granted.

The emperor and his count believed the synagogue affair to be a matter of

public order, and acted to defend that order and their own sovereignty from the monks' claims to place both themselves and their victims outside the law. Ambrose's response is breathtaking. He claims that this very insistence on upholding the letter of the law is Judaizing, and pointedly reminds the emperor of his predecessor's unhappy fate. "Maximus . . . hearing that a synagogue had been burnt in Rome, had sent an edict to Rome, as if he were the upholder of public order. Wherefore the Christian people said, No good is in store for him. That king has become a Jew." The threat rests in implication: a monarch who reads literally, upholding the letter of the law over the demands of spirit, deserves deposition as a Jew.

Ambrose placed the Jew entirely outside the law. According to him, they themselves "deny that they . . . are bound by the Roman laws," and by rejecting God's Son they have set themselves outside His law as well. "Will God the Father avenge those who do not receive the Father, since they have not received the Son?" By asserting the Church's power to exclude the Jews from the protection of public law, Ambrose sought to articulate a hierarchy within Christian politics. Imperial will is sovereign only insofar as it accords with the will of God, "Who is rightly set before even emperors," and with the Church that communicates that will. The Jews, with their peculiar status as enemies of God and vessels of letter, law, and flesh, seemed to him a decisive point of engagement in the struggle for sovereignty between divine and secular power. Ambrose did succeed in obtaining the revocation of the count's order, but his victory was anything but decisive. For the project he had set himself—the assertion of the supremacy of heavenly over earthly law through the complete exclusion of the Jews—proved just as problematic as its hermeneutic analogue: the attempt to purge Christian letters of "Jewish" literalism.

Again it was Augustine who pointed the way, not toward a solution, but toward a more durable paradox, assigning to the Jews an exceptional political space congruent with their semiotic one. In an exegesis of Psalm 59 aimed at the "Origenist" Pelagius, Augustine explained that God had poured his message into two vessels, one of mercy, the other of wrath, the former perceptible through the latter.⁴⁶ "For so God, willing to show wrath, and to manifest His power, has brought in with much patience the vessels of wrath, which have been perfected unto perdition" (citing Rom. 9:22). These vessels of wrath were God's enemies the Jews, destroyed spiritually but nevertheless preserved in the flesh ("dead men") and protected in the polity so that His sovereignty might be known. Exiled yet ubiquitous, conquered but still a distinct nation, enemies of God that adhere to His laws, the Jews' exceptional status served as

the best evidence for the nature of Christ's sovereignty over the world, and as a lesson for heretics everywhere. Hence, according to Augustine, the Psalmist sang, "Slay them not, lest sometime they forget your law" (*En. in Ps. 59.17-19*). And hence (as he put it in the *Contra Faustum*) "no emperor or monarch who finds under his government the people with this mark [of Cain] kills them, that is to say, makes them cease to be Jews, separate in their observance and unlike the rest of the world."

For heuristic reasons then, Augustine assigned to the Jews the exceptional role of "included exile,"⁴⁷ a status that many historians believe made possible the continued survival of the Jews in Christendom. But this status had constitutional consequences as well. Insofar as the power of both divine and imperial law was manifested through the Jews' peculiar status, they became a potential focal point for debates over the nature of that power.⁴⁸ Indeed Augustine's transformation of the Jews into living monuments of God's law, combined with their placement under the sign and power of earthly legislators, created political difficulties analogous to and even sharper than the exegetic ones created by holding together the Old Testament and the New. Analogous, in that in order to articulate God's sovereignty the laws of "Emperor or monarch" had to contain Judaism within themselves, much as Christian scripture needed to contain the Hebrew Bible. Sharper, in that unlike biblical exegesis (which has at least the potential to lead toward the divine), Augustine understood terrestrial politics to take place always beneath the curse of Cain, its first practitioner. Like Cain, the founder of every polity is of necessity "a fratricide" (Augustine gives the example of Romulus). Like Cain, who sinned by subjecting his reasoning soul to the desires of his flesh, every earthly city "has its good in this world, and rejoices in [the material world] with such joy as such things can afford," so that it will at the end of time be "committed to the extreme penalty." Secular power operated under Cain's conjoined significations, as both "founder of the earthly city" and "a figure of the Jews."⁴⁹ Sovereigns therefore trod a path haunted by monsters of Judaism even more ferocious than those that beset readers of biblical texts. Augustine did not seek to slay these monsters. Instead he immured them, like the furies under Aeschylus's Athens, at the foundations of the Christian hermeneutic and political order.

Toward a Medieval Resistance Theory

We have already seen, in the world of exegesis, that Christians were sometimes willing to release these furies in order to deploy them against their Chris-

tian rivals through accusations of Judaizing. The same is true in the world of politics, where we can speak at the very least of a latent potential, under particular conditions of conflict, for the violent release of the "Jew" against the sovereign. This release, foreshadowed by Ambrose, was occasionally suggested in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. But we can find particularly coherent examples of this political discourse after the year 1000, when newly robust monarchies began to emerge throughout Western Europe. Among the first prerogatives established by these young monarchies was the power of decision over the Jews. Even the Papacy, upon which royal claims to sovereignty so often foundered in this period, did not often contest the monarch's special powers over a people explicitly excluded from the Ecclesia. The king's position as protector of the Jews became a commonplace of medieval law.⁵⁰ The sovereign decided the Jews' fate, and any attempt by other Christians to circumscribe that power of decision through violence became a violation of the king's rights. As King John of England famously put it in his edict forbidding attacks on Jews, "If I give my peace even to a dog, it must be kept inviolate."⁵¹

Insofar as the Jews represented regalian rights in their most concentrated form, the Jews' diffusion could help kings expand those rights. In the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, for example, a number of the great magnates of France who gave only token recognition to Capetian suzerainty harbored Jews on their lands. In 1230 King Louis IX issued the Ordinance of Melun, claiming the right to prohibit one lord's Jews from emigrating to the domains of another, even when neither domain belonged to the Crown. The French Crown claimed the right to adjudicate between lords in all such disputes. Moreover, the Ordinance asserted that any lord who resisted these claims could be punished as a rebel: "If any barons do not wish to observe them, we shall compel them. . . . We and our other barons have sworn to compel the rebels to observe the aforesaid statutes." William Jordan has called this "the first piece of treason legislation in French history," as well as the first example of French legislation since the Carolingians. Such arguments not only extended royal authority over Jews who belonged to other lords, they also provided an entry point for new forms of monarchical power (such as the charge of treason and *lèse majesté*) that would later find much broader application.⁵² By the thirteenth century, control over Jews had become a defining characteristic differentiating monarchy from lower forms of political authority.

These articulations of royal sovereignty through the idiom of the Jewish exception were met by an increasingly powerful critique of monarchy as protector of Jews. As Peter the Venerable put it in the mid-twelfth century to King

Louis VII of France: "Has that which a certain holy king of the Jews once said escaped the notice of the king of the Christians? 'O Lord,' he said, 'shall I not hate those who hate you and be consumed with enmity for your enemies?' (Psalm 139:21)."⁵³ Royal protection and toleration, critics increasingly argued, gave the Jews an opportunity to act out their eternal hatred of Christians through usury, blasphemy, and murder.⁵⁴ The consequences of this imagined Jewish enmity widened over time. Jewish usurers were portrayed sucking the blood of Christian peasants. Jewish blasphemers were said to desecrate hosts and murder Christian children. Jews were believed to cause plague and disease, either actively through poison, or passively because Christian toleration of their malignity angered God and roused Him to punishment.

Within this discourse the decisions of princes were presented as a choice between a corrupt materialism that endangered the land or a piety that protected it, between "Jewish" carnality and Christian spirit. Medieval Europe developed a number of ways of representing the potential hypercarnality of monarchs. Stories about host desecration and ritual murder, for example, first began to circulate in twelfth-century England before spreading to the continent, where they remained an important tool of political mobilization until the seventeenth century. And though their rise has often been explained in terms of the increasing importance of Eucharistic devotion and Marian piety, it is more important for our purposes to stress their birth as a form of political critique. Through a narrative about Jews physically tormenting the Eucharistic flesh of Christ and the living flesh of Christian children, ritual murder and host-desecration accusations gave flesh to the charge that the material greed of princes tormented Christian society.⁵⁵ Throughout the 1380s, to choose but one example, the town council of Prague fought with King Wenzel of Bohemia over his protection of money lending. "Oh kings, kings! Be shamed for such a crime . . . in which you yourselves are proven to be accursed usurers." During Holy Week 1389 the conflict escalated. The Jews of Prague were accused of chanting "stone him, for he pretends to be God's son," and throwing rocks at a Eucharist carried in procession. Since the king wrongly tolerated such "nefarious acts against Christ's faithful," the people took it upon themselves to exact vengeance, eviscerating and dismembering the Jews, burning their bodies and their habitations.⁵⁶ By representing their actions in these terms, the people of Prague asserted that theirs was not a rebellion against divinely appointed monarchy, but rather what St. Ambrose might have called legitimate resistance to Jewish tyranny.

If tales of murder and host desecration provided one way of representing

the dangers of royal "love" for Jews, tales of real love, carnal and passionate, provided another.⁵⁷ Perhaps the most revealing of these stories was told about Alfonso VIII, king of Castile (1158–1214) and grandfather of France's St. Louis:

After the king Alfonso was married . . . he departed to Toledo with his wife. And while there he saw a very beautiful Jewess, and he became so attached to her that he left the queen his wife and secluded himself with the Jewess . . . for seven months, so that he paid no attention to himself or his kingdom or anything else, and they say that this great love that he bore the Jewess was caused by love magic and spells that she knew how to make. But the counts and knights and rich men, seeing how the kingdom was in such danger . . . agreed together how they would resolve such a bad and unconscionable situation. And the agreement was that they would kill her. And with this intention they entered to where the king was, pretending that they wished to speak to him. . . . While some spoke to him the others entered to where the Jewess was and . . . they cut her throat and did the same to the others who were with her. . . . And then some of his vassals took him and transported him to a place called Illescas. . . . And as he lay one night preoccupied by the affair of this damned Jewess there appeared to him an angel who said to him: how now, Alfonso, are you dwelling on the evil you have done, from which God received great disservice? You do ill, for know that He will charge you dearly for it, you and your kingdom . . . because it consented.⁵⁸

Though this account was often rewritten for the benefit of early modern and modern audiences moved by *mesalliances*,⁵⁹ the medieval version was not a romance but a morality tale, an erotic allegory for medieval Christian ideas about the peculiar and perilous nature of relationships between monarchs and Jews. The tale splits those potential relationships into two relatively extreme positions. On the one hand the philo-Semitism of the king, in this case carnal as well as political, puts Jews at the center of the kingdom's affairs. The king's barons espouse the opposing view, favoring the extermination of what they perceive to be a dangerous Jewish influence. God's angel agrees with the barons, and even heightens the revolutionary implications of that agreement by promising God's punishment not just against the king, but also against the kingdom, "because it consented" to his sin. Kingdoms that allow their kings to love Jews will suffer. The barons' only error was in not having taken action earlier.

The history of medieval rebellions is peopled with "Jew-loving" rulers. In Castile alone the list is revealing: the civil war against Alfonso X ("the Wise," r. 1252–1284) was fueled, in part, by complaints that he was a Jew-loving

tyrant. The aristocratic factions that deposed and murdered King Peter “the Cruel” in the mid-fourteenth century justified their actions by portraying him as a favorer of Jews, and even claimed that he was a cuckoo, the son of a Jewess adopted by the queen mother to conceal her inability to provide an heir. Prince Henry (IV) rebelled against his father Juan II claiming that he favored the Jews (it is in this revolt that we met the Bachiller Marcos). He himself would later be ritually deposed, accused of favoring Jews and of living like a Muslim. Even the “Catholic monarchs” Ferdinand and Isabel, conquerors of Granada, founders of the Inquisition, expellers of the Jews, were said by some of their subjects to be descended from Jews and to favor them in their policies.⁶⁰

“Royal Judaizing” was particularly useful as a revolutionary discourse in late-medieval Castile, where mass conversions and intermarriage had created an unusually potent confusion of bloodlines and hermeneutics. But there was nothing peculiarly “Hispanic” about the discourse itself.⁶¹ It was rather the pan-Christian product of a genealogy of morals that rooted extremes of spirituality and carnality, of love and enmity, of metaphor and letter, of freedom and tyranny, in the one lineage that had simultaneously produced the flesh of God and of his enemies, the lineage of the Jews. The Bachiller Marcos, besieged by royalists and with time for only one more salvo, did not call for some new weapon in his moment of greatest need. He reached instead for a fundamental insight of Patristic pyrotechnics: the language of sovereignty burns hottest in the presence of Jewish flesh.

Notes

1. Text in E. Benito Ruano, “El Memorial del bachiller Marcos García de Mora contra los conversos,” *Sefarad* 17 (1957): 314–351, here pp. 320–321. With the occasional exception of some biblical, classical, or Patristic passages for which widely available translations exist, all translations are the author’s own unless otherwise noted.

2. According to Aristotle the natural life of subsistence we share with animals, but the human has a higher goal: “born with regard to life, but existing essentially with regard to the good life,” *Politics* 1252b, 30. Cf. 1278b, 23–31; 1252a, 26–35. On the *Politics* in Spain during this period, see A. R. D. Pagden, “The Diffusion of Aristotle’s Moral Philosophy in Spain, ca. 1400–ca. 1600,” *Traditio* 31 (1975): 287–313.

3. This is not the same as Aristotle’s distinction between *logos* and *phonē*, language and voice. Animals have voice, but only humans have language, the precondition for moral judgment and political life (1253a, 10–18). Paul’s distinction

discriminates among men as Aristotle’s does not: all humans have language, but only some read correctly, according to the spirit.

4. K. Marx, “Zur Judenfrage,” in *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Werke*, Bd. 1 (Berlin, 1981 [1956]), S. 347–377, here p. 377, final sentence (italics in the original). Cf. J.-P. Sartre, *Anti-Semite and Jew* (New York, 1965), pp. 148–150. These positions are (to my mind) secularized products of the political theology this essay seeks to describe.

5. The bibliography of each of these claims is so vast that it defies footnoting. Since that on the contemporary linkage of anti-imperialism, antiglobalization, and anti-Americanism with anti-Judaism remains most fragmentary, I provide a few examples of its analyses: Pierre-André Taguieff, *La nouvelle judéophobie* (Paris, 2002); Mark Strauss, “Anti-Globalism’s Jewish Problem,” *Foreign Policy* (Nov.–Dec. 2003; www.foreignpolicy.com). For an example of its invocation, see the President of Malaysia (Mahathir bin Mohamad), “Address at the Opening of the Tenth Session of the Islamic Summit Conference,” Putrajaya, Oct. 10, 2003.

6. Though this essay will not touch directly on the subject, the absorption of much Christian material into early Islam influenced use of the Jews as negative foils for Muhammad’s prophetic and political sovereignty. For one particularly important example among many see the Qur’an, Surah II, al-Baqarah. For a modern Islamist interpretation of this Surah that explicitly adopts the terms we are interested in, see Sayyid Qut.b’s monumental *tafsīr* first published in 1952: *Fī Zilāl al Qur’ān*, English translation: *In the Shade of the Qur’ān*, vol. 1 (London, 1999).

7. The word “exception” is a term of art in discussions of sovereignty today, one that moves in the twin gravitational fields of Carl Schmitt, with his claim that “he is sovereign who decides the exception” (e.g., *Political Theology* [Boston, 1985], p. 5), and Walter Benjamin, with his emphasis on the undecidability of the exception (e.g., *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* [London, 1998], p. 71). These positions will both prove useful in understanding the exceptional political function of the Jew, but neither will govern this essay.

8. My attention to the scholarship will necessarily be limited. I will not touch at all upon the many fruitful rereadings of Paul that seek to underwrite philosophy or theology in our own time (such as Badiou or Agamben). I will enter only briefly into the heated debate about how Paul himself understood his words. My interest is primarily in the main streams of debate that Paul’s texts made possible for the many historical communities that read them, both in his own and later times.

9. These questions were not Paul’s alone. Cf. Acts 10:10–16 and Galatians 2:11–13 on Peter.

10. On some consequences of this universalism, see Kathy Gaca, “Paul’s Uncommon Declaration in Romans 1:18–32 and Its Problematic Legacy for Pagan and Christian Relations,” *Harvard Theological Review* 92, no. 2 (1999): 165–198.

11. In contemporary political philosophy the term “enmity” seems always to gesture toward Carl Schmitt, who understood it as the fundamental political con-

cept. Schmitt, however, rarely treated Judaism explicitly as a "political enemy," for all that he saw politics as a secularized form of theology. The oversight is curious in someone who lived through Weimar and National Socialism. It has been pointed out, first by J. Taubes in his *Ad Carl Schmitt: Gegenstrebiges Fügung* (Berlin, 1987), and more recently by J. Derrida, *Politics of Friendship* (London, 1997), pp. 84–85.

12. This reading of Romans is not much like the "politico-theological" reading maintained by Jacob Taubes in his debate with Schmitt. (For Taubes Romans was "a political declaration of war" and Paul an archtheorist of enmity: *Die Politische Theologie des Paulus*, ed. A. Assmann and J. Assmann [Berlin, 1993], pp. 27, 72.) It is rather the result of contemporary attempts to read Paul in his historical and rhetorical context. For a synthesis of these rereadings of Romans, see J. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 101–143. Of course the Patristic period and the Middle Ages had their own very different traditions of reading these much debated texts. See, inter alia, P. Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9–11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine* (Lewiston, 1983); F. J. C. Iturbe, "Et sic omnis Israel salvus fierit, Rom 11,26-su interpretación por los escritores cristianos de los siglos III–XIII," *Estudios Biblicos* 21 (1962): 127–150; and above all J. Heil, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion? Die Juden in den Pauluskommentaren des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Hannover, 1998), pp. 140–158.

13. A generation before Paul, for example, the Jew Philo of Alexandria stressed the need to read for "the hidden meaning that appeals to the few who study soul characteristics, rather than bodily forms," and discussed the signification of circumcision in terms very similar to Paul's, though written a generation before (Abr. 147). But for Philo circumcision's spiritual meaning increased, rather than lessened, the necessity of the outer practice. *On the Migration of Abraham* 92–93: "we should look on all these [outward observances] as resembling the body, and [these inner meanings as resembling] the soul. It follows that, exactly as we have to take thought for the body, because it is the abode of the soul, so we must pay heed to the written laws. If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols." On Philo's (and later Origen's) Neoplatonic use of the analogy of body and soul for text and meaning, see D. Dawson, "Plato's Soul and the Body of the Text in Philo and Origen," in *Interpretation and Allegory*, ed. Whitman (Leiden, 2000), pp. 89–107. See also A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology against Its Graeco-Roman Background* (Tübingen, 1987).

14. In all the passages cited here Paul uses the term *soma* for body, but it is not the only term in his vocabulary. In Gal. 5:16 and elsewhere, e.g., he uses *sarx* (σὰρξ). The difference is important, but lies beyond our reach here. On Philo's body as tomb, see D. Winston, ed. and trans., "Philo and the Contemplative Life," in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible through the Middle Ages*, ed. A. Green (New York, 1988): 198–231, here p. 212. D. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 57–85, emphasizes Paul's "moderate" dual-

ism; and G. Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley, 1979), pp. 108–116, illuminates the generative potential of the Pauline polarities.

15. This, in any event, is the reading favored by those many scholars who have accepted the implications of E. P. Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis, 1977), L. Gaston's *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver, 1987), and J. Gager's *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 1985).

16. Gk. Ἰουδαίξειν Latin *indaizare*. The Douay Rheims translation expands a bit: "how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

17. In letters of undisputed Pauline authorship, the few passages that articulate an unambivalent view of Jewish enmity have come under scrutiny as later interpolations. See, e.g., 1 Thess. 2:13–16: ". . . the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out, and displease God and oppose all men by hindering us from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved." On this passage, see Birger A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 79–94; Gager, *Origins*, pp. 255–256.

18. The dating of the New Testament's books is much debated, but there is a scholarly consensus (e.g., W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* [Nashville, 1975]) at which all revisions aim. The genuine writings of Paul come first, circa 45–60 CE. (For a revised dating of the letters, see G. Luedemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* [Philadelphia, 1984].) The Gospel of Mark is often characterized as the earliest Gospel, written shortly before or after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, followed by Matthew later in the first century (W. R. Farmer's reversal of the two in *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* [Dillsboro, 1976] has not altered the consensus). Luke is sometimes treated as contemporaneous with Matthew but is probably later, since Acts, written by the same author, is generally dated to circa 100 CE. John has almost universally been treated as coming last, though recent revisionists argue instead for its priority (see, e.g., J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* [London, 1976]).

19. Without plunging into a vast literature, the reader can get some sense of current debates about Gospel representations of Jews in W. Farmer, *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels* (Harrisburg, PA, 1999). For the Sermon on the Mount, see W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1964).

20. On the Johannine community, see J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York, 1968); J. Townsend, "The Gospel of John and the Jews," in Davies, *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York, 1979), pp. 72–97; W. Meeks, "Am I a Jew?" Johannine Christianity and Judaism," in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden, 1975), pp. 163–186. For A. Reinhartz, however, Christology drives sociology. See her "The Gospel of John: How 'The Jews Became Part of the Plot,'" in *Jesus, Judaism and Christian Anti-Judaism: Reading the New Testament after the Holocaust*, ed.

A. Reinhartz and P. Fredriksen (Knoxville, 2002), pp. 99–116. For the Matthean community, see D. C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh, 1998).

21. See, e.g., the creed in Ignatius's letter to the Ephesians, 7: "There is one Physician possessed both of flesh and spirit, both made and not made, god existing in flesh, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first possible and then impossible."

22. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereseos* 27.2. There were many other important early Christian thinkers (e.g., Valentinian) whose knowledge of Greek philosophy led them to argue for the separation of the highest god from the god of Genesis and the Jews. My focus on Marcion is meant to be heuristic, not exclusive.

23. A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1924); J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago, 1942); E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London, 1948); S. G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews," in *Anti-Judaism and Early Christianity*, vol. 2, ed. S. Wilson (Waterloo, ON, 1986), pp. 45–58.

24. Indeed in the second century the apostle to the gentiles seems to have been more popular among dualists than among those we consider proto-orthodox. See E. Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 1–13.

25. H. Von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia, 1972), p. 148; cf. B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 90–99; B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1993).

26. *Adversus Marcionem* 1.19, ed. and trans. E. Evans (Oxford, 1972), vol. 1, p. 49.

27. *Adversus Marcionem* 3.7, vol. 1, p. 191.

28. Tertullian was among those theologians who argued strongly against too sharp a differentiation between the figurative interpretation and the literal reality. His words in *Adversus Marcionem* 4.40, e.g., are suggestive: "figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Ceterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset." Or as he writes of the prophets in *De resurrectione carnis* 19, they expressed themselves in flesh as well as in allegorical shadows: "nec omnia umbrae, sed et corpora." How this caution affected his polemics against Judaism (e.g., in his *Adv. Iudaeos*) remains unexplored.

29. As he put it in his commentary on the sacrifice of Isaac, "sicut in Domino corporeum nihil est, ita etiam tu in his omnibus corporeum nihil sentias; sed in spiritu generes." *PG* 12, 209b.

30. See E. A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy* (Princeton, 1992); K. Jo Torjesen, *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis* (Berlin, 1986); H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit: L'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène* (Paris, 1950). More tangential to our topic, see also N. R. M. de Lange, *Ori-*

gen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine (Cambridge, 1976).

31. For an example of the strength Augustine devoted to the task, and a re-statement of his motives for doing so, see his work from the 410s, the *De Genesi ad litteram* (*On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis*) CSEL 28, 8.1, pp. 231–232. He had undertaken but not completed a similar project in 393, *De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus* (CSEL 28.1).

32. On Origen's theory of scriptural deception, see J. W. Trigg, "Divine Deception and the Truthfulness of Scripture," in *Origen: His World and His Legacy*, ed. C. Kannengieser and W. Peterson (Notre Dame, IN, 1988), pp. 147–164; and D. Satran, "Pedagogy and Deceit in the Alexandrian Theological Tradition," in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. R. Daly (Louvain, 1992), pp. 119–124.

33. This exegesis was much cited in the Middle Ages, on which, see G. Dahan, "L'Exégèse de l'histoire de Caïn et Abel du XII^e au XIV^e siècle en Occident," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 49 (1982): 21–89, and 50 (1983): 5–68, here (1982): 25–27. Augustine treats Cain quite differently in *De civitate Dei* 15.7, where Cain is the founder of the earthly city. On this contrast, see the beautiful passage of P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London, 1967), p. 321. On the evolution of Augustine's views on religious coercion and his turn to other prooftexts (such as Psalm 59:11, "slay them not"), see P. Brown, "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 107–116, and J. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, 1999), pp. 54–55.

34. Cf. Paula Frederiksen, "Divine Justice and Human Freedom: Augustine on Jews and Judaism, 392–398," in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. J. Cohen (Wiesbaden, 1996), pp. 29–54, here p. 48.

35. Milestones: Sermo 199.1.2, PL 38:1027. For other examples, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*. Compare Qur'an 62:5, with its image of the Jews as donkeys carrying books.

36. In this sense I am following a path parallel to that of Erich Auerbach in his essay "Figura," in *Neue Dantestudien* 5 (Istanbul, 1944), pp. 11–71.

37. See n. 2, above.

38. E.g., *Politics* 1279b.

39. Elsewhere Paul seems less monistic: cf. 1 Thess. 5:1–11, 1 Cor. 3:5–4:5, 15:24; 2 Thess. 1:1–12.

40. Tertullian, e.g., opposed Church and Empire as castle of light to castle of darkness: *De idolatria* 19.1 (CC 2:1120). Similarly for Hippolytus of Rome "the kingdom of this world" "rules through the power of Satan" (*Eis ton Danila* 4.9, cited by Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis*, pp. 137–138). The argument that earthly kingdoms are Godly institutions for the utility of the pagan un-Godly emerges in the second century author Irenaeus, *Adversus haereseos* 5.24.2. Those gathered at the council of Antioch in 341 thought of earthly kings as *externae potestates*, nei-

ther demonic nor salvific, but simply external and natural powers appointed for those who do not belong to the people of God (Canon 5). On the issues treated in the following paragraphs, Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis*, chap. 4, and L. Field, Jr., *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords* (Notre Dame, IN, 1998), are especially useful.

41. Of course within a Christian logic the Jews chose Caesar's kingship over God's when they executed Jesus, as Pseudo-Cyprian put it. Ps.-Cyprian, *Adversus Iudaeos* 42, 54 (CC 4.271, 273), and *De montibus* 7 (CSEL 3.3.111). See also Justin, *Dialogus* 41.1, and Melito of Sardis's Homily on the Passion. On debates over the dating (212?) and authorship of the *Adv. Iud.*, see the works listed in Field, *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords*, n. 60, p. 280.

42. *Com. Rom.* 9.25, 1226B. See Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis*, p. 142; H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris, 1954), pp. 193–196.

43. This position is less antinomian than it sounds. Origen also stressed (topologically) that since all bodily things “bear the bodily image of the Prince of Bodies,” all men must pay “tribute to Caesar.” Only Jesus's flesh did not bear upon it the stamp of the Prince of this world: Caesar had no rights over him. Hence Jesus had to draw from the mouth of a fish the coin with which he paid the tax collector (Matt. 17:24ff.). *Com. Rom.* 9.25, 1226B on Peter and John. *Com. Mat.* 17.27, 659f.: “*imaginem enim Caesaris habet omnis res corporalis.*” On the fish, *Com. Mat.* 13.11, 208f.

44. The quote is from Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis*, p. 9. Caspary uses the term “fleshly envelope” to refer to Origen's view of the relationship of state to Church (p. 181). For examples of Origen's “Judaizing” political error, see *Com. Mat.* 17.27, 659f., where he calls those Christians who err by refusing to acknowledge the debts of the flesh “Phariseae”; or his characterization in his commentary on Romans of Pneumatics, who resist the earthly powers with material force as Judaizing Zealots.

45. A position eventually adopted as imperial law: cf. *Codex Iustinianus* 1.4, *De audentia episcopali* 26.5 (*Corpus iuris civilis*, ed. Paul Krüger, Theodor Mommsen, and Wilhelm Kroll, [Berlin, 1900–1950], 3 vols., here 2.43). Ambrose's letter is preserved in two versions: the finished form (Ep. 74) and an original or earlier draft. I quote from the latter, Ep. 1a *extra collectionem*, in Ambrose, *Epistulae et acta*, ed. O. Faller and M. Zelzer, CSEL 82.1–4, 4 vols., (Vienna, 1968–1996), vol. 3, pp. 162–177. See generally, N. B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 298–315.

46. For a sustained reading of Pelagius as an Origenist, see Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*.

47. Cf. Giorgio Agamben's discussion of “included exclusion” in *Stato di eccezione* (Turin, 2003), a discussion which I heard at UCLA in preliminary form. Curiously, some Roman authors had described the Jews' status in the Empire in similarly paradoxical terms, i.e., Seneca (circa 70 CE) in his lost *De supersti-*

tionem: “The vanquished have given their laws to the victors” (*victi victoribus leges dederunt*). The text survives only in its citation by Augustine, *De civ. Dei* 6.11 (= GLAJJ, I, no. 186). Compare Augustine's contemporary Rutilius Namatianus: “And would that Judea had never been subdued/by Pompey's wars and Titus' Military power! /The infection of this plague, though excised [*excisae pestis*] still creeps abroad to more: /and 'tis their own conquerors that a conquered nation keeps down.” *De reditu suo* I, 391–398 (= GLAJJ 2, no. 542).

48. The paradoxes of exile as a status constituted by the law as outside the law had long been fertile ground for ancient legal theorists. See, e.g., G. Crifò, *L'esclusione dall città: Altri studi sull'exilium romano* (Perugia, 1985).

49. *De civ. Dei*, 15.4–5, 7. Cain's politics give priority to flesh, “that part which the philosophers call vicious, and which ought not to lead the mind, but which the mind ought to rule and restrain by reason.” Augustine's prooftexts here come significantly from Galatians (5:17) and Romans (7:17, 6:13).

50. One widespread expression of this was the legal notion that all Jews in whatever kingdom they were found were “slaves/serfs [*servi*] of the king's chamber.” But regardless of specific legal form, the king's prerogatives over Jews became emblematic of royal power at its most absolute. On these issues, see most recently D. Abulafia, “The Jews in the Municipal Fuero of Teruel (1176–7),” in *Jews, Muslims and Christians in and around the Crown of Aragon: Essays in Honour of Professor Elena Lourie*, ed. H. J. Hames (Leiden, 2004), pp. 97–123; idem, “The Servitude of Jews and Muslims in the Medieval Mediterranean: Origins and Diffusion,” *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Moyen Âge* 112 (2000): 687–714. For the particularly stark case of England, see also J. Watt, *The Jews, the Law, and the Church: The Concept of Jewish Serfdom in Thirteenth-Century England*, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 9 (Oxford, 1991).

51. Quoted in Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1964), p. 33.

52. W. C. Jordan, “Jews, Regalian Rights, and the Constitution in Medieval France,” *AJS Review* 23 (1998): 1–16, here p. 7. The ordinance is published in the *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, ed. A. Teulet et al., 5 vols. (Paris, 1863–1909), vol. 2, no. 2083, pp. 192–193.

53. Peter the Venerable, *Epistulae* 130, in *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. G. Constable, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 327–330. Without contradicting Augustine, Peter pushed him to an extreme. “Slay them not,” he conceded, “for God does not wish them to be entirely killed and altogether wiped out, but to be preserved for greater torment and reproach, like the fratricide Cain, in a life worse than death.” On Peter, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, pp. 245–270.

54. As Ramon Martí put it in the thirteenth century, “what do you think the devil can accomplish through the Jews, who are so numerous, almost all educated and most adept at trickery, so well endowed with the good life and the usuries al-

lowed them by Christians, so loved by our princes on account of the services they provide and the flatteries they spew forth, so scattered and dispersed throughout the world, so secretive in their deceptions that they display a remarkable appearance of being truthful?"

55. In the earliest surviving narrative of ritual murder (Thomas of Monmouth's account of William of Norwich's death in 1144), royal complicity is already an important element. The king's sheriff blocks the investigation, and the king is skeptical of the charges. See *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth*, ed. A. Jessopp and M. Rhodes James (Cambridge, 1896); G. Langmuir, "Thomas of Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder," *Speculum* 59 (1984): 822–846. Telling a similar story long after the Jews had been expelled from England, Chaucer's Prioress still remembered royal perfidy as an indispensable detail: "In Asia once there was a Christian town / In which long since a ghetto used to be / Where there were Jews, supported by the Crown / For the foul lucre of their usury, / Hateful to Christ and all His company."

56. I am here conflating the claims of a number of sources (notably the "Passio judaeorum secundum Johannes rusticus quadratus" and the "De caede judaeorum pragensi") that are analyzed in M. Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven, 1999), pp. 135–140.

57. Guibert of Nogent, for example, excoriated the Count of Soisson for his affair with a Jewess: *De vita sua* III.16 (English translation in J. Benton, *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent* [New York, 1970], pp. 209–211). Count Thibault of Blois brought his dalliance with the Jewess Pucellina to a brutal conclusion by burning a number of her coreligionists on charges of ritual murder in 1171: see most recently, S. Einbinder, *Beautiful Death: Jewish Poetry and Martyrdom in Medieval France* (Princeton, 2002), pp. 45–49. According to Polish legend, King Casimir the Great (1310–1370) expanded Jewish privileges in 1334 because of his love for the Jewess "Estherke" (Esther): H. Bar-Itzhak, *Jewish Poland: Legends of Origin* (Detroit, 2001), pp. 113–132; Ch. Shmeruk, *The Esterke Story in Yiddish and Polish Literature: A Case Study in the Mutual Relations of Two Cultural Traditions* (Jerusalem, 1985) (my thanks to Magda Teter for this last reference).

58. I am citing from the *Crónica de 1344*, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, ms. 10,815, fol. 145 r–v. For an extensive treatment of this story, see my "Deviant Politics and Jewish Love: Alfonso VIII and the Jewess of Toledo," *Jewish History* 21 (2007): 15–41. This story of love between Jewess and Christian king has an obscure history, on which, see most recently G. Hilty, "Die Jüdin von Toledo: Entstehung und Frühgeschichte des Motivs in der spanischen Literatur," in *Verlust und Ursprung, Festschrift für Werner Weber*, ed. A. Maass and B. Heinser (Zürich, 1989), pp. 241–267. The tale first appears around 1292, in a "mirror for princes" written by King Sancho IV (*Castigos e documentos para bien vivir*, ed. A. Rey [Bloomington, IN, 1952], p. 133).

59. Most notably in Lope de Vega's (1617) and Franz Grillparzer's (1851) plays, and in Lion Feuchtwanger's novel (1955). On these and others see, inter alia, J. Castañeda, *A Critical Edition of Lope de Vega's "Las paces de los reyes y judía de Toledo"* (Chapel Hill, 1962).

60. On the accusations made by Castilian bishops against Alfonso X, see P. Linehan, "The Spanish Church Revisited: The Episcopal *Gravamina* of 1279," in *Authority and Power: Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. B. Tierney and P. Linehan (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 127–147. On complaints about Peter's favor toward Jews, see C. Estow, *Peter the Cruel of Castile: 1350–69* (Leiden, 1995), pp. 154–179; and on his Jewish mother, M. Kriegel, "Histoire sociale et ragots: sur l' 'ascendance juive' de Ferdinand le Catholique," in *Movimientos migratorios y expulsiones en la diáspora occidental* (Pamplona, 2000), pp. 95–100. For Henry IV's difficulties, see most recently F. Foronda, "Le prince, le palais et la ville: Ségovie ou le visage du tyran dans la Castille du XV^e siècle," *Revue Historique* 305 (July 2003): 521–541; A. Echevarria Arsuaga, "La conversion des chevaliers musulmans dans la Castille du XV^e siècle," in *Conversions islamiques. Identités religieuses en Islam méditerranéen*, ed. M. García Arenal (Paris, 2001), pp. 119–140. On Isabel as "protector of the Jews and daughter of a Jewess," see the account of the Polish traveler Nicolas Popplau, in J. Liske, *Viajes de extranjeros por España y Portugal en los siglos XV, XVI, y XVII: colección* (Madrid, 1878).

61. In England, e.g., it stoked (among others) the famous rebellions against King John that produced Magna Carta. See clauses 10 and 11 of that document (both omitted from the version reissued by John in 1216).