ENMITY AND ASSIMILATION

Jews, Christians, and Converts in Medieval Spain

David Nirenberg

In the year 1391, Christians in the lands we now call Spain witnessed a miracle so great that it seemed to some a harbinger of the messiah.[1] In town after town across the peninsula, mobs of rioters attacked the Jews. This was not in itself miraculous. The miracle resided in the fact that, although thousands of Jews were killed, many thousands more converted to Christianity. Their conversion, long a dream of Spanish Christians, had been equally long despaired of—and its miraculous nature was abundantly clear. In the city of Valencia, for example, so many Jews sought baptism that the clergy feared running out of chrism; then suddenly, the priests found their vessels so overflowing that they were able to resume their work. "Consider for yourself," the town council of Valencia wrote the king, "whether these things can have a natural cause. We believe that they cannot, but can only be the work of the Almighty."[2]

If in the 1390s these conversions (the most extensive in the Middle Ages) were seen as miraculous, by the 1450s many Christians were beginning to consider them a disaster. The converts and their descendants were now seen as insin-

1. The following abbreviations will be used throughout: ACA:C: Archive of the Crown of Aragon, Chancery; AMV: Municipal Archive of Valencia; BNM: National Library, Madrid; BNP: National Library, Paris; BT: Babylonian Talmud; BC: Biblioteca de Catalunya.

2. See the list of miracles in AMV, Lletres missives, g^3–5, fol. 20v–22v, dated July 14, 1391 = José Hinojosa Montalvo, *The Jews of the Kingdom of Valencia* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1993), no. 11. The letter presents to the king the exculpatory claim that the massacres were a "divine mystery" accompanied by many miracles and wonders.

Common Knowledge 9:1

cere Christians, even as clandestine Jews. Their secret Judaizing was thought to be so extensive and dangerous as to require the establishment of institutions (such as the Inquisition) to identify those at risk and either reform or extirpate them.[3] Some went so far as to see this insincerity as a product of nature. Baptism could not alter the fact that the converts' blood was corrupted by millennia of mixture and debasement, indelibly saturated with a hatred of everything Christian. Hence laws mandating purity of blood were needed to bar the descendants of converts from any position of power or privilege, and "natural Christians" were encouraged not to intermarry with them.[4]

The shift compressed within these sixty years is a massive one. It is as if an earthquake had jolted Christian religiosity out of its ancient Pauline course into a new channel, this one carved by nature rather than by grace. It is perhaps difficult for inhabitants of a less Catholic and more Darwinian world to recognize the magnitude of the change. But all of us can easily recognize the relevance of two broad sets of questions that the change poses. First, why do societies that struggle sincerely and mightily to assimilate their minorities ferociously resist that assimilation once they have succeeded? How do they justify that resistance in the face of the ideal of assimilation that they had earlier professed? Second, how and why do societies translate cultural differences into natural ones? How do they transform their social classifications and discriminations into products of nature, rather than of human or divine agency? In modern terms, we would ask: How and why do they create race?

Curiously enough, historians of Spain and its Jews have not favored these questions. Instead they have emphasized not transformation but continuity, insisting that there is no gap between sentiments of the earlier and later eras. Among historians, there are two dominant positions, each answering to an apologetic need. The first places the blame for the persistence of discrimination upon the unchanging nature of the discriminator, the second upon that of the discriminated.

Benzion Netanyahu's recent bestseller, *The Origins of the Inquisition*, represents an extreme example of the first position. He insists that the great majority of the converts and their descendants were devoted Christians, persecuted for no failing of their own but because they were the object of the ancient (from "about the opening of the sixth century B.C.E."), continuous, and relentless hatred of Jews to which Spain was heir. Spanish society was "sick with an all-pervading hatred

3. Andrés de Miranda's treatise addressed to the Catholic monarchs on the dangers of heresy and the necessity of an Inquisition provides a good example of such arguments: Escorial ms. Cast. a.IV.15.

4. The "Alborayque" provides a well-known example of such claims: *Tratado del Alborayque*, BNM ms. 17567. See Moshe Lazar, "Anti-Jewish and Anti-*converso* Propaganda: Confutatio libri Talmud and Alboraique," in *The Jews of Spain and the Expulsion of 1492*, ed. Moshe Lazar and Stephen Haliczer (Lancaster, CA: Labyrinthos, 1997), 153–236. Lazar provides an edition of the text based on BNP ms. esp. 356.

for the Jews," with a "deep-seated hatred—fierce, implacable, and infernal hatred—for everything related to anything Jewish . . . [a hatred] that stemmed from prejudice and a tradition rooted in the peculiar condition of the Jews." Conversion, assimilation, and acculturation posed no barriers to this essential and fundamental hatred; on the contrary, they exacerbated it. Anti-Semitism has always been racial and inescapable, religion and culture always incidental to it. It has always been the assimilationists' tragic error (and for Netanyahu, the converts were assimilationists) not to realize this set of facts.[5]

The second position blames the victims. Old Christians were perfectly sincere in their desire to convert and assimilate Jews and Muslims; it was the converts who were insincere, resisting assimilation and Judaizing (or Islamizing) within their new faith. This argument, of course, was already made by the converts' Christian enemies in the fifteenth century, and it continues to be deployed by Catholic apologists to the present day. Explanations for the intransigence of converts, however, have varied widely. Polemicists before the nineteenth century pointed to Jewish sin (and the eternal blindness and enmity toward Christians that were its symptoms) or else invoked the corruption of Jewish blood and breeding stock by bad habits or excessive interbreeding. Many in the nineteenth century expressed similar notions along more explicitly racial lines. Finally, in the years since the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War that followed on it, the persistence of difference has come to be explained in cultural or sociological terms. But whatever the explanation, the conclusions have always been roughly the same. Converts and their descendants continued to be "Jewish," to transmit essential "Jewishness," and this continuing Jewishness accounted for their ensuing rejection and persecution by Old Christians.

Both of these positions have venerable pedigrees, dating to the first salvo of debate in the mid–fifteenth century. Their confrontation has produced a voluminous literature dominated, since the beginning, by debates over the sincerity or insincerity, the Christianity or the continuing Jewishness, of the baptized. Of course, each of these positions encompasses a great diversity of views, each with its own coherence and utility. Nor have all members of the same school shared the same motivations. If the Christian enemies of the converts made claims about their continuing Jewishness in order to demonize them, so too did the converts' Jewish friends—though for very different reasons. It was on such claims, for example, that many medieval and early modern rabbis pinned their hopes that the converts and their descendants might not be lost to Judaism forever. Similarly, in the modern period, many Jewish historians have agreed with Catholic

5. Benzion Netanyahu, *The Origins of the Inquisition* (New York: Random House, 1995), 827, 1086. Netanyahu seems to take the inheritance of this hatred seriously. Thus he writes of Cardinal Juan Martínez Pedernales (Siliceo), archbishop of Toledo and an important proponent of *limpieza de sangre*, that he "was a man of peasant stock who inherited from his ancestors their hatred of Jews" (1064).

apologists in emphasizing the continuing Jewishness of the *conversos*, though they have done so in an attempt to stress the vitality of Judaism—the heroic resistance of Jews to assimilation—rather than to excuse the Inquisition. The heterodoxy of the converts has even been invoked by a number of literary critics and historians of ideas who are interested in assessing, not the *conversos*' Catholicism or Judaism, but their agnosticism or religious skepticism, deemed crucial to the emergence of modern secular subjectivity.

We have, then, two basic camps, each with its peculiar variants and its odd alliances. The two confront each other over the question of responsibility for the origins of intransigent identity. But beneath that disagreement lies a common ground so vast as to be invisible. Both camps dissolve the paradoxical tension between assimilation and persecution, and they do so by agreeing that those differences most essential to enmity and to identity remained unchanged by conversion.

I want to suggest the opposite: namely, that the conversions of tens of thousands of Jews in the generation between 1391 and 1418 transformed the sacred and social worlds in which they occurred. The migration of such a large number of Jews into the body of Christ catalyzed a series of debates whose complexity and dynamism is perhaps comparable to those fateful ones in the first formative centuries of Christianity. The arguments produced in these debates, like those preserved in the Epistles of Paul, give us a glimpse of a society for which establishing the difference between Christian and Jew had become once again a matter of vital urgency. In order to substantiate this thesis, I will focus, not (as Netanyahu does) on those later generations of Christians who so clearly articulated their suspicion of converts, but on the generation closest to the events themselves. How did the generation of Christians that came of age in 1391 and the decades immediately following imagine the consequences of the massacres and conversions they had wrought? Were their concerns the same as those of their descendants? If not, what can such differences teach us about the ways in which we have explained the emergence of Old Christian enmity toward converts?

Few people would disagree that the period after 1430 was characterized by the increasing scrutiny of *converso* religiosity and a widening gap between Old Christian and New.[6] It is tempting, but misleading, to extrapolate these tendencies backward to 1391. Indeed, what is most striking about the earlier period is its relative lack of interest in the specific contents of *converso* religious practice. Inquisitors and royal officials were clearly interested in patrolling the boundaries

6. For some Castilian and Aragonese examples of the anti-*converso* rhetorics emerging in the 1430s, see my "El concepto de la raza en la España medieval," *Edad Media: Revista de Historia* 3 (spring 2000): 39–60.

of faith. Their attempts are best documented under the crown of Aragon. In Morvedre, for example, royal officials entered the Jewish quarter during Passover 1393 and fined the (few) converts they found there participating in "Jewish Easter" with their relatives. By and large, however, officials were much more interested in apostasy than in Judaizing and did not equate the two. Throughout the reigns of Joan I (1387–96) and his brother Martí (1396–1410), a great deal of official attention focused on preventing converts from emigrating (in order to return openly to Judaism) with their wealth to Muslim North Africa. The issue here seems to have been as much the crown's impoverishment as it was the converts' apostasy.[7] To the extent that there was concern about Judaizing in this early period, it tended to be projected upon the Jews per se, rather than upon the converts. The Jew Jacob Façan, for example, was accused of encouraging his *converso* son to emigrate to North Africa and of delivering matzah to converts in Sogorb. The converts who allegedly received the matzah, on the other hand, were not charged.[8]

Christian authorities did worry that converts might linger in their old spiritual and liturgical sensibilities. In 1400 King Martí decreed that *converso* observance of the Jewish Sabbath or of any Jewish holiday would be punishable by a fine of 100 sous, and he encouraged the inquisitors in their search for such practices.[9] But these worries were voiced remarkably rarely—a striking contrast with the litany of complaints about *converso* Judaizing that would arise in the 1450s. The contrast is especially impressive considering that in the 1390s the thousands of converts who had entered Christianity (by force and without catechism) almost certainly had little sense of how to practice their new religion.

Rather than focus on the religious practices of the converts or on the differences between Old Christian and New, the generation after 1391 worked to reinforce a still more fundamental boundary, that between Christian and Jew. In 1393, for example, King Joan wrote to a number of his most important cities asserting that it had become impossible for "natural Christians" (as opposed to

7. There is a great deal of documentation concerning such emigration. On emigration to North Africa, see Haim Zeev Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews of North Africa*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1974–81), 1:384–88. For emigration to the Holy Land, Benzion Dinur, "A wave of emigration from Spain to the land of Israel after the Persecutions of 1391" [Hebrew], *Zion* 32 (1967): 161–74; Joseph Hacker, "Links between Spanish Jewry and Palestine, 1391–1492," in *Vision and Conflict in the Holy Land*, ed. Richard I. Cohen (New York: St. Martin's, 1985), 114–25.

8. ACA:C 1906:64r–66r (May 10, 1393) = Fritz Baer, *Die Juden im Christlichen Spanien*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1929), no. 451; Hinojosa, no. 164. See also Mark D. Meyerson, "The Jewish Community of Murviedro (1391–1492)," in Lazar and Haliczer, *The Jews of Spain*, 132–33. In a related case, however, Joan did order his subjects to cooperate with the inquisitor Barthomeu Gaçó, who was inquiring against necromancers and "malicious converts who hold the erroneous sect in their depraved hearts." ACA:C 1927:101r–v (November 7, 1393) = Johannes Vincke, *Zur Vorgeschichte der Spanischen Inquisition* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1941), no. 144.

9. ACA:C 2173:115r (August 12, 1400). In 1398, the king wrote to royal officials of his concern that converts met with Jews to observe the Sabbath and that "quamplurimum frequentius judaytzant." He ordered all officials to aid the inquisitors "ad extirpandum errores predictos." ACA:C 2229:60r (February 4, 1398).

converts) to tell who was still a Jew and who a Jewish convert to Christianity. Henceforth converts were to be forbidden to live, dine, or have conversation with Jews. The Jews were to be made to wear more conspicuous badges and Jewish hats so "that they appear to be Jews." The king ended the letter with his most emphatic point: "And we order and desire that if any of these said Jews are found with a Christian woman in a suspicious place, in order to have carnal copulation with her, let them both be burned without mercy."[10] Similar admonitions would be continuously repeated in the decade that followed.

It is a symptom of the sway later events hold over our imagination that we have not been struck by the highly specific contours of the concern that a royal letter such as this one expresses. It focuses, not so much on the beliefs or religious identity of the converts, but on the physical and social proximity of Jew to Christian, a proximity that threatens the very process of religious identification and classification. Moreover, the perils of that proximity are expressed not in terms of sincerity of belief or confessional allegiance, but in terms of dangerous social and sexual intimacy. The solution proposed here has (unlike solutions proposed later) little to do with the policing of *converso* orthodoxy. What is advocated is a prophylactic heightening, through marking and segregation, of the physical distance between Christian and Jew.

There is a subtle but profound difference in tone between King Joan's letter of 1393 and the more essentializing chorus heard in the later fifteenth century. We can amplify that difference by turning from its bureaucratic manifestations in the royal chancery to its most systematic and strident exposition in the preaching of St. Vincent Ferrer. St. Vincent was the most important evangelist of his day, and a large number of his sermons survive. Hundreds of thousands heard him preach over the course of his career, and especially during the most dramatically successful period of his mission, from 1411 to 1415. The influence and abundance of his sermons make them a most informative source for understanding the particulars of the processes under study, and they repay frequent citation. But at their most general, the terms in which St. Vincent articulates his position do not differ substantially from the terms of King Joan's letters, written some twenty years earlier.

Like Kings Joan and Martí, St. Vincent did sometimes worry that the converts were not being properly educated as Christians. In 1413, for example, he exhorted the city of Valencia to force the dispersal of the many *conversos* whose homes were clustered in the old Jewish quarter. In a letter announcing the city's agreement, the town councillors explained St. Vincent's reasoning:

10. ACA:C 1964:108v–9v (August 18, 1393) addressed to Tortosa = Fritz Baer, *Die Juden*, 1:456, 716–18. Similar letters were sent to Barcelona and Girona (ACA:C 1960:120v–21v), and three years later to Murviedro (ACA:C 1911:46r–v, 2d numeration [April 4, 1396]). See also Jaume Riera i Sans, "Judíos y conversos en los reinos de la corona de aragón durante el siglo XV," in *La Expulsión de los Judíos de España: Conferencias pronunciadas en el II Curso de Cultura Hispano-Judía y Sefardí de la Universidad de Castilla–La Mancha* (Toledo: Caja de Castilla–La Mancha, 1993), 83.

> Since experience, teacher of all things, has shown that the new Christians, who converted in the city of Valencia some XXIII years ago and were baptized without much information or instruction in the holy Catholic faith . . . have received very little improvement in the Christian religion and are not well informed about that which for the sake of salvation they must believe, and even less in the devotions and actions of the said blessed law, and [that] this is because for the most part they converse and dwell amongst themselves as among blind people, as none knows how to instruct the other.

Once resettled in neighborhoods of "natural Christians and ancient," the councillors wrote, the *conversos* would have before them many more examples of the proper way to live a Christian life.[11]

But so explicit a focus on the religiosity of the converts was as rare in St. Vincent's sermons as it was elsewhere during this period. Much more often St. Vincent stressed, not the integration of the convert, but the segregation of the Jew. (Perhaps the Valencian exception owed something to the fact that there were no Jews living in that city and therefore was no way to heighten the difference between Christian and Jew through their segregation.) And just as King Joan had done two decades before, St. Vincent stressed sexual danger, rather than *converso* heterodoxy, as the justification for this segregation. Of course, as a moral reformer St. Vincent was very much concerned with sexual offenses of any kind.[12] But he was especially concerned about what he perceived to be an explosion of sex between Christians and Jews. As he explained to a Zaragozan audience in 1415, "Many Christian men believe their wife's children to be their own, when they are actually by Muslim and Jewish [fathers]." If the citizens did not put a stop to such interfaith adultery, he warned, God would do so through plague. His sermon provoked a sexual panic. Christian patrols searched the streets, on the lookout for Jews or Muslims roaming in search of Christian women. One Muslim was found with "iron tools for . . . forcing open doors" and was seized on the charge of pursuing Christian women for the use of Muslim men. Another Muslim was arrested after witnesses claimed to have seen him fleeing a Christian woman's room by the rooftops (*terrados*) during the night. So many charges were brought that the responsible judicial official was accused of fomenting a riot against the local Muslims and Jews.[13]

11. AMV, Manual de Consells A-25, fol. 79r = Hinojosa, *The Jews of Valencia*, no. 288, 487–88. The councillors do adopt a plan to resettle the converts in Old Christian neighborhoods, but the extent of its implementation is unclear.

12. St. Vincent Ferrer, *Sermons*, ed. Joseph Sanchis Sivera and Gret Schib, 6 vols. (Barcelona: Editorial Barcino, 1932–88), 1:224.

13. It is thanks to his exculpatory letter to the king that we know of these events: ACA:C cr. Fernando I, box 22, no. 2764. Compare the text of a sermon delivered in Castile in 1412, "nam multi putant esse filii judeorum et sunt christianorum, et e contrario." Colegio del Corpus Christi de Valencia, ms. 139, fol. 113, cited in Pedro Cátedra, "Fray Vicente Ferrer y la predicación antijudaica en la campaña castellana (1411–1412)," in *Quium sang impur*, ed. Jeanne Battesti Pelegrin (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1997), 30–31.

According to St. Vincent, the problem was one of ambiguous identities. Jews and Muslims were living among Christians, dressing like Christians, even adopting Christian names, so that "by their appearance they are taken and reputed by many to be Christians."[14] The solution he advocated was one of heightened marking and segregation. So powerful was his reasoning that it mobilized one of the most extensive attempts at segregation before the modern era. According to a Castilian chronicler, it was one of St. Vincent's sermons that in late 1411 moved the queen of Castile to issue her famous legislation on the segregation of Muslims and Jews:

> The queen . . . reached Valladolid with the king her son, and found there Friar Vincent, the friar whom we said was preaching there, and every day he preached his marvelous sermons, and criticized frequently the living of Muslims and Jews among Christians, saying that they should be separated, both from conversation with Christians, and from their dwellings, because this was said to be the cause of very great and very ugly sins. And the queen, taking this upon her conscience, issued a proclamation throughout her province, that wherever they were, [Jews and Muslims] should be given places apart.[15]

Similar actions were taken in Aragon, where King Ferdinand I implemented measures virtually identical to those of Queen Catherine in Castile.

Some of the provisions were already familiar. King Ferdinand, for example, stipulated that respectable Christian women found in the Jewish quarter should be fined and that Christian prostitutes caught there should receive a hundred lashes.[16] Though harsher than previous legislation, this redirection of anxiety about the integrity of religious categories into an anxiety about sexual boundaries is reminiscent of similar phenomena earlier in the Middle Ages.[17] But the punishment of prostitutes was no longer a sufficient prophylactic against the Jewish danger. Total segregation was now necessary:

> Jews and Muslims should be separate, not among Christians. Do not tolerate infidel doctors, do not buy victuals from them, let them be walled up and enclosed, for we have no greater enemies. Christian women may not be their wet nurses, nor should [you] eat with them. If they send you

14. "Por su aspecto son havidos e reputados por muytos seyer cristianos, senyaladament entre qui no son conoscidos." The quotation is from a letter written by the *jurados* of Zaragoza after hearing a sermon by St. Vincent, dated January 28, 1415. ACA:C cr. Fernando I, box 8, no. 919.

15. *Crónica de Juan II*, Biblioteca Colombina ms. 85-5-14, fol 176r. See also Pedro Cátedra, *Sermón, sociedad, y literatura en la edad media: San Vicente Ferrer en Castilla (1411–1412)* (Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, consejeria de Cultura y Turismo, 1994), 134–35.

16. ACA:C 2416:60v–63v (March 20, 1413). The fine for married women was 50 florins; for single women, loss of their clothes.

17. Cf. Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), chap. 5.

bread, throw it to the dogs. If they send you live meat, accept it, but not dead, for Holy Scripture says of these sins: "Do you not know that a little leaven corrupts the entire dough?" (I Cor. 5:6)[18]

If authorities failed in preventing such exchange, St. Vincent warned, the wrath of God would fall upon them and their cities in the form of plague.

In the interest of separating Christian from non-Christian, segregated neighborhoods were created for Jews (and, to a lesser extent, for Muslims), and the new residents were severely restricted in their market and economic activities. In some towns Christians even refused to sell Jews food. Because few neighborhoods where Jews resided were completely segregated, entire communities found themselves evicted from their homes. Many found shelter in caves and huts, "with boys and girls dying from exposure to the cold and the snow." Writing years after these events, Abraham Zacuto called the discriminations of 1412–15 "the greatest persecution that had ever occurred."[19] And as in 1391, one of the consequences of this persecution was the mass conversion of thousands who sought to avoid being barred from their trades and expelled from their homes.

The goal of my narrative thus far has been to trace the development of a particular anxiety over the period from 1391 to 1415, and not to provide an adequate causal explanation for it. I am not arguing, for example, that sexual concerns were "the primary reason" for the campaigns of segregation and evangelization. I seek only to make a simpler point: that St. Vincent and his contemporaries described themselves as living through a crisis of identification—a period in which it suddenly became difficult to establish the religious classification of individuals. Contemporaries expressed this sense of crisis in highly specific terms (emphasizing sexual risk, for instance, more than the danger of heterodoxy). If we assume that these particularities are potentially meaningful (and why should we not?), then we need to ask explicitly: Why sex? And why a crisis?

Modern commentators have tended to ignore these questions, assuming that the invocation of sex in a language of crisis was merely a pretext for discriminatory pressure intended to further evangelization. Or else commentators have concluded that, if the crisis was real, *converso* Judaizing was its cause. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the questions I want to raise were ignored as well, for at that time the answer was obvious: the crisis was caused because real ambiguities of identity were allowing Jews (and Muslims) to have sex with

18. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 3:13–14.

19. Solomon Alami, *Iggeret Musar*, ed. Jellinek (1872), 10b; Abraham Zacuto, *Sefer Yuhasim ha-Shalem*, ed. Herschell Filipowski (London, 1857), 225b; Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. 8 (Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1890), 111, n. 2.

Christians more often than in the past. But in fact all the surviving evidence suggests that, despite such claims, the new anxieties were not the result of any increase in the amount of sexual contact between Christians and Jews or Christians and Muslims. Of the thousands of documents concerning Jews that I have seen for the years from 1391 to 1415, only a handful concern such intercourse (a much lower number than for the two decades preceding the massacres). The most significant case involved a *converso* who put his wife to work as a prostitute in the Jewish brothel of Zaragoza.[20] The story is interesting, but it is clearly not the stimulus for interfaith sexual panic.

The generation after 1391 spoke increasingly the language of sexual danger and segregation, not because of any real increase in intercourse across confessional lines, but because the logic of sex was central to the way in which they imagined boundaries between the faiths. Throughout the Middle Ages, Christian theologians (as well as rabbis and Muslim jurists) emphasized the importance of maintaining sexual boundaries among the three religious groups.[21] The possibility that these boundaries might be transgressed justified any number of segregation practices. When, for example, Pope Innocent III imposed the "Jewish Badge" at the fourth Lateran council, he argued that such distinctions were necessary so that easy identification might prevent sexual intercourse between Christian and Jew. In the words of King Alfonso the Wise of Castile:

> Many errors and offensive acts occur between Christian men and Jewish women and between Christian women and Jewish men as a consequence of their living together in cities and dressing alike. In order to obviate the errors and evils that might result from this situation, we consider it proper and decree that all Jewish men and women living in our kingdom wear some sort of mark upon their heads so that all may clearly discern who is a Jew or a Jewess.[22]

Sex between Christians and non-Christians, then, had long been symbolic of all the dangers of insufficient separation and differentiation, and had long been used to justify drawing new and brighter lines between religious groups. St. Vincent

20. ACA:C 2237:39r–v (July 6, 1408). ACA:C 2312:113v–114r (July 14, 1408) apparently concerns a number of Jews of Calatayud who had been imprisoned for having sexual intercourse with this woman. Compare the case of Saltell Gracia, a Jew of Barcelona accused in 1393 of "promenading in Christian dress and under guise of that dress having sex with many Christian women." ACA:C 2030:80r–v (August 23, 1393).

21. See the material collected by James Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); Brundage, "Intermarriage between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law," *Jewish History* 3 (1988): 25–40; Walter Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews* (Ebelsbach am Main: Gremler, 1988), 263–91. On this type of logic more generally, see Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, ed. Rodney Needham, trans. James H. Bell, John R. von Sturmer, and Rodney Needham (Boston: Beacon, 1969), 67–68.

22. Dwayne Carpenter, *Alfonso X and the Jews: An Edition and Commentary on "Siete" Partidas 7.24 "De los judíos"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 36.

and his contemporaries drew on this ancient logic, but they articulated it more insistently, and applied it more broadly, than Iberian Christians had done before.

Consider St. Vincent's elaboration of one of the most basic metaphors through which medieval Christians imagined the sexual risk to their communities—the metaphor of the conjugal family. Medieval theologians often represented every Christian woman, wed or unwed, as the bride of Christ through baptism.[23] St. Vincent utilized the metaphor frequently and made explicit many of its implications. God had a sexual interest in all Christian women. As His wives, their bodies represented the extension of His authority and community, and represented the point at which His honor as father and husband was at risk. Women's bodies could thus become the site of fears concerning God's honor and that of His church. But Christian women were not simply God's wives. They were also His daughters. Imagine, St. Vincent exhorted, that the king had a daughter. Even if she consents with pleasure to have sex with you, do you not betray the king in lying with her? Would you not deserve to be drawn and quartered? The king is Jesus Christ: are prostitutes not His daughters? "Yes, surely, for he has engendered them in baptism, just as he has engendered you and all other [Christians]."[24] God's "engendering" of the Christian family was of course central to the metaphor, and it too was understood in explicitly sexual terms: "Jesus every day impregnates the Church, and the womb is the baptismal font, and he sends there his semen from heaven"—it is therefore the obligation of every Christian woman to honor father and mother, Jesus Christ and Holy Mother Church.[25] It is also every Christian woman's spousal duty to honor Christ as husband: "If a king takes the daughter of a poor laborer as wife, and she leaves him and goes off with villains, she would be considered a great whore."[26]

In all of these analogies, the emphasis is on God as paterfamilias, whether as husband or as a father, with rights over his "family." The violation of those rights diminishes his honor and constitutes an insult both to Him and to His "household" (the entire Christian community). St. Vincent's metaphors of marriage and reproduction represent the Christian community as a family of brothers and sisters tied to God through overlapping bonds of marriage and paternity. The limits of the community are marked by strict endogamy. Muslims and Jews are not God's children since they have not undergone his engendering baptism.[27]

23. For a legal usage of the metaphor, see *Siete Partidas* 7.24.9: "Jews who lie with Christian women [deserve death], for these are spiritually espoused to Our Lord Jesus Christ by virtue of the faith and baptism they received in His name." The translation is from Carpenter, *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 35.

24. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 1:190–91; 2:18.

25. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 1:121. In 3:263, Ferrer uses the same image to explain why Jews and Muslims, who are not baptized, are not children of God.

26. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 2:231–32. A similar analogy is used in 2:153.

27. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 3:263. Cf. 6:108, describing Muslims and Jews as bastards, because they are not legitimately engendered in baptism.

Because these non-Christians are explicitly excluded from the kin group, they should have no sexual contact with it, lest a kinship in the flesh be established that would dishonor the more vital kinship in the spirit.[28]

The tremendous power of these analogies derived in part from their depiction of the Christian community's claims to privilege and allegiance in the same terms as individual Christians used to depict the claims of their own families. The analogy, in this sense, served to bridge the gap between the individual and the collective.[29] In the vocabulary of sociology, the discourse of honor functioned to stabilize "the cohesion, standing, regularity, and furtherance of the life processes" of a social group, and to isolate it from other groups or classes, by appealing to the individual's "conviction that the maintenance of his honor constitutes his most intrinsic, most profound and most personal self-interest." In our case, it is the sexual metaphor that lent honor its power, a power that moved Georg Simmel to call honor "one of the most marvelous instinctively developed expediencies for the maintenance of group existence."[30]

The tremendous power of these sexual analogies derived as well from their ability to portray a society as the object of collective punishment. Within the economy of honor, insult required vengeance. Generally that vengeance was aimed, nor merely at the sinner, but at the totality of the collective that was dishonored and corrupted by the sin. As always, the instruments of God's discipline were plague, famine, and other horrors. St. Vincent was a systematic exponent of this logic. In various sermons, he listed six particularly dishonorable sins that provoke God's punishing angel. The last two were the most prominent. The fifth was negligence in the repression of prostitution. If the populace wished to avoid divine punishment, it must locate any brothel outside the town. It must allow no concubines or public women in its midst, for if even one man should have a concubine, "it is something very dangerous for the community." Had not St. Paul explained that on account of one concubine, an entire "city was corrupted and suffered great plagues?" Therefore, Vincent preached, "eject the prostitute into the street, for on her account so many plagues have come upon you."[31] The sixth and not unrelated sin was negligence in the segregation of Jews and Muslims. Do not even light their fires, he urged, for it was in just such a transaction, so seem-

28. Compare 1 Cor. 6:16–17.

29. There were other analogies available that were less "sexualized" than the family analogy, but these too were generally implicated in the same logic of honor. Consider, for example, the analogy of baptism as an oath of fealty, requiring the Christian's loyalty and willingness to uphold the honor of his lord. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 3:111.

30. Georg Simmel, *Soziologie*, 5th ed. (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1968), 403–6.

31. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 3:111–13. In 2:219, St. Vincent draws upon different analogies from the world of fermentation: One prostitute corrupts an entire town, just as "if you have a thousand apples in one basket, and one of them is rotten, all the others will quickly rot: thus one bad person corrupts the good ones." Such corruption angers God, so that he sends us plague. Similarly 3:140.

ingly innocent, that "a young Christian girl was raped by a Jew." Proper attention to these matters, according to Vincent, would guarantee the health of a city.

It is not so much the content of St. Vincent's catalogue of vices that concerns us here as it is the images that were called upon in this and other sermons in order to express the dangers that sexual sins posed to the community. A little yeast in a large mass of dough; one sick sheep infecting the flock; a spoiled apple rotting the entire bin: these analogies supported models of corruption and contagion that raised the consequences of individual sin to the level of the community. In this sense, anxieties about sexual honor helped to define the Christian community as a collective with natural boundaries whose integrity needed to be maintained if disease was to be avoided.[32]

The language of sexual danger, in other words, was both a symptom of crisis and a potent cure for it, simultaneously and somewhat paradoxically fortifying boundaries (through, for example, segregation) and marking them as breached. But though sex may have been both symptom and cure, it was not the cause of the crisis. Nor was *converso* Judaizing, at least not if we are to credit the silence of the early-fifteenth-century sources on this score. The perception of crisis was provoked, I would suggest, not by the converts' "Jewish" practices, but by a much more complex phenomenon: the mass conversion's destabilization of an oppositional process of identification by which generations of Christians had defined themselves theologically and sociologically against Jews and Judaism.

It is well known that Christianity had since its earliest days used the Jew to represent the anti-Christian, mapping polarized dualities such as spiritual-material, allegorical-literal, sighted-blind, redemptive-damning, good-evil, onto the pairing of Christian and Jew.[33] As Rosemary Ruether, a most mordant historian of this process, described it: "It was virtually impossible for the Christian preacher or exegete to teach scripturally at all without alluding to the anti-Judaic theses. Christian scriptural teaching and preaching per se is based on a method in which anti-Judaic polemic exists as the left hand of its christological hermeneutic."[34] Ruether was primarily concerned with the first, formative centuries

32. Compare Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), viii; Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), 122–28; and also her more recent "Rightness of Categories," in *How Classification Works: Nelson Goodman among the Social Sciences*, ed. Mary Douglas and David Hull (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 239–71. The metaphors I have described are not those, preferred by Douglas's theory, of Christian society as a body. Rather, the emphasis in my sources is on society as an aggregate of individual units bound together by the intimately related forces of kinship, shared honor, and a shared vulnerability to each other's disease.

33. For an example from St. Vincent, see Ferrer, *Sermons*, 3:311.

34. Rosemary Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Seabury, 1974), 121.

of Pauline Christianity, but her observation holds true for later periods as well. Indeed, in the Middle Ages the phenomenon was so pervasive as to pass almost unperceived. Consider St. Vincent's sermon "Sabbato," in which the creation of man (first flesh, then spirit) stands as well for the order of the Testaments. The Old Testament is represented as materialist and is symbolized by circumcision, beard, and distinctions of dress and diet, while the New Testament is spiritual and symbolized by spiritual attributes.[35] The opposition (and thousands of others like it) is so familiar, so well-worn, that we are hard pressed to recognize it as significant, let alone vital to the creation and maintenance of Christian identity.

And yet vital it was. The polarized pair, Christian-Jew, provided medieval theologians and their audiences with a powerful hermeneutic lens through which to comprehend and classify their constantly changing world. Sara Lipton has elegantly demonstrated the power of this hermeneutic in France, drawing on two early-thirteenth-century *bibles moralisées*. The designers of those works used textual commentaries and illuminations in order to relate Biblical texts to the most pressing problems of the day. Phenomena perceived to be dangerous were mapped onto the negative pole of the Jewish-Christian opposition. Issues as diverse as the rise of universities, the shift from parchment to paper, the increasing emphasis on the apostolic poverty of clergy, a perceived increase in simony, reliance on lawyers: these "innovations" and many more were characterized in the moralized bibles as Judaizing. Perhaps the most fateful (and best known) of these characterizations were economic. Theologians reacted to what they perceived to be dangerous aspects of the new profit economy by labeling them "materialist" and "Jewish." In Lipton's words, "Moneylending . . . is not condemned because it is exclusively or even primarily a 'Jewish' activity; rather, because moneylending is condemned, it becomes in the sign system . . . a 'Jewish' activity."[36]

I know of no studies like Ruether's or Lipton's for the late medieval Iberian context, but there is plenty of evidence for the persistence of the hermeneutic. Like his predecessors, St. Vincent railed against those who "Judaized" themselves by pursuing secular knowledge.[37] He too translated Christian spiritual dangers into Jewish idioms, as when he told his audience that because they did not confess often enough, they were "similar to the Jews."[38] And likewise Vincent

35. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 6:47–48.

36. Sara Lipton, *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible Moralisée* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 45. This particular projection flourished into modernity. It is only "since Auschwitz," to quote Dan Diner, that "common linguistic usages such as the description of phenomena from the sphere of circulation as Jewish have forfeited their dubious claim to reality." See Diner, "Reason and the 'Other': Horkheimer's Reflections on Anti-Semitism and Mass Annihilation," in *On Max Horkheimer: New Perspectives*, ed. Seyla Benhabib, Wolfgang Bonss, and John McCole (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993), 337.

37. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 6:104.

38. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 6:221.

stressed the Jewishness of usury and avarice in order to underscore the carnal materialism of the Jews while simultaneously labeling Christians who lent at interest as Judaizers. "Today, nearly everything is avarice, for almost everyone commits usury, which used not to be done except by Jews. But today Christians do it too, as if they were Jews."[39]

Ruether argued that the projection of all carnality onto the Jews made Christianity blind to its own "bodiliness": "Christian spiritualization becomes false consciousness about its own reality, fantasizing its own perfection and unable to cope with its own hypocrisy."[40] As we have just seen, the opposite is also the case. The negative pole of Judaism provided a powerful diagnostic tool for Christians to identify and condemn carnal tendencies within their society and themselves. Christian society threatened to Judaize any Christian who, for example, practiced usury, confessed infrequently, or enjoyed secular learning.[41] Nevertheless, it appears certain that the projection of carnality upon the Jews facilitated the repression (to echo Ruether's psychologizing language) of Christian anxiety about a great deal of materialism in their own beliefs and practices.[42] It is thanks to the power of such projections, for example, that neither St. Vincent nor his audience were confused when he derided what he described as the Jews' carnal belief that proper piety brings reward in the form of health and good harvests, and in the next breath threatened Christians with famine and plague if they did not enforce segregation.[43] These projections, obviously, had little to do with real Jews or real Judaism, and the hermeneutic they formed a part of did not necessarily require the presence of living Jews in order to function. (Of this assertion, late-medieval England and France are clear proof.) But the existence of living Jews, badged, bearded, and circumcised, gave foreign flesh to these negations of the Christian and thereby heightened Christian society's feeling of coherent identity.

In this sense (among others), medieval Christians defined themselves theologically against the Jews. But they defined themselves sociologically against the Jews as well—and this was particularly the case in late-medieval Iberia. Individually and collectively, Iberian Christians asserted their honor as members of God's privileged people by contrasting themselves to the dishonored Jew.[44] This

39. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 5:147.

40. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 160.

41. "[To] call someone a Jew amounts to an instigation to work him over until he resembles the image." Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming (New York: Seabury, 1972), 186.

42. Compare *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, 187: "What is pathological about anti-Semitism is not projective behavior as such, but the absence of reflection in it."

43. As he did in a sermon from 1414, BC ms. 476, folios 136v–153v, ed. Josep Perarnau i Espelt, "Els quatre sermons catalans de sant Vicent Ferrer en el manuscrit 476 de la Biblioteca de Catalunya," *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics* 15 (1996): 109–340.

44. The Muslim played an important role in this process as well, but that is a subject for a different article.

sociological process was of course already encoded in venerable theological principles. As St. Augustine had put it, the Jews' abjection in comparison with Christians was witness to the truth of the latter's faith. This doctrine of witness was in fact the chief theological justification for the continued toleration of Jews in Christian society.[45] But the performance of this contrast also became fundamental to the representation of Christian political and social privilege.

The logic of sexual privilege and sexual boundaries, already discussed, provides one example of sociological differentiation.[46] There were, however, countless others. At a political level, for example, community privilege could be asserted through juxtaposition with Jews. When King Peter the Ceremonious attempted to raise funds for his expedition to Sardinia and Sicily in 1378, the town council of Valencia replied that the imposition of arbitrary taxation "is nothing other than to make a Jewry out of each of his municipalities . . . , and we will not give way to such a demand, for we would rather die than be made similar to Jews."[47] And just as the erosion of corporate privilege could threaten to turn a municipality into a Jewry, so the erosion of honor could Judaize the individual Christian. St. Vincent himself frequently complained of Christians who believed that failure to avenge an injury "would be a dishonor to me, for they would say of me 'Oh, the madman, oh, the Jew!' "[48] According to this view, to withdraw from the economy of violence was tantamount to withdrawing from the fraternity of honorable Christian males. It was, in other words, to become Jewish.

These examples confirm what we should already know: Christian identity and privilege were defined in large part by insisting upon the Christian's distance from the Jew. The expression of distance could occur in countless venues: in the taking of vengeance or the paying of taxes, in the choice of foods or sexual partners, in law (as in the preferential treatment of Christian witnesses) and in ritual (as in the enclosure and stoning of Jews during Holy Week).[49] The mass conversions of 1391 threatened the continued performance of Christian identity because they raised, perhaps for the first time in Iberian Christian imagination, the possibility of a world without Jews. Many in the generation after 1391 worked

45. The literature on the point is vast, but see most recently the chapter on Augustine in Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

46. A particularly important one, in that so many other distinctions were mapped onto the sexual one. For a formulation of the point derived from Lévi-Strauss, see Stanley Tambiah, "Animals Are Good to Think and Good to Prohibit," in *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 169–70.

47. AMV, Ll. M., g[1] 4, 108v (October 26, 1378), cited in Dolors Bramon, *Contra moros y judíos* (Barcelona: Península, 1986), 67.

48. Ferrer, *Sermons*, 1:42: "Deshonor me seria, que dir m'ien: 'O del foll!, o del juheu!, no és bastant a venjar la mort del pare.'" Compare 1:93, 1:155, 3:16, 5:190.

49. For an extended treatment of the Holy Week example, see my *Communities of Violence*, chap. 7.

to make that world a reality: a few, by urging the slaughter of the unconverted;[50] others, such as the citizens of Barcelona and Valencia, by banning Jews from their cities in perpetuity. Still others, like St. Vincent and his supporters, mounted a program of evangelization intended to achieve the full conversion of the infidels.[51] These were exhilarating times for a Christian society trained to expect the coming of the messiah at the conversion of the Jews.[52] On the other hand, the messianic "disappearance of the Jews" promised to eliminate the living representatives of a negative pole vital to the coherence of Christian theological self-understanding.[53] Moreover, the emergence of the converts as an intermediate class produced a rapid narrowing of the social space that had previously separated Christian from Jew, and a consequent perception of the erosion of Christian privilege.

The second point bears elaboration. When the converts of 1391 emerged from the baptismal waters, they immediately occupied a good deal of the cultural no-man's-land that had hitherto divided Christian and Jew. The *conversos* now enjoyed all the privileges of the Christian. They could attend university, hold political office, or throw rocks at Jews during Holy Week. They could even have sex with Christian prostitutes or marry Christian women (and we know that many of them did so). But at the same time that converts enjoyed the privileges of Christians, many converts continued to occupy houses in or near the Jewish Quarter.[54] For some years (and certainly throughout the period that concerns us here), their financial affairs remained hopelessly entangled with those of the Jewish community. And of course, the converts had Jewish relatives with whom they might need to communicate for any number of reasons. Some even had Jewish spouses to whom they remained legally married.[55]

Such proximity undercut the radical distinction between the two groups and thereby destabilized the foundations of Christian privilege and identity. It

50. See, for example, the charges made circa 1393 against Antoni Rieri of Lerida, who was accused, among other things, of preaching that the prophesied time had arrived "in which all the Jews should be killed, so that no Jew remains henceforth in the world." Jaume De Puig i Oliver, "La 'Incantatio studii ilerdensis' de Nicolau Eimeric, O.P.," *Arxiu de Textos Catalans Antics* 15 (1996), 47.

51. Vincent's messianic inspiration is well known. See, most recently, José Guadalajara Medina, *Las profecías del anticristo en la edad media* (Madrid: Gredos, 1996), 232–47.

52. See most recently Robert E. Lerner, *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), esp. chap. 7.

53. I do not intend here any echo of Ruether's quite different point, *Faith and Fratricide*, 228: "Possibly anti-Judaism is too deeply embedded in the foundations of Christianity to be rooted out entirely without destroying the whole structure."

54. We even have documents describing the active choice of residence after conversion. In Mallorca, for example, converts were called before a notary after the riots to declare whether they wished to remain in their old homes or rent them out and move into traditionally Christian neighborhoods. See José María Quadrado, "La judería de la ciudad de Mallorca en 1391," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 9 (1886): 294–312. But compare ACA:C 1994:186v–187r, cited in Riera, "Judíos y conversos," 83.

55. For examples of these and other ambiguities of status, see my "Mass Conversion and Genealogical Mentalities: Jews and Christians in Fifteenth-Century Spain," *Past and Present* 174 (February 2002), 1–39.

was this destabilization to which Old Christians were reacting when they complained that it was now impossible to distinguish Christian from Jew. Many converts perceived the problem as well. When a handful of Zaragozan *conversos* living in a Jewish neighborhood invoked the orders of segregation in the hope of having their much more numerous Jewish neighbors evicted, the converts were seeking to increase the distance on which their new privileges depended.[56] The same logic motivated their invasion, together with other Christians, of the Jewish quarter. When, in the course of that invasion, the son of Jerónimo de Santa Fe stabbed a Jew, he was not merely acting out the excessive zeal of a convert. He was performing his claim to Christian honor and privilege in the idiom of his new religion.[57]

Once again, the point was most succinctly articulated by St. Vincent: "The Christian who is neighbor with a Jew will never be a good Christian." Such "neighborliness," he went on to say, dishonored God and put Christian society at risk of divine displeasure (and, consequently, disaster).[58] St. Vincent and his sponsors sought to reinstate the necessary distance between Christian and Jew in three ways. One focused on the religiosity of the *conversos*, seeking to integrate them as fully as possible into Christianity as practiced in Old Christian society. A second strategy was to sharpen the boundaries between Christians and Jews through a massive program of segregation. (Recall the efforts of the town council of Valencia to force all *conversos* to leave their homes and move into Old Christian neighborhoods.) The third possibility was to eliminate the Jewish antithesis to Christianity altogether by achieving the conversion of all remaining Jews to Christianity. The least important of these, if the surviving evidence is a guide, was the first. It is not with the *conversos*, but with the segregation of Jews and with their elimination through evangelization, that the generation after 1391 was most concerned.

The previous pages focus on the anxieties of one generation and on the sexual metaphors through which those anxieties were expressed. But observations made here about the generation of 1391 have implications as well for the history of later generations. To see these implications requires that we again emphasize the contrast between periods. St. Vincent and his contemporaries emphasized the

56. The case is discussed in Francisca Vendrell de Millás, "En torno a la confirmación real, en Aragón, de la pragmatica de Benedicto XIII," *Sefarad* 20 (1960): 1–33. Less dramatic but equally meaningful are the "distancing" actions of converts like Gil Roiz Najarí, who successfully petitioned to have an entrance to the Jewish quarter of Teruel moved so that he would have no contact with Jews. See ACA:C 2391:102r–v (March 16, 1416).

57. ACA:C 2389:110r–v, 111r–v, 112r–v (November 20, 1415). Similar events occurred in other cities such as Lerida.

58. "Car nunqua será bon christiá, lo qui és vehí de juheu." BC ms 476, folios 136v–153v. Perarnau i Espelt, "Els quatre sermons," 231–32.

dangers of sexual mixing since they hoped to widen the separation between Christian and Jew. They did not invoke those dangers in order to sharpen the line between Old Christian and New, even though a sharp distinction between what quickly came to be called "natural Christians" and converts might have helped to render the converts' proximity to Jews less threatening. By the mid-1430s, a few people were articulating the view that converts and their descendants were in some way tainted, essentially different from (worse than) natural Christians, and therefore (among other things) unmarriageable. By the 1450s, such a view was becoming mainstream. But in the years immediately following the mass conversions of 1391, these arguments were virtually unknown.[59]

The contrast is meaningful. It suggests that medieval Iberian societies were more complex than historians generally allow, in that those societies had available any number of ways to work through the consequences of mass conversion. The Judaization of the *conversos* was only one of these, and for more than a generation not a significant one. This means that we cannot explain the mid- and late-fifteenth-century attacks upon the *conversos* in terms of continuities. The anti-*converso* movements of midcentury were not the straightforward and unavoidable consequences of earlier discriminations and identities that, too often, they are assumed to be. They were not the result of the irreducible Jewishness of the converts, of the irreducible anti-Semitism of old Christians, or of some ineluctable process by which societies always recreate their essential other. They were instead the product of a particular, and far from inevitable historical development. This article does not attempt to explain that development; indeed, it focuses on the period before the development took place. But by demonstrating that this earlier period was very different from those that followed, we are reminded of what tends to be ignored: that an explanation for the continuation of prejudice is necessary. Wandering as historians often do in an unrelenting landscape of human cruelty, we are apt to forget that hatred too has a history, that persecutions and discrimination are not simply the result of inertia but, rather, that they require rebuilding by each generation's hands. A depressing conclusion, yes, but also an uplifting one, for it offers the only consolation: that, however badly things turned out, they could have turned out otherwise.

59. There were of course exceptions. A very suggestive one comes from a sermon St. Vincent delivered in 1414, inveighing against the great sin of those Christian women who "disdain the Jewess who has become Christian, and refuse to go with her to Church. . . . And there are others," Vincent added, "who do not wish to give [the converts] their daughters and sons in marriage, because they had once been Jews." He urged these women, not only to associate with the converts, but also to marry them, for they were "brothers in Christ." Perarnau i Espelt, "Els quatre sermons," 257–59, lines 2380–2455.