


**Hervé RYSEN**

# **HISTORY OF ANTI-SEMITISM**



**Translated by Carlos W. Porter**



# **HISTORY OF ANTI-SEMITISM**

**Hervé Ryssen**

**Translated by  
Carlos Whitlock Porter**

# *History of Anti-Semitism*

ISBN 978-1-937787-51-6

By HERVÉ RYSEN

Translated from the French by CARLOS WHITLOCK PORTER

Copyright 2016 by CARLOS PORTER with permission.

<http://www.cwporter.com>

Copyright—cover presentation 2018 by THE BARNES REVIEW

## **Published by:**

THE BARNES REVIEW, P.O.Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003

## **Ordering More Copies:**

Order more copies of *History of Anti-Semitism*—softcover, 453 pages. Pricing: \$35 minus 10% for TBR subscribers plus \$5 S&H inside the U.S. Outside U.S. email [sales@barnesreview.org](mailto:sales@barnesreview.org) for S&H. Order from TBR, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003 or call 1-877-773-9077 toll free to charge, Mon.-Thu. 9-5 ET. To purchase online visit [www.BarnesReview.com](http://www.BarnesReview.com).

## **Subscriptions:**

A subscription to THE BARNES REVIEW historical magazine is \$56 for one year (six issues) and \$88 for two years (12 issues) inside the U.S. Outside the U.S.: Canada/Mexico: \$75 per year. All other nations: \$90 per year sent via air mail. Send payment with request to TBR, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003. Call 1-877-773-9077 toll free to charge. Order online at [www.barnesreview.com](http://www.barnesreview.com).

## **Reproduction Policy:**

Portions of this publication may be reproduced with prior permission in critical reviews and other papers provided credit is given to author, book title is listed and full contact information are given for publisher. Contact publisher at above address for permission.

## **On the Cover:**

**Front cover:** On the front cover is pictured a Medieval woodcut depicting Christian officials burning copies of the Talmud, the Jewish holy book in which Mother Mary is described as a harlot and the punishment for Jesus—considered a false messiah by the Jews—is to be boiled in a vat of excrement for eternity.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	7
1. The Flight from Egypt .....	8
2. Amalek.....	11
3. The Philistines .....	12
4. Nebuchadnezzar .....	13
5. The Encounter with the Greeks .....	14
6. Antiochus Epiphanes .....	17
7. The Conquest of Judea by the Romans .....	21
8. Cicero.....	23
9. Caesar, Cleopatra and Marc Antony.....	25
10. Herod .....	27
11. Tiberius, Sejanus and Pontius Pilate.....	29
12. August 38 A.D.: The Pogrom of Alexandria.....	31
13. Claudius .....	35
14. The Revolt of 66 A.D.....	37
15. Titus and the Destruction of the Temple.....	40
16. Domitian and the <i>Fiscus Judaicus</i> .....	45
17. Trajan.....	46
18. Hadrian and the Siege of Bethar .....	50
19. The Severus Dynasty .....	54
20. The Christian Emperors .....	56
21. The Fathers of the Church.....	59
22. The End of the Western Roman Empire .....	63
23. Emperor Peroz.....	66
24. Theodoric's Weakness .....	67
25. Zeno, Byzantine Emperor .....	69
26. The Legislation of the Church.....	70
27. The Justinian Code .....	75
28. Gregory I (590–604).....	77
29. Jerusalem, 614.....	79
30. Visigothic Spain .....	81

31. Dagobert .....	85
32. Mohammed .....	86
33. Visigothic Spain II .....	89
34. Agobard and Amulo .....	94
35. The Kings of the Eastern Trade .....	100
36. Granada, 30 December 1066.....	103
37. Gregory VII.....	106
38. The First Crusade .....	108
39. Saint Bernard .....	111
40. The Second Crusade .....	113
41. The Almohads .....	118
42. Toledo, 1180 .....	119
43. Philip Augustus .....	121
44. The Coronation of Richard the Lion Hearted .....	125
45. In the East .....	128
46. Innocent III .....	130
47. Nicholas Donin and the Talmud.....	136
48. 1240: Expulsion of the Jews from Brittany .....	141
49. Saint Louis .....	144
50. Saint Thomas Aquinas.....	147
51. Pablo Christiani and the Barcelona Dispute .....	149
52. Central Europe .....	152
53. Pointed Hats and Ritual Murders .....	154
54. Nicholas IV, <i>Turbato Corde</i> , 1288.....	156
55. Edward I and the Expulsion from England, 1290 .....	157
56. In Persia, March 1291.....	160
57. Rindfleisch of Röttingen, 1298 .....	161
58. Philip the Fair.....	162
59. 1320: The Crusade of the Pastors .....	165
60. 1328: The Revolt of the Navarrais .....	169
61. Spain in the Hands of the Jews .....	170
62. The German Judenschläger, 1336–1338.....	174
63. 1348: The Black Plague.....	176
64. The Late Awakening of John the Good.....	181
65. The Death of Blanche of Bourbon .....	184

## *Table of Contents*

---

66. Bertrand du Guesclin and the White Company .....	192
67. May 1370: The Hosts of Enghien.....	202
68. The Obsequies of Charles V.....	203
69. The General Uprising of 1391 in Spain .....	206
70. 1394: Expulsion from France .....	211
71. 1397: Expulsion from Venice.....	216
72. Pablo de Santa Maria .....	218
73. Vincent Ferrer.....	221
74. Jerome de Santa Maria and the Tortosa Controversy .....	223
75. Martin V.....	226
76. The Hussites and the Council of Basel .....	228
77. 1449: The “Blood Purity” Statute in Spain .....	230
78. John of Capistrano, the Scourge of the Hebrews.....	232
79. Alfonso de Espina.....	239
80. Bernardine of Feltre .....	243
81. Torquemada versus the Marranos.....	247
82. 1492: Expulsion of the Jews from Spain.....	253
83. 1497: Expulsion of the Jews from Portugal .....	257
84. Savonarola and the Expulsion from Florence.....	259
85. The Sephardic Diaspora .....	260
86. The Ashkenazim Expelled from Germany .....	262
87. 1501: Expulsion from Provence .....	265
88. Lisbon, 1506.....	267
89. Joseph Pfefferkorn versus Johann Reuchlin.....	269
90. Albert of Brandenburg .....	274
91. The Judaic Origins of the Protestant Reform .....	275
92. Martin Luther .....	279
93. Julius III and the Talmud .....	283
94. Paul IV, <i>Cum Nimis Absurdum</i> , 14 July 1555.....	286
95. Ivan the Terrible .....	289
96. Pope Pius V .....	291
97. The Synagogue, “Blind and Obstinate”, 1593.....	294
98. Vincent Fettmilch’s War .....	297
99. France, 1615–1617 .....	299
100. Uriel and Vicente da Costa .....	303

## *Table of Contents*

---

101. Back to Free Spain .....	306
102. Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 1648 .....	308
103. William Prynne .....	310
104. The Expulsion from Austria, 1670.....	312
105. Madrid, 30 June 1680.....	314
106. Johann Andreas Eisenmenger .....	316
107. The Jews of Rome under Surveillance .....	319
108. The Jew Süß, 4 February 1738 .....	320
109. Empress Maria Theresa .....	322
110. Benedict XIV, 1751 .....	324
111. The Jews during the Enlightenment .....	327
112. The Jews in France in the 18th Century .....	329
113. Louis XVI.....	332
114. François Hell.....	334
115. The Revolution and the Empire .....	336
116. The Restoration.....	341
117. Germany 1814–1819.....	344
118. The Rothschild Era.....	349
119. France: Anti-Semitic Fumblings .....	353
120. The Romanian Interference Policy.....	357
121. Criminality in Germany.....	361
122. Austria-Hungary under the Boot.....	371
123. La Civiltà Cattolica, 1870–1903 .....	378
124. German Anti-Judaism in the 19th Century .....	382
125. The Anti-Jewish Counter-Offensive in France .....	391
126. Austria-Hungary at the End of the 19th Century .....	401
127. The Collapse of Russia.....	406
128. Jewish Messianism.....	416
Notes .....	426

## **Introduction**

The history of Judaism is that of a people or sect permanently at war with the rest of humanity. The Jews have naturally aroused anti-Semitism at all times and in all places. The scenario which then unfolds is always the same: after a few initial riots and violence, the goyim (non-Jews) pass laws intended to regain control of the situation and eventually end up simply expelling them *en masse*. But invariably, after the lapse of a certain time, the Jews always succeed in re-infecting the host society by bribing the kings and lords, after which they start all over again with their rackets and their intrigues, having learnt absolutely nothing from the lesson which has just been inflicted upon them. This has been their history for three thousand years.

On their side, the Jews never cease attempting to convince the whole world of the truth of their self-invented image of a community persecuted for “no reason at all”. From their exodus from Egypt to Auschwitz, from the destruction of the Temple to the pogroms of the Cossacks, from the massacres committed by the Crusaders to the pyres of the Inquisition, their history is an unending succession of undeserved tragedies. To explain this phenomenon, Jewish intellectuals come up with all sorts of theories, more or less concocted, and end up claiming that the history of the Jewish people is a “mystery”, an extraordinary “enigma”, a fabulous destiny. Most of the time, they add or imply that they are “God’s Chosen People”. But when you take a closer look, the reality is in fact much simpler... In any case, I hope this book puts an end to all the self-contradictory blabber about “Judeo-Christian” civilisation.



**1**

**The Flight from Egypt**

The first known manifestation of hostility to the Jews is related in Exodus, the second book of the Torah. The Hebrews, we learn, in their hasty departure from Egypt under the leadership of Moses, set out for the "Promised Land", which they finally reached after wandering in the Sinai Desert for only about 40 years.

The Jews were originally invited into Egypt a few centuries earlier by Joseph, Jacob's favourite son, whom his brothers had sold into slavery. In Egypt, according to the legend, Joseph finally attracted the attention of the Pharaoh, who trusted Joseph completely and appointed him viceroy. The country and the entire region was going through a period of abundance, then a drought, as predicted by Joseph. All cattle belonging to the Egyptian people were (mis)appropriated by Joseph: "And Joseph said, Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail" (Genesis 47:16). The next year, he acquired the territory of Egypt for the Pharaoh, "for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's (Genesis 47:20).

During this time, Joseph opened the door of Egypt to his father and his Hebrew brothers, and they were given the best lands: "And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Ramses, as Pharaoh had commanded" (Genesis 47:11). In a few years, the Hebrews multiplied in the country and enriched themselves considerably, as we can read in the Torah: "And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Exodus 1:7).

The Egyptians succeeded in freeing themselves thanks to the new Pharaoh, who had "not known Joseph" (Seti I, or Ramses II, in the 13th century B.C.). The Pharaoh ordered all newborn Hebrew males thrown in the river. What is more, the Jews were compelled to work with their hands; their lives were embittered by hard work: "And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour" (Exodus 1:13).

It was here that the figure of Moses appears. Moses had been placed in a basket and delivered to the river currents by his mother,

who feared that the Egyptians would kill him. The newborn, according to Jewish legend, was rescued at the river bank by the Pharaoh's daughter, who was bathing at the time, and decided to adopt him.

Moses later negotiated the liberation of his people by compelling the Pharaoh to allow the Hebrews to leave the country, calling down a series of plagues which devastated the country: water turned into blood, invasions of frogs, mosquitoes, horseflies, hail, grasshoppers, etc. Each time, the Pharaoh broke his word and refused to allow the Hebrews to leave Egypt. The tenth plague was the extermination of all the first-born among the Egyptians.

Meanwhile, "back at the ranch", the Israelites were busy looting the natives of all their movable valuables. Moses, quite naturally, was only obeying Yahweh's command: "Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold" (Exodus 11:2). "And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment" (Exodus 12:35).

When the Egyptians discovered the death of their children there was great lamentation in the middle of the night. The Pharaoh immediately called Moses and authorised him to leave Egypt with the Hebrews, naturally taking all the treasures stolen from the Egyptians with him (according to the Egyptians). According to Jewish legend, this all occurred after the Jews had lived in Egypt for 430 years.

The Hebrews then made their way to the country of Canaan, taking possession of it by virtue of the divine promise made to their ancestors. Nevertheless – as always, according to Jewish legend – the Pharaoh changed his mind after their departure, and sent his soldiers in pursuit of the Jews to bring them back. The Israelites then escaped by crossing the Red Sea which miraculously opened up before them and closed again upon their pursuers.

The truth is no doubt another matter. When we look at history, in fact, we see that the Jews have been expelled everywhere they have ever lived, from all countries and nations, big or small, at one time or another. If soldiers were sent after them, it was most probably not to transport them back to Egypt, but rather, to recover the riches which the Jews had stolen from the Egyptians, and which they were taking away with them. And what did the Jews do with all this wealth? They fabricated their Golden Calf in the Sinai Desert. As for the Egyptian texts of the time, they mention the expulsion of a "sick people", or of a "people with a leprous king".[1] The Jews, in fact, "were regarded by the Egyptians with just as much contempt as the Hyksos, their brothers,

## *1. The Flight from Egypt*

---

who are referred to as lepers in hieroglyphic texts and who are called a 'plague' and a 'pestilence' in a few other inscriptions".[2]

In sum, all the ingredients of Jewish history were already in place at that early time.[3]

## 2

### Amalek

In the Sinai Desert, the Jews were compelled to fight the Amalekites, a nomadic people who lived between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea. The Israelites had hardly exited the Red Sea when the Amalekites came to attack them. Moses, on the mountain, raised his hands to the sky, while Joshua won the battle and triumphed over “Amalek” for the first time, who were subsequently to symbolise the hereditary enemy of the Jews from generation to generation. We find the Amalekites listed right alongside the Moabites, conquered by Ehud (Judges 3:13) and the Midianites, conquered by Gideon (Judges 6:3).

Towards 1050 B.C., Saul, the first king of the Israelites in the Land of Canaan, listened to the prophet Samuel, who commanded him to begin a war of extermination against “Amalek”. Saul called all the soldiers to arms and undertook a perilous war against King Agag. The Lord said to Samuel (Samuel 15:2), “Thus says the Lord of hosts: I will punish Amalek for what he did to Israel, how he ambushed him on the way when he came up from Egypt. Now go and attack Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and do not spare them. But kill both man and woman, infant and nursing child, ox and sheep, camel and ass”. Thus spake the prophet Samuel: of Amalek there must remain “neither vestige nor memory”.

Saul therefore marched against the Amalekites, fought them, from Hevila to the mouth of the Euphrates, to the south, to the Red Sea, and advanced against their capital. This occurred in the year 1053 B.C. He took their cities; he put men, women and children to death. He captured Agag, King of the Amalekites, and put all his people to the sword, but spared all the best among their animals and movable property, thus violating Yahweh’s order.

At this news, Samuel spoke out about Saul’s disobedience and informed him that a new king was to be annointed in his place. Samuel then told Saul: “And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel” (I Samuel 15:26). Samuel then asked that King Agag, who had been loaded with chains, be brought to him, and ordered him cut to pieces. Saul retained his position, but was deprived of authority.

3

**The Philistines**

Around 1020 B.C., King Saul started the war against the Philistines. The battle of Gilboa took place in 1010. The Philistines arrived on the plain with their cavalry and their war chariots, so that the Israelites were obliged to take refuge on Mount Gilboa, where the Philistines pursued them and cut them in pieces. Three of Saul's sons were killed, and Saul himself, finding himself alone, fell on his sword. The victory of the Philistines was total. After resting for a night, the Philistines searched the battlefield and looted the dead of their garments and arms. Among the bodies they found King Saul and his three sons and they sent his head and his weapons home to their country as trophies. They hung Saul's decapitated body and that of his son Jonathon from the walls of Beit-Shean. In memory of this victory, Saul's skull was conserved in a temple of Dagon (Chronicles 10:10), and his armour in a temple of Astarte. The Philistines then took the cities in the plain of Jezreel and in the western region of Jordan.

The state of Israel re-established itself with King David, Saul's successor. David had entered Saul's service and married his daughter Mikal. His fame as a hero was constantly on the increase, over the course of his combats, which he conducted side by side with his king, until he made Saul jealous of his success, to the point where the King decided upon his death. David then took to the hills and gathered all the discontents around his own person. Saul's defeat at Gilboa caused him to be recognised as king at Hebron by the chiefs of the Judean clans. His numerous victories over the Philistines in the west, and in the south over the Edomites, beyond Jordan, over the Moabites and the Ammonites and, in the north, over the Arameans, made David the great king of Israel. According to legend, it was his son Salomon who replaced him, although the very name of Salomon nowhere appears in the archaeological documents of the Middle East. Upon his death, the Jews became divided. Ten tribes founded the kingdom of Israel in the north, which was destroyed in 722 B.C. by the Assyrians. In the south, the tribes of Benjamin and Judah formed the kingdom of Judah, with Jerusalem as its capital.



4

**Nebuchadnezzar**

In September 605 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar II was crowned king of Babylon. His principal concern at the time was the struggle against the Egyptians, who dominated the Middle East and threatened his western borders. A few months before his coronation, Nebuchadnezzar vanquished the Egyptians on the Euphrates and drove them from Palestine and Syria. The same year, he entered Jerusalem, capital of the kingdom of Judah. But the kingdom refused to submit and the Babylonians reoccupied Jerusalem twice, in 597, and, after a long siege, in 586. It was in this year that the Temple of the Jews was destroyed and the population deported to the Mesopotamia.

The Judeans exiled to Babylon found themselves treated with great moderation. The famous Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz writes, in his monumental *History of the Jews*: “The goodness of Nebuchadnezzar went so far as to permit families, entire populations, to remain together, with their people and their slaves, and to retain their former relationships. These banished persons lived as free men, their rights and their domestic habits remained intact. They formed special agglomerations and could even govern themselves according to their respective traditions”.[4]

The exiles received lands in compensation for those which they had lost; they possessed slaves, horses, mules, camels and asses, and, apart from the obedience which they owed to their king, were hardly subject to land tax contribution. After Nebuchadnezzar’s death, in 561, under his son’s reign, their condition became even more favourable. Among the young people employed at his court, there were Judeans who filled the office of eunuchs. Heinrich Graetz writes here: “How many times have we not seen the harem guards, servants to the whims of their tyrants, rise from the rank of slaves to the position of masters of their masters!”

Towards 550 B.C., the Persians took over the Babylonian Empire, and, in 536, their sovereign Cyrus authorised the exiles to return to their homeland, where the Jews immediately began the reconstruction of the Temple, which was finished in 515 B.C.[5]

5

## The Encounter with the Greeks

Starting in the 4th century B.C., the Persian empire was shaken by Greek imperialism. In 338, a blonde young prince, Alexander, defeated the troops from Thebes, and began a prodigious career which was to lead him to the confines of Asia in years to come.

The city of Alexandria, founded on the Egyptian coast in 332, became the hearth of Hellenic culture and a great commercial centre. Alexander encouraged the Jews to come and live there, as well as in other imperial cities, so that the city became cosmopolitan. There was a major Jewish community in the city as early as the 3rd century B.C., arousing the defensive reactions of other inhabitants.

The first anti-Jewish writings which have come down to us were the works of Greek scholars from Alexandria. Hecataeus of Abdera, a Greek historian who lived in Egypt at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., was the author of a *History of Egypt* which was much used by Diodorus of Sicily. In it, Hecataeus of Abdera describes Jewish customs as “inhospitable and anti-human”. The Jews, even then, seemed in opposition to the rest of humanity, at least since Moses: “The sacrifices and customs established by Moses”, writes Hecataeus of Abdera, “were entirely different from those of other nations; by harping on his people’s wanderings and exile, he established a way of life contrary to humanity and hospitality”.

The repugnance of the Judeans at sitting down at table with non-Jews was considered by all to be hostile and insulting. “They live apart, in special districts, shutting themselves up, living in isolation, administering themselves by virtue of privileges of which they were jealous and which excited the envy of those who surrounded them”, writes the Jewish historian Bernard Lazare.[6] “Their reserve in their relations with foreigners was interpreted as a hatred of the human race”, writes Heinrich Graetz.

Many of them were very rich: “They obtained the monopoly of navigation on the Nile, the grain trade and the provisioning of Alexandria and they expanded their dealings to all the provinces of the Mediterranean littoral. They also acquired great wealth”, affirms Bernard Lazare, who also informs us that Jewish scholars falsified texts for propaganda purposes. Thus did Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides celebrate the One God and the Sabbath!

Historians were also falsified: "The most important of these inventions was that of the Sibylline Oracles, fabricated from start to finish by Alexandrine Jews, announcing future times where the reign of the One God would be brought about".[7]

The Jewish literature of this period, the *First and Second Books of Enoch*, the *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Sibylline Oracles* and others, were impregnated with apocalyptic accents and filled with imprecations against all non-Jews: "Woe to thee, Gog and all later peoples, and to you as well, Magog!". Several of these texts, such as the *Sibylline Oracles* in which passages from the *First Book of Enoch* were drawn up in Greek, and their effects upon non-Jewish readers were catastrophic due to their emphasis upon the notion of an exclusively Jewish God who conspires with His People to exterminate other peoples.

But the Greeks, at least literate Greeks, only really discovered Judaism with the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, known as the *Septuagint*, or *Seventy*, completed at Alexandria in the 3rd century B.C., under the reign of, and to the order of, Ptolemy II. The text aroused indignation and disgust among scholars. Did the God of Israel really order the destruction of the temples of the people of the countries in which the Jews lived? And what can one say about all these stories of treachery, rapes, vengeance, and incest which filled these pages?

The book *Les Juifs, rois de l'époque*, published in 1845 by Alphonse Toussenel, a French naturalist, writer and journalist, is seriously dated, but the introduction contains an interesting passage regarding the Old Testament: "I don't know a lot about the great things the Jews did, since I never read their history except in a book which talks of nothing but adultery and incest, of butcheries and savage wars; where everything we respect is sullied with infamy; where all great fortunes are invariably founded on fraud and treason; in which kings who are considered great saintly religious leaders have husbands murdered so they can steal their wives; in which women who are considered holy enter the tents of enemy generals to cut their heads off. I do not concede the title of a great people to a horde of usurers and lepers, living at humanity's expense since the beginning of time, which drags its hatred of other peoples and its unconquerable pride all over the globe".[8] The Greeks of Alexandria were scandalised at all this twenty centuries ago.

Manetho, high priest of the temple of Heliopolis, was a Hellenist Egyptian from the 3rd century B.C. He was the author of a *History of Egypt*, only a few fragments of which remain, which were cited a few centuries later by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. Manetho

claimed that the Exodus of the Jews was not the heroic adventure described by the Pentateuch, but the expulsion of a colony of lepers and lunatics. He describes Moses as a priest from Heliopolis who committed apostasy, named Osareph, who was the leader of a particularly cruel race of people. After their arrival in Canaan, "they burned the cities and villages, pillaged the temples, and sullied the statues of the gods".[9]

Hecataeus of Abdera stated that the story of Exodus was largely imaginary. The Jews, in fact, had already been militarily expelled from Egypt: "The natives became convinced that if they didn't expel these strangers, they would never be freed from their evils. They immediately proceeded with the expulsion".[10]

Later, Lysimachus of Alexandria, a Greek scholar who lived at the end of the 2nd century, disseminated this literature with perseverance. In his *History of Egypt*, he spoke of the Jews as a people suffering from leprosy: "The result in Egypt was widespread sterility". Lysimachus is cited here by Flavius Josephus: "Once the lepers and mange-carriers were drowned, they transported the others into the desert and abandoned them *en masse*". The Jews therefore only landed in the desert by chance.

The laws to which they were subject aroused the most vivid indignation. Moses, we learn, "exhorted them not to show benevolence to anyone, to follow only the worst advice and to demolish the sanctuaries and altars of all the gods they met with. They approved of this advice: the outlaws, in putting them into practice, advanced through the desert in considerable numbers and arrived in inhabited countries. They then mistreated the men, pillaged and burnt the temples, reached the territory known as Judah today, built a city and installed themselves there".[11]

Damocritus, a Greek historian, one of Lysimachus's contemporaries, presents the oldest mention of ritual murder among the Jews: "Every seven years, they captured a stranger, brought him to their temple, and sacrificed him, cutting him into little pieces".[12]

6

**Antiochus Epiphanes**

After the death of Alexander the Great, in 323 B.C., his generals disputed his legacy, and the empire was divided in the end. Ptolomy and Seleucus both founded dynasties. The Ptolomys dominated Egypt, Syria and Judea, while the rest of the empire, including Persia, fell to the Seleucids (a Hellenistic dynasty in Western Asia).

In 198 B.C., the Seleucid Antiochus III took control of Judea, but was defeated by the Romans in 188 B.C. and had to pay a colossal indemnity, causing his successor, Antiochus IV, to raise taxes in Judea.

The entire Mediterranean littoral became impregnated with Greek culture, and the Hellenisation of Judea continued vigorously. The Jews there spoke and wrote Greek. Philo wrote his philosophical treatises in Greek. Innumerable Greek words passed into rabbinical literature, and great priests, such as Menelaus or Aristobulus, bore Greek names.

These tax increases set off the powder keg. In 169 B.C., Antiochus IV, who was returning from the campaign in Egypt to levy more troops, decided to crush the revolt of the Jews in Jerusalem. He entered the city, repressed the rebellion and profaned the temple, "showing contempt for the god they worshipped there" (Graetz). He removed all objects of value, the altar of gold, the chandelier, the table, all the precious vases, and the temple was transformed into a place of pagan worship. Menelaus, even more pro-Hellenic than his predecessor, was raised to the dignity of high priest. After vanquishing the Jews, he was granted the title of Epiphanes (the Illustrious).

One story was fated to make the Jews look ridiculous in the eyes of civilised peoples for a long time; Heinrich Graetz writes: a "fable half-hallucination and lies, a fable inspired by his accomplice Menelaus".

Antiochus claimed in fact to have seen in the Holy of Holies of the Temple a stone statue depicting a man on a donkey, wearing a long beard, standing on an ass and holding a book in his hand. The man on the donkey was Moses, who had taught the Israelites an abominable doctrine, a doctrine which treated all of humanity as an enemy, which commanded them to keep themselves apart from all other peoples and show them no benevolence.

Since then, there was a rumour going around among the Greeks and Romans, that Antiochus had found the head of an ass, made of gold, to whom the Jews rendered great honours: they worshipped an ass.



“Again, it was probably Antiochus who encouraged people to believe, or pretended to believe himself, an infamous calumny against the Judeans”, writes Graetz; “he is said to have found a Greek lying on a bed in the temple, who begged him to save him. The Judeans, he supposedly said, are accustomed to fatten up a Greek every year, and then cut his throat, savour his entrails, and, in so doing, to swear deadly enmity against all Greeks”. And the Jewish historian added, offended: “Whether or not this calumny originates from Antiochus or he borrowed it from artisans of mendacity, it did, in fact, give Judaism a reputation which was as lamentable as it was undeserved, that of lacking charity towards other peoples.”

In June 168 B.C., Antiochus undertook a second expedition to Egypt, but the Macedonian army was defeated and he was compelled to withdraw to his capital city.

“This time, once again”, writes Graetz, “he found no better way to discharge his anger than to commit the most atrocious cruelties against the Judeans...”, who were no doubt quite happy, and noisily so, to witness his failure. One of his lieutenants, Apollonius, governor of Mysia, entered Jerusalem and fell on the inhabitants with a troop of Greek and Macedonia mercenaries.

Apollonius also ordered the demolition of numerous houses and the ramparts of the city. Those of the inhabitants who could escape the massacre sought safety in flight.

Posidonius of Apamea, a Greek stoic philosopher, born in Apamea, a city in Syria (135–51 B.C.), reproached the Jews for their laws “contrary to the sacred laws of hospitality”. This is a passage from his tale:

“Most of Antiochus’s friends were of the opinion that they should take the city by force, and completely annihilate the Jewish race, as the Jews, alone among the nations, refused to have any social relations with other peoples, and considered them all as enemies. They told him that the very ancestors of the Jews, impious men hated by the gods, had been chased out of Egypt, out of the whole country. Covered by leprosy and dry patches, they were gathered up like cursed wretches and thrown out over the borders so as to purify the country. Then, once they had been banished, they took over the territory of Jerusalem, forming the Jewish people and perpetuating hatred between themselves and all mankind. This is why they instituted special laws, such as never sitting at table with a stranger and never showing them any benevolence”. [13]

Since Judaism considered all of humanity to be its enemies, it was therefore permissible, for the good of humanity, to take all steps to annihilate Judaism. In 168 B.C., through an edict published all over

Judea, Antiochus the Great purely and simply prohibited Mosaic law. Circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and Jewish festivals were severely prohibited; violators were punished by death. Altars in memory of the Greek gods were erected almost everywhere and the temple of Jerusalem was dedicated to the Olympian god Zeus. On 6 July 168 B.C. (17 Tammuz of the Jewish calendar), the high priest Menelaus sacrificed a pig on the altar and smeared its blood all over the altar. "They cooked the meat of the animal and soiled the parchments of the Holy Scriptures with it", laments Heinrich Graetz. The rolls of the Torah which were found in the temple were not only soiled, but burnt, "since the Torah, this school of moral purity and universal charity, taught nothing, according to Antiochus, but hatred of mankind". It received its baptism of fire. An altar to Jupiter was then erected on the spot.

Antiochus Epiphanes issued decree after decree, ordering recalcitrant Jews to be treated with the greatest severity. Anyone openly professing Judaism was subject to death by public execution. The Jews from the cities of Syria and Phoenicia, living in the immediate neighbourhood of the Greeks, were also compelled to abandon Judaism. Wherever they found the Rolls of the Law the Greeks tore them up and threw the pieces into the fire. Every Jewish house of prayer and educational establishment in the country were destroyed.

A few Jews voluntarily renounced the sect in which they had been brought up and denounced their ex-fellow Jews to the Greeks: "The refuges of the Hassidic Jews were no doubt revealed by a few miserable Hellenists", writes Graetz. The head of the garrison, the Phrygian Philipp, immediately opened a military campaign against them, and they all died by fire or smoke inhalation.

The signal for the revolt of the Jews was given by a rabbi, Matthias Hasmon. Upon his death, in 166 B.C., leadership of the resistance passed to his third son, Judas Maccabeus (from his surname "The Hammer", *maccabi*). These fanaticised Jews organised a guerrilla war against the Seleucid garrisons and against all Jews sympathising with the reforms. The same year, Judas Maccabeus won a battle against the Greeks at Emmaus. Ever since this victory, Jews all over the world have celebrated the feast of Hannukah – the Feast of the Lights – for eight days every year, during which they light candles. From 166 to 164, the Greeks were even expelled from Jerusalem and the surrounding area.

The victories of the Jews only aroused the hatred of the neighbouring peoples against them. The Judeans "were more than ever the object of their furore", writes Graetz, as if the Jews were already the

object of particular hatred. "To the South-West the Philistines, to the North-West the Phoenicians, beyond the Jordan River, the Ammonites, Syrians and Macedonians throughout the neighbouring regions, all were driven by the same hatred; but none to the same degree, it appears, as the Edomites, who lived in the south." Bitter enemies of Israel, "they ambushed these unhappy refugees, mistreated them and often killed them." Judas Macchabeus went to attack them in Akrabattine, defeating them and expelling them from their homes. He then crossed the Jordan with his troops and fought the Ammonites, commanded by a certain Timotheus, "an implacable enemy of the Judeans", who was also defeated by Judas.

Antiochus Epiphanes, who had just crushed Artaxias' rebellion in Armenia, undertook an unlucky expedition in Persia. He fell ill shortly afterwards and died in 164 B.C. The following year, 163 B.C., the regent Lysias granted them freedom of worship, and the High Priest Menelaus was sentenced to death and executed. Nonetheless, a Seleucid garrison remained in the citadel of Jerusalem until 141 B.C., so as to protect the Hellenising Jews.

7

## **The Conquest of Judea by the Romans**

John Hyrcanus, third son of Simon, last of the Maccabees, launched himself into the conquest of Samaria and reduced the capital to a heap of ruins. He devastated Scythopolis and massacred the populations on the sole pretext that they spoke Greek. According to Flavius Josephus, he was a sanguinary tyrant, who believed himself invested with the gift of prophecy. When he conquered Idumea, he put to the sword all those who did not wish to convert to Judaism. The cruelty of the Jews against conquered populations spread beyond their frontiers.

In 134 B.C., in a last attempt to reconquer the lost provinces, the Seleucid king Antiochus VII laid siege to Jerusalem. His advisors advised taking the city by storm and exterminating “the nation of the Jews”, since it was the only nation among all the nations of the world to avoid dealing with any other peoples and in considering all men their enemies, reports Diodorus of Sicily in the 1st century B.C., adding: “The ancestors of the Jews were chased out of Egypt because they were impious and detested by the gods.” The historian wrote again that the descendants of the Jews from Egypt had “raised their hatred of humanity to the level of a tradition”.<sup>[14]</sup>

In the year 64, part of Asia Minor and the Middle East was conquered by the Romans under General Scaurus, under Pompey’s orders, commander in chief of the armies of the East. Pompey enjoined the enemy brothers Aristobulus and Hyrcan, who were struggling for power in Judea, to appear before him in person at Damas, where he examined their dispute. Hyrcan invoked his right as the elder brother, while Aristobulus claimed to be the more deserving to wield power. Pompey was at first more favourable to the rich and impetuous Aristobulus, then inclined towards Hyrcan, who was more favourable to Rome. Aristobulus immediately organised resistance forces and retrenched himself with his men on the Mount of the Temple. Pompey then gave the order to invade Palestine with a great deployment of forces. Roman legions joined up with troops remaining loyal to Hyrcan and Jerusalem was once again subjected to the horrors of a siege, which lasted three months. In June 63 B.C., one of the towers of the temple was destroyed and a breach was opened in the lines, through which the Romans entered in force. Piso, the lieutenant-general, took the temple on a fast day. The legions and allied troops succeeded in entering

through the forecourt, massacring the Jews and cutting the throats of the priests. Chroniclers maintain that Pompey was the first to penetrate the Holy of Holies of the temple, sword in hand, where no one was allowed to enter except for the high priests.

This war cost the lives of 12,000 Jews. The title of king was withdrawn from Hyrcan, who retained only his dignity as a high priest and was placed under the trusteeship of Antipater, appointed administrator of the country.

The walls of Jerusalem were razed and Judea was treated as a conquered country. Moreover, Judea shrank within its narrow pre-Hasmonean borders. The cities of the coast, inhabited by Greeks, were declared free cities, the same as certain cities of the interior.

After having appointed Scaurus governor of Judea, Lower Syria and territories which extended from Egypt to the Euphrates, Pompey left for Rome, where he was received in triumph. Taking Aristobulus, the latter's daughters and two sons, Antigone and Alexander with him, who, despite close surveillance, succeeded in escaping en route.

The next year, Alexander placed himself at the head of a new revolt. Gabinius, who replaced Scaurus, raised an army of 10,000 men, then sent the young Marc Antony against Alexander, who were joined by numerous soldiers from Antipater's army. The Roman army won a decisive victory, during which over 6,000 Jews died.

At Rome, Crassus, Pompey and Caesar shared power for several years, in an initial triumvirate (60 B.C.). In 54 B.C., the consul Crassus, commander in chief of the armies of the Orient, visited Jerusalem and took control of the treasure of the Temple (2,000 golden talents), which Pompey had not dared touch, so as to carry on the war against the Parthians in Persia. He also collected 8,000 talents from the rest of the country, already heavily taxed by the Romans and thus recovered a total of 10,000 gold and silver talents (according to Flavius). Crassus took away everything he found in the Temple, as well as all the presents given to the Temple by Diaspora Jews (of Asia and Europe). In 53 B.C., he crossed the Euphrates to meet the Parthians, but was defeated at the battle of Carrhes. Retreating with what remained of his army, he was assassinated during an interview with the Parthian general Surena, and his head was sent to the king of Persia, Orodes II. Cassius Longinus succeeded him as commander of the East, at Damas, and stopped the Parthian advance, which threatened Syria. The revolt then broke out in Judea against the Roman protectorate. In 53 B.C., Cassius invaded the country and crushed the revolt. Nearly 30,000 Jewish men were taken prisoner and sold as slaves in various slave markets of the large city.



## 8 Cicero

At Rome, the Jewish community at the beginning of the 1st century A.D. consisted of 40 to 50,000 persons. The Jews already exercised a certain influence over the progress of Roman affairs, writes Heinrich Graetz: "Since they all, former emigrés and freed slaves, had the right to vote in the popular assemblies, their opinions often had great weight, thanks to their mutual unity, their activity and their cold-bloodedness in conducting business, and perhaps their wisdom".

Here, as always, they were detested. A young writer, the rhetorician Apollonius Molon, who lived on the island of Rhodes – like Posidonius of Apamea, Stoic philosopher and geographer – was the first to write a treatise against the Judeans, compiling numerous and varied complaints against them. His work is lost; we only know of it by the mentions made of it by Flavius Josephus in his treatise *Against Apion*. Apollonius described the Jews as "atheists and misanthropes" and concluded his observations that the Judeans were "incapable of rendering any service to humanity".

The Roman lawyer and statesman, Cicero, who had been Apollonius Molon's student, also gained a good knowledge of the Jews. In 59 B.C., he was responsible for defending the cause of his friend and client, the proconsul of Asia, Lucius Flaccus, who was accused of embezzling funds intended for the navy and extorting money from a few Greek cities during his term of office in Asia Minor. The accusers included Jews, who accused him of appropriating the religious tax which the Jews of the province sent to the temple of Jerusalem each year. For his part, Flaccus cited a Senatorial decree authorising the exportation of gold from Roman provinces.

The investigation was conducted by Lelius, a partisan of Caesar and Pompey, the political enemies of Cicero and Flaccus. Caesar, and Pompey in particular, encouraged Lelius in his investigation in Asia Minor, and the charge of misappropriation of public funds turned into a political trial. The Jews, in their traditional determination to destroy all elites, naturally belonged to Caesar's party, that of the people, against the party of the aristocrats, represented by Flaccus and Cicero.

In his summation, *Pro Flaccus*, Cicero dedicated only two pages to the accusations made by the Jews, but these pages have become

famous, because in them, Cicero proved himself an inveterate enemy of the Jews. Roman Jews, who were keenly interested in Flaccus's trial, came to mix with the crowd. Cicero was hesitant to reveal his hostility towards them, so he spoke in a very low voice. Here is a passage from his summation, which Heinrich Graetz preferred not to quote. Here, Cicero is addressing the prosecutor Lelius:

"The next thing is that charge about the Jewish gold. And this, forsooth, is the reason why this cause is pleaded near the steps of Aurelius. It is on account of this charge, O Lælius, that this place and that mob has been selected by you. You know how numerous that crowd is, how great is its unanimity, and of what weight it is in the popular assemblies. I will speak in a low voice, just so as to let the judges hear me. For men are not wanting who would be glad to excite that people against me and against every eminent man; and I will not assist them and enable them to do so more easily. As gold, under pretence of being given to the Jews, was accustomed every year to be exported out of Italy and all the provinces to Jerusalem, Flaccus issued an edict establishing a law that it should not be lawful for gold to be exported out of Asia. And who is there, O judges, who cannot honestly praise this measure? The senate had often decided, and when I was consul it came to a most solemn resolution, that gold ought not to be exported. But to resist this barbarous superstition were an act of dignity, to despise the multitude of Jews, which at times was most unruly in the assemblies in defence of the interests of the republic, was an act of the greatest wisdom."

Graetz, by contrast, cites another passage: "One must take particular care to combat the barbarous superstitions of the Judeans and it is the act of a man of great character to testify to his great contempt for these agitators of our popular assemblies. If Pompey made no use of his right as conqueror and respected the treasure in the temple of Jerusalem, he did not do so for the sake of the sanctuary, but out of prudence. He did not wish to provide a pretext for an accusation to a nation inclined to suspicion and calumny."

One year later, Cicero was sentenced to exile, and could not reside less than 80 miles from Rome. His house and villas were entirely demolished.

9

**Caesar, Cleopatra and Marc Antony**

In 48 B.C., Pompey, who had fled to Greece, was defeated by Julius Caesar at Pharsalia. He then took refuge in Egypt, where he was assassinated. In thanking them for their assistance, Caesar permitted the Jews to re-erect the walls of Jerusalem, which had been demolished by Pompey when he took the city by storm. He also ordered that all Jews still in bondage in foreign countries as a result of the acts of Crassus and the ordinances of Cassius Longinus should be freed.

Caesar showered the Jews with favours. He considerably diminished their taxes and exempted them from military service. Here is an extract from the edicts posted on the Capitol of Rome and Alexandria:

“We, Caius Caesar, inform the magistrates of the Parianians that the Jews from various provinces have come to see us at Delos to complain of the prohibition which you have enacted against them living according to their laws and making their sacrifices, a measure of harshness against our friends and allies such as we cannot tolerate, since they are permitted to practice these customs even in Rome. Even if by this same edict we prohibit public gatherings in Rome, we except the Jews from this interdiction.”

But the power acquired by Caesar threatened republican institutions: a few conspirators, among them Brutus and Cassius Longinus, swore to destroy him and fomented a coup d'état.

On 15 March, 44 B.C., Caesar was assassinated in Rome, in the midst of the Senate, pierced by twenty-three dagger wounds. The Jews, who had not forgotten that Caesar had permitted them to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, met around his tomb for several nights in a row to weep and preserve his memory with a religious fidelity. “It is for good reason that the Judeans of Rome wept at his death and spent several nights lamenting next to his funeral pyre”, writes the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz.

Cassius then went to the Senate, where he assumed power and his victory was ratified by the Senate. In early 42 B.C., he joined Brutus in Macedonia.

Confronting these two defenders of republican institutions were the “triumvirs”, Lepidus, Marc Antony and Octavius, who joined battle

with them on the plain of Philippi in October 44 B.C. Cassius, who commanded the left wing of the army, was defeated by Antony's attack. Believing Brutus to have been defeated at his side, he asked his freedman to stab him to death. Three weeks later, Brutus was defeated in turn by Octavius and chose suicide rather than surrender.

Octavius, the nephew and adoptive son of Julius Caesar, now governed the western part of the Empire, while Antony governed the eastern part. Antony required the assistance of Egypt in his war against the Parthians. In 41 B.C., Cleopatra came to meet the man who had so effectively avenged the assassins of Caesar, her deceased lover who had made her queen of Egypt. Antony was completely besmitten by the young Cleopatra's charm and beauty.

Relations between Antony and Octavius deteriorated, and a confrontation between the two became inevitable. Octavius blamed Cleopatra for the war, and accused her of wishing to rule over Rome. Marc Antony and Cleopatra were defeated on September 31 B.C. at the naval battle of Actium, on the western coast of Greece. The following year, Octavius arrived at Alexandria with his army and Marc Antony, seeing that his cause was lost, preferred to commit suicide. Cleopatra, led before Octavius, was able to withdraw with her servants, where she was able to commit suicide in turn, causing herself to be bitten by an asp. In this regard, Graetz writes:

"The Judeans of Alexandria were also overjoyed at the queen's death, since they had suffered much at her hand. Shortly before her death, this crowned monster expressed the wish to be able to cut the throats of all the Judean inhabitants of her capital who supported Octavius".

## 10 Herod

As he had formerly received Antipater's hospitality, Marc Antony showered his son, Antipater II, with honorary distinctions. Antipater II (who called himself Herod), aged only 25, was also appointed governor of Galilee.

The Parthians entered Jerusalem and pillaged Herod's palace with everything which he had left behind. These barbarians, as Flavius Josephus called them, also sacked Jerusalem, and the entire surrounding countryside, then attacked other cities, which they pillaged and completely ruined. In 40 B.C., Herod fled to Rome, where Antony had him crowned king of Judea by the Senate.

The Romans and Herod's troops then reconquered the region from Antigone, his rival, who had formed an alliance with the Romans. In 37 B.C., Herod besieged Jerusalem, and in the fifth month, the walls of the city were demolished. This second taking of Jerusalem by the Romans occurred 27 years after the siege led by Pompey.

Herod then filled Judea with cities and monuments bearing the names of his Roman protectors, swearing allegiance to Octavius, who had in the meantime become the first Roman Emperor, under the name Augustus. For a dozen years (from 23 to 12 B.C.) Herod laid out a world-class maritime city, Cesarea, which was equipped with two collossi, one representing Augustus as an Olympian Jupiter, and the other, the city of Rome, with the features of Juno. When the new city was inaugurated with sumptuous festivities, one might have fancied oneself transported into a pagan city: thus the city was given the name of Little Rome. Later, this city became the head of Roman government and became the rival of Jerusalem. "Every time Cesarea rejoiced, Jerusalem wept".

Certain Judeans felt an aversion for this parvenu who was attempting to destroy the morals and customs of the Jews. As for Herod, who was later nicknamed Herod the Great, Graetz writes: "This young man was the *éminence grise* of the Jewish nation. He seemed destined to deliver Judea hog-tied into Roman hands and place his heel on their neck."

In Babylon under Persian domination, Judaism prospered. Jews had lived there for centuries, even before the destruction of the First

Temple in 586 B.C. Their situation never ceased improving. “They were rich”, writes Elie Wiesel, “lived in security and enjoyed spiritual and sometimes even juridical autonomy. Cities such as Nehardea were entirely Jewish. It is in no way astonishing that, in the conflicts between Rome and the Persians, the Jews of Babylon supported the Persians and contributed to the financing of their war effort”.[15]

## 11

### Tiberius, Sejanus and Pontius Pilate

Wherever they lived, the Jews nourished the hope of seeing the return of the Messiah and actively prepared for the coming of this triumphant ruler. In a passage in his *History of the War of the Jews*, the writer Flavius Josephus confirmed the hopes of the Jews and their determination to rule the world. "That which determined the Jews upon their war against the Romans", he writes, "was an ambiguous prophecy, contained in the sacred books, assuring the Jews that a Messiah would obtain for them domination over the world".

The Roman historians Suetonius and Tacitus confirmed this idea, firmly anchored in the Jewish soul. All over the Orient, says Suetonius, the antique and enduring belief that "men from Galilee would dominate the world" according to the prophecies was believed.

Judaism penetrated the eastern part of the Roman Empire. "They have invaded all the cities", [16] writes Strabo, a Greek geographer (58 B.C. – 21 A.D.) and "it is not easy to find a single place in the world which has not hosted this tribe, or, more accurately, which was not occupied by them". [17]

The Romans quite naturally distrusted them for all their intrigues, and some emperors took the necessary steps to bridle their power. "One would have said", writes Graetz, "that the Caesars had a premonition of the mortal blow which the Roman Empire and its cult was to receive from Judaism."

To compensate them for their support, Augustus, the first Roman Emperor, granted the Jews of Egypt the confirmation of their political rights and privileges. But his successor, Tiberius, was more hostile to Judaism than his adoptive father had ever been.

Following a scandalous swindle, he had several thousand Jews expelled from Alexandria to Sardinia.

In his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Flavius Josephus writes that four converted Jews had persuaded a converted aristocrat, Fulvius, wife to the Senator Saturninus, to make a donation of gold to the Temple of Jerusalem, but that, instead of sending the gold to the Temple, the four Jews misappropriated it. The Roman historian Tacitus (55–120) writes that, in the year 19 A.D., Tiberius, upon being informed of this fraud, caused the Senate to vote a law by virtue of which four thousand men,

Egyptians and Jews, should be sent to Sardinia to help combat brigandage. As for the others, they were to leave Italy before a certain date, unless they had renounced their impious rites, under pain of perpetual servitude.

Tacitus's contemporary, Suetonius (69–125), in his *Life of the Twelve Caesars*, states that “the Jewish youth were scattered, on the pretext of military service, in unhealthy provinces”.

Dio Cassius reports a bit further on, that, “while the Jews live in Rome in great numbers and had converted many people to their ideas, Tiberius banished most of them”.

In compliance with this law – which is said to have been inspired in Tiberius's mind by his all-powerful minister Sejanus – thousands of Jews were exiled in Sardinia, and the Jews of all Italy were threatened with expulsion. Young healthy men were trained in the use of arms, on the Sabbath just as on other days; when they refused, they were severely punished. This was the first expulsion of the Jews in the Western world.[18]

Pontius Pilate, who received the governorship of Judea from 26 to 36 A.D., was a creature of Sejanus. Until then, the commanders of Roman troops had respected the scruples of the Judeans. But Pontius Pilate, who wished to accustom them to worshipping the Emperor, secretly caused the images of Caesar which surmounted the standards of the legions to be transported to Jerusalem to be exposed in public.

A violent agitation ensued throughout the entire country, so much so that Pilate ordered the removal of the images.



## 12

### August 38 A.D.: The Pogrom of Alexandria

Emperor Caligula did not like the Jews either. As Heinrich Graetz writes, it was under his reign that “the implacable hatred which had long been simmering in the hearts of the Greeks of Alexandria” finally exploded against the Judeans. “In fact, the Judeans had long been considered secret or declared enemies throughout the Roman Empire. This was a mixture of religious and racial hatred, joined with a vague apprehension at seeing this small people, so contemptuous and so proud, attain supreme power one day.”

Nowhere had these malevolent propensities ever reached such a degree of intensity as among the Greek population of Alexandria, which observed the opulence of the Jews and suffered their arrogance. Greek writers opposed both the Jews and their doctrines, both. We know nothing of Lysimachus; nothing remains of his writings, but we know some of his texts from what Flavius Josephus says about them.

Apion, a Greek from Alexandria who lived at Rome in the first century A.D., was the author of numerous erudite books. In his *History of Egypt* in five volumes, he wrote a version of the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt which corroborated that of his predecessors. Apion also wrote a *Treatise against the Jews*, in which he affirms that the laws of Moses “consist of nothing which is not wicked and dangerous”. He pursued the members of this sect, which occupied a high rank in Alexandria, with sarcasms, recalling Cleopatra’s animosity against the Judeans, observing that the Jews were hostile to the rest of humanity.

In his *Against Apion*, Flavius Josephus repeats several of his remarks. The Jews, said Apion, “captured a Greek traveller every year, fattened him up for a year, and then, at the end of this time, led him into a forest where they immolated him; his body was sacrificed according to prescribed rites, and the Jews, relishing his entrails, swore oaths while sacrificing the Greek: they then threw their victim’s remains in a ditch.”

Flavius Josephus attempted to refute Apion’s writings by insulting his adversary, thus inaugurating a long tradition among Jewish intellectuals: Apion, he said, “has the stupidity of an ass and the impudence of a dog, which is one of the gods of his nation”.

These spiteful dispositions of the Alexandrians had to be kept under

wraps under August and Tiberius, when the Imperial governors of Egypt severely repressed any violent demonstrations. The situation changed under Caligula, because the governor Flaccus, who had been one of Tiberius's friends, closed his eyes to the acts of violence committed by the exasperated Greek population. These anti-Jewish demonstrations were chiefly instigated by a few intellectuals, among them Denys, the bailiff Lampon and the gymnasiarc Isodorus.

Heros Agrippa I had been appointed king of Galilee by the Emperor. In July 38 A.D., he stopped at Alexandria where he was acclaimed by the Jews, who saw in his ascension the hopes of a national renewal and who decided to give a festival in his honour. His presence set off the explosion.

The Greeks submitted a petition to Flaccus, governor of Egypt, requesting the promulgation of an ordinance requiring the Jews to accept a statue of the Emperor in the synagogues, to which the Jews refused to submit. Under popular pressure, Flaccus deprived the Jews of Alexandria of the rights of citizenship, declaring them foreigners, and ordered the arrest of 38 members of the Council of Elders and the confiscation of their goods. On 31 August 38 A.D., the leaders of the Jewish community were led through the crowd in chains and whipped in public, so thoroughly that several of them died. Flaccus then sent the army to search all the houses of all Jews, who were chased out by the residents of the four districts of Alexandria and pushed back into the Delta district, near the port. The mob, which had long been awaiting this moment, stormed the abandoned houses, shops and workshops, pillaging and destroying everything. The Delta district was even besieged to prevent the Jews from leaving, leaving them to die of starvation and heat prostration. Entire families perished, old men, women, children, without distinction of age or condition. Four hundred Jewish houses were pillaged or destroyed, and their places of worship were profaned and burnt. As desired by Emperor Caligula, the statues bearing his image were then installed in all the synagogues. These vexations lasted until mid-September, without any official intervention. It was at this time that the Emperor dismissed Flaccus and summoned him to Rome, due to his disputes with the Emperor.

The Jew Philo of Alexandria (12 B.C. – 54 A.D.) left a testimony of these events in his text entitled *Legation to Caius*, in which we glimpse once again this propensity of all Jewish intellectuals to ignore the real causes of anti-Semitism and depict the Jews as the innocent victims of religious persecution organised by fanatics having lost their reason.

Philo of Alexandria speaks of Caligula here and of his desire to place a statue of Jupiter's representative in all the temples of the

Roman Empire, including the synagogues: "There was an unlimited power of which we, in misery, were the first to feel the effects... We were ransacked; scholars were chased out of their dwellings with their wives and children, to the point that their houses remained deserted; they tore out the furniture and fittings and whatever was most valuable, not like thieves, who, in the fear of discovery, steal in the darkness of night, but in broad daylight, in public. They all showed their loot to passers-by, as if they had been inherited by right or dearly purchased. A few, who had ganged together for the purpose of pillaging, shared out their loot in the public squares, often under the very gaze of the unfortunates whom they had just pillaged, insulting and mocking them, which was the hardest of all to bear. All this was sad enough without anything else. Who would not have found it horrible to see these unfortunates fall from wealth into dire poverty, from opulence into misery, without having committed the slightest fault; to see them chased from their deserted homes, wandering through the streets, suffering death by exposure to a torrid sun, or the rigours of a frigid night? But all this was less horrible than what happened.

"The Jews were chased out of the entire city, everywhere; thousands of men, women and children, crammed into a narrow district, like a cave, were piled up like miserable herds of animals, in the hope that in a few days they would be no more than a pile of dead bodies... Those who were surprised in the other districts of the city, those who arrived from the countryside, being unaware of the misery of their brothers, were the object of all sorts of maltreatment. They were stoned with rocks, broken brick and pottery; they were beaten about the head, or wherever such injuries might be fatal, until they had all been killed. The unemployed or wealthy classes of Alexandria posted themselves all about the narrow district in which the Jews had taken refuge; the Jews were held prisoner like the citizens of a city under siege, and the surrounding mob ensured that no one could escape by hook or by crook. It was anticipated that many, pressed by famine, would brave death to avoid witnessing the death of their families by starvation and exhaustion, and would attempt to make a break for it. But their enemies resolutely sealed every exit; those who were caught were killed after horrible tortures; a few of those captured were tied with leather straps around their ankles and dragged through the public places and along the streets and trampled on by the crowd, who mutilated and abused their bodies. Their bodies, cut or torn to pieces, were unrecognisable, to such an extent that there was hardly enough left to bury". Which is to say, that the depredations of the Jews had goaded the Greek population of Alexandria beyond endurance, which then exploded in fury.

The Greek population of Alexandria sent a delegation to Rome to prevent the Jews from recovering their equality of civil rights. Their delegation was led by Apion, the sworn enemy of the Judeans, whom Tiberius nicknamed *Cymbalum mundi*, the “carillon of the universe”. Isidorus was also a member of the same delegation, while Philo represented the Jews. The outcome of this struggle between the pagans and the Judeans of Alexandria remained doubtful, but what is certain is that Emperor Caligula, who was to be their arbiter, hated the Jews, surrounded as he was by his counsellors, the Egyptian Helicon and Appelles of Ascalon, both sworn enemies of the Jews.

Caligula caused his statues to be erected in the synagogues of Judea and ordered that all resistance be broken by force of arms. In October 40, the governor of Syria, Petronius, received the order to enter Judea with his legions and to transform the sanctuary of Jerusalem into a pagan temple. But the Emperor was assassinated by the soldiers of his guard in January 41 A.D., at the age of twenty-eight, after four months of his reign, although no one knew who commanded them. His death aroused great relief among the Jews, while at Alexandria, the rumour spread that he had been killed by the Jews of Rome. Like all the princes opposed to domination by Israel, he was considered “insane” by Jewish historians and those who copied from them.

## 13 Claudius

Caligula's successor on the throne of the Caesars was Emperor Claudius, who reigned from 41 to 54 A.D. A priori, he seemed little suited for the job; he was a stutterer and his family considered him incapable of exercising a public function. Claudius, in fact, owed his crown to chance and the intervention of King Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great, whom Caligula had made king of one third of the provinces of Palestine, Galilee in particular. It was Agrippa who, to quell the disorders, caused the arrest of the apostle Peter and the decapitation of James, among Jesus' disciples. Agrippa convinced Claudius to accept the election of the Praetorians and induced the Senate to recognise him. Graetz writes here: "Rome must indeed have fallen quite low for a wicked little prince to have a word in his Senate, and get mixed up in his deliberations and impose a master upon the Empire, in a manner of speaking."

Claudius did not prove ungrateful: he invested Agrippa with consular dignity and made him king of all of Palestine, joining Judea and Samaria to his kingdom. At Alexandria, Claudius re-established the Jews' freedom of worship and cancelled the erection of imperial statues in their places of worship, but he recommended that the Jews cease to demand new privileges and cease to send a distinct ambassador to Rome from that of the Greeks, i.e., a Jewish ambassador in addition to the Alexandrine Greek ambassador. Finally, the Jews were requested to stop the importation of new Jews, foreign Jews, to Alexandria. The edict of 41 A.D. also prohibited the Jews of Alexandria from participating in the athletic competitions presided over by the gymnasiarcs. The right to participate in these games was reserved to Greek citizens.

To top it all, he sentenced Isidorus and Lampon, the two leaders of the anti-Jewish insurrection, to death. The investigation into their case was conducted with much fanfare, on 30 April and 1 May 41 A.D., which proves the importance which the Emperor attributed to the case. The sentence was carried out soon afterwards. It should be noted that Isidorus had aggravated his case when he was interrogated in Rome, together with Apion, to accuse Agrippa. Isidorus enjoyed the support of the Senate, which rendered him no doubt a bit too insolent with regards

to the Emperor: "As for you, you are the miserable abortion of the Jewess Salome..."

In the two large Empires of the time, the Roman Empire and the Parthian Empire, the Jews were everywhere, having infested all the major cities of the Mediterranean basin. Rejected by one country, they simply went elsewhere. We are able to form an idea of the immense Jewish population of the time simply by remembering that Egypt alone, from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of Ethiopia, had nearly a million Jews. At Rome, the Jewish population, expelled by Tiberius, soon regrouped, and became so numerous and such a nuisance that Emperor Claudius, although favourable to the Jews, resolved to expel them. Suetonius summarily reports: "Since the Jews were constantly rebelling, he expelled them from Rome, at the instigation of a certain Chrestos". At the time, in fact, the distinction between Jew and Christian was still very tenuous.

Claudius' intentions were, apparently, not favourably interpreted by the Jews. The Acts of the Apostles, in fact, reports that Claudius issued an edict ordering the Jews to leave Rome. But Dio Cassius writes that Claudius did not in fact ban the Jews: "The Jews had once again become too numerous to be expelled from Rome without riots, due to their large numbers. He did not expel them, but he prohibited them from gathering together to live according to the customs of their fathers" (*Histoire romaine*, LX, 6). This is what permitted Heinrich Graetz to write that Claudius "was an idiot doubled by a pedant". Graetz wrote this way because Emperor Claudius, in a letter dated 41 A.D., maintained that the Jews were the "plague of the universe".[19]

14

**The Revolt of 66 A.D.**

At the beginning of Christianity, before the year 70 A.D., according to the most plausible estimates, there were about seven million Jews in the Empire, some two of them in Judea and four and a half million in the diaspora, or a tenth of the population of the Roman Empire, while the Christians represented no more than one hundred to two hundred million souls at the end of the 1st century A.D. Under the Emperor Nero, we find the Jews re-established in the Empire, in full exercise of their religion. Seneca (4 B.C. – 65 A.D.), a Stoic philosopher, complained of their influence.[20] Seneca had been an advisor at the Imperial Court under Caligula before becoming Nero's teacher. He played a role as an advisor to Nero, but was then discredited and forced to commit suicide. Seneca detested the Jews: "This abominable nation has succeeded in spreading its messages all over the world; the defeated are issuing laws to be followed by the victors".[21] As for the Christians, who were very hostile to the Jews, he has nothing to say – neither for nor against.

In 66 A.D., Judea arose against the Romans and insurrection turned into mass confusion. The only available source on this event is Flavius Josephus' book *The Jewish War*. Here, we learn that a familiar of King Agrippa, a Jew named Norus, conducted nightly massacres of Jewish insurgents throughout the city, invading the market of the upper part of the town and adjacent streets, cutting the throats of men, women and children, sacking the houses and pillaging homes and shops. More than 3,600 able-bodied Jews perished on this one day (16 Iyar 66), according to Heinrich Graetz. Florus had prisoners beaten with rods and crucified.

At the news of the struggle of the zealots against the Roman cohorts from Jerusalem, the Greeks and Syrians from Caesaria also fell upon the Jews and there was a massacre; approximately two thousand Judeans are said to have died on this occasion. On Florus' order, those who fled were put in irons and thrown in the galleys like slaves. The inhabitants of Caesaria are said to have cut the throats of twenty thousand Jews "in an hour", according to Flavius Josephus, hardly bothered by the exaggerations.

The Romans also suffered heavy losses: "The horrible massacre of Caesaria inspired the entire population of Judea like an attack of

delirium and excited their hatred of the pagans into a form of insanity", writes Graetz. "As if by tacit agreement, bands were formed everywhere, attacking the pagan population, massacring persons, burning houses, sacking estates. These bloody expeditions led to reprisals on the part of the pagans of Judea and Syria. Many cities, in both Judea and Syria, were separated into two camps, fighting without letup during the day and spending the night observing each other".

The war between Jews and pagans spread to Alexandria. The Greeks of Alexandria attempted to address themselves to Nero to get the Judeans deprived of the rights solemnly granted them by Claudius. To this end, they gathered in the amphitheatre to appoint an ambassador. The Greeks, Macedonians, and no doubt the Egyptians, the "forgotten men" of the Greek and Roman chroniclers of the time, met in the amphitheatre to discuss the ambassador's delegation which they planned to send to Emperor Nero.

"A few Judeans infiltrated the meeting", writes Graetz, who adds that the crowd, "seized with fury at the sight of them", seized them, and, "calling them spies, dragged three of them through the streets to burn them alive". In truth, the Jews probably arrived at the amphitheatre in force, but found someone to talk to. Other Jews, in fact, came along, armed with torches and threatened to burn the amphitheatre where the Greeks were still assembled. The prefect, Tiberius Alexander, although a nephew to the Jewish philosopher Philo, sent the legions to the Jewish quarter to restore order. He ordered troops, reports Flavius Josephus (who was also a Jew in the service of the Romans), not just to kill the Jews, "but to pillage their property and reduce their homes to ashes".

The Roman soldiers then committed a massacre worse than that committed by the Greeks and Egyptians in August in 38 A.D. "They took no pity on babes in arms, nor the elderly, but killed everyone they found, to the point that the entire district was bespattered with blood: fifty thousand bodies filled the streets", writes Flavius Josephus.

Heinrich Graetz accepts this figure in his account: "The soldiers stormed the rich Delta district, burned the houses and filled the crossroads with blood and bodies. Fifty thousand Judeans perished in the massacre, and the soldier's commander was none other than the nephew of the ardent patriot, the philosopher Philo!" Tiberius Alexander, in fact, was of Jewish origin, hated by the Jews as an apostate.

Between one quarter and one half of the Jewish inhabitants of Alexandria had perished, but it is also possible that Flavius Josephus exaggerated. "Naturally", Graetz writes, "the Judeans revenged



themselves, as much as they could, for these atrocities, against the local Gentiles, who committed reprisals in turn, adding to the racial hatred between the Judeans on the one hand, and the Romans and Greeks on the other hand, and this animosity extended beyond the narrow frontiers of Palestine”.

## 15

### Titus and the Destruction of the Temple

Pacifying Judea required a strong hand, and Emperor Nero sent General Vespasian. During the winter of the year 67 A.D., Vespasian left Greece to visit the theatre of the war. His son Titus supplied him with two legions from Alexandria, the full fury of which was to be felt by the Judeans. At Ptolomais, at the mouth of the Nile delta, the local princes, including King Agrippa and his sister Berenice, came to welcome Vespasian. They paid homage and offered troops to the Roman general, thus testifying to their devotion to Rome. Berenice then initiated an amorous intrigue with Titus which was to last many years, although she was much older than Vespasian's son.

The Romans entered the city of Gamala and killed approximately 4,000 men. Titus crucified the prisoners, sometimes five hundred in a single day, to show the most obstinate of the rebels the fate in store for them. Sometimes they were sent to Jerusalem after cutting their hands off. He gathered an army of 80,000 men, gathered a quantity of siege engines and marched against Jerusalem.

Three "Judean traitors" (Graetz) assisted Titus during this campaign. First, there was King Agrippa, who supplied Titus with troops and who, with his speeches, dissuaded the inhabitants of Jerusalem from resisting the Romans. Tiberius Alexander, who had already ordered the massacre of his fellow Jews at Alexandria, was to continue on to Judea. Titus, not yet an experienced general, required the apostate's assistance and appointed him commander in chief of his guard (*praefectu praetario*). Finally, there was Joseph Matityahu ha-Cohen, better known under the name Flavius Josephus, a young general who had fought the Romans, and who, after having been made prisoner, served Titus as a guide, accompanying him everywhere.

Flavius Josephus is the author of two reference works which we have already cited: *The Jewish War* (75–79), which is the only text we know of regarding the destruction of Jerusalem, and *The Antiquities of the Jews* (93).

In *The Antiquities of the Jews*, Flavius Josephus, who is considered a traitor by his fellow Jews, despite all the evidence, attempts to show that the Jews were well integrated into the Empire, returning to this contention no less than 18 times. He is nonetheless one of the few

authors of antiquity who may be granted the title of historian, by reason of the precision and abundance of his information. A Jew by origin, he was the descendent of a priestly family through his father, and Hasmonean kings through his mother. Like Philo, and Philo's nephew, Tiberius Alexander, he belonged to an aristocratic and Hellenistic social class. For him, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were the victims and prisoners of blood-thirsty extremist "brigands" who led them to their doom.

He never dissimulated his aversion for the zealots, who were in his view a gang of lunatics, obsessed by the notion of a final catastrophe. Vespasian and Titus treated him with the greatest respect. During the insurrection in Judea, Flavius Josephus was thus appointed commander and head of the Roman troops on the northern front of Jerusalem.

On the side of the Hebrews, the approach of danger led to a certain understanding amongst the different parties, and a number of volunteers appeared from Judea and foreign territories to defend the city. The zealots, the most radical of Jewish resistance members, did not hesitate to lash out at the elite of the Judeans who preferred to collaborate with Roman power. When Titus arrived before the walls of the city, in March of 69 A.D., these "brigands", using Josephus' expression, began pillaging and murdering, to liquidate the most eminent personalities through a reign of terror.

The zealot camp was itself divided into several rival factions. There was John of Giscala, at the head of ten thousand men; Simon Bar Giora, with two thousand men; and Eleazar Bar Simon, with 2,400 men. They were soon all killing each other, and – according to Josephus – "people had begun to pray for the arrival of the Romans".

During the month of May, Titus finally began the assault. He took the third wall, then the second, then the upper town. During all this time, the zealots, feeling their defeat approaching, redoubled their cruelty. The Jewish warriors, exhausted by so many struggles and by famine, could no longer repel the Roman assaults. The Romans scaled the walls, took the towers and threw themselves into the upper town, massacring the inhabitants.

There remained only the Temple to conquer. The last fanatics had barricaded themselves inside and the Romans wondered whether they should destroy it.

While a few Roman officers expressed the opinion that they should raze the focus point of the insurrection, Titus, on the contrary, pronounced himself resolutely in favour of saving the building, no doubt the result of the influence acquired over him by Princess Berenice. It was therefore decided to take control of the building

without destroying it. The next day, the 9th of Ab (fateful day of the Jewish calendar), the Judeans attempted a new sortie but were compelled to withdraw, overwhelmed by their adversaries.

On 29 August 70 A.D., after a renewed attempt at escape, the Temple was finally set on fire. A Roman seized a burning brand and, raising himself upon the shoulders of a companion, threw the torch through a window into the interior of the edifice. The wood of the galleries caught fire, and spread rapidly. Titus ran up with his soldiers and immediately ordered the extinction of the fire, but no one listened to him. The Roman soldiers threw themselves inside in a fury, massacring all those who had not succeeded in fleeing. Titus himself, impelled by curiosity, penetrated as far as the Holy of Holies, until he was compelled to withdraw by the smoke. The Temple then burned completely, except for the foundations and some debris left over from the western wall. After the fire, Titus ordered that all the remaining structures should be burnt as well. The walls of the city were entirely razed, with the exception of the three towers Hippicos, Marianne and Phasaël, which Titus reserved as a monument to his memorable victory. The last vestiges of the political independence of Judea were thus buried under the ruins of Jerusalem.

According to Josephus, 115,800 bodies were removed through the city gate under guard by Titus. In total, he writes, one million one hundred thousand persons perished during the siege, but this figure is obviously excessive, since this would be half the inhabitants of Judea. The population of Jerusalem, increased by bands of zealots, must have amounted to 40 or 50,000 souls, and the number of deaths no doubt amounted to 20 or 25,000.[22]

Here, Graetz writes: "This siege, it is said, costs the lives of more than a million people. If we add those who fell in Galilee and the cities of the interior, we may conclude that the population of Judeans in Palestine was largely annihilated".

Judaism had lost its sacerdotal institutions, its capital city, its centre of gravity. The contributions to the Temple were thereafter to be sent directly to the Roman treasury. The annual fee of two drachmas, which the Jews were accustomed to send to the Temple of Jerusalem, would thenceforth be sent to the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter. This tax – the *Fiscus Judaicus* – was paid into the Emperor's personal cash box.

It was thus that what the Jews refer to as the *Third Captivity* began, the period of the *Roman Exile* (*Galut Edom*). Most of the young people were scattered among the provinces to gamble with their lives in the circuses. The youngest and the women were sold at auction to slave merchants at risible prices in view of their great numbers.

Titus held court at Caesarea, where King Agrippa resided. There he organised combats between wild beasts and prisoners. The ferocious beasts were led into a circus and the Judean prisoners were forced to fight with them until they were torn to pieces. Sometimes the spectacle changed: the prisoners were to fight and kill each other. It was thus that, on 24 October, according to Graetz, 2,500 young noblemen perished “on the occasion of Titus’ brother’s birthday, the ignoble Domitian.”

Numerous victims expired under the eyes of Titus and Berenice. At Beryle, on his father’s birthday, 17 November, Titus deployed the greatest prodigality, and again it was the Judeans who perished in the arena. In all the cities of Syria, Titus provided the inhabitants of the Empire with the revivifying spectacle of Jewish martyrdom. The Jews of the Roman Empire – particularly those of Syria, Asia Minor, Alexandria and Rome – barely escaped the fate of their Palestinian brothers. “As a result of the Judeo-Roman war”, writes Graetz, “the pagan population was seething with anger against the sons of Jacob; their hatred went as far as to inspire a veritable fury, and they did not even bother to conceal the fact that the extermination of the Jewish race was the most ardent of their wishes”.

It was once again Berenice who inspired Titus to grant clemency to his fellow Jews. When Titus approached Antioch, the population came out to greet him and to request that he expel the Judeans from the city. But Titus disagreed, and never even withdrew their civil rights and privileges. The inhabitants of Alexandria, as well, begged in vain to deprive the Jews of their city of their civil rights.

During this whole time, at Rome, the civil war was raging. Nero committed suicide in 69 A.D., and Emperor Galba was assassinated in the midst of the Forum. Otho succeeded him on the throne, but was confronted with the rival pretensions of Vitellius, a military candidate chosen by the legions from Germany. After a military defeat, Otho committed suicide in turn. His reign only lasted a few months.

Titus’ entry into Rome was accompanied by the honours of the triumph, the most extravagant seen in Rome for many years, which attests, despite its troubles, to the immense joy caused by the Roman victory over Judea. For several years, gold, silver and copper medals were struck in memory of this glorious event. These medallions represented Judea with the features of a woman seated sadly underneath a palm tree or standing, her hands chained, in the attitude of desperation. They bore the legend: *Judaea devicta* or *Judaea capta*. Nevertheless, neither Vespasian nor Titus wished to take the nickname *Judaicus*, which would have recalled their victory – as the name had a displeasing connotation at the time.

Flavius Josephus accompanied Titus to Rome during his triumph. Vespasian installed Josephus in a palace of his own, granted him the title of Roman citizen and gave him many rich estates in Judea. Josephus, who enjoyed the favours of the Flavian dynasty, decided at that time to adopt the family name of his protectors: Flavius Josephus. In 95 A.D., he nevertheless published a work entitled *Against Apion*, in which he refuted the accusations directed against Judaism, and the book earned him the recognition of his fellow Jews.

Josephus' political choices were in sum not highly exceptional. Until 73 A.D., three years after the apocalyptic fall of Jerusalem, Jewish assassins having escaped from Palestine arrived in Egypt and attempted to cause trouble, while the Jews of the upper bourgeoisie led the repression. 600 "brigands" were arrested; the others were pursued into Upper Egypt and handed over to the Romans, who tortured them and then put them to death.

The same year, the Jewish resistance rose again at Massada, in Judea. A few hundred zealots as well as their families had taken refuge in this old fortress, besieged by Roman forces. Their leader, Eleazar, exhorted them to commit suicide rather than fall into the hands of their enemies. On the 1st day of Passover of the year 73 A.D., inspired by Eleazar's words, the Jews cut the throats of their wives and children before committing suicide. A silence of death reigned over Massada when the Romans succeeded in entering: there were (according to legend) only two wives and five children still alive, in the midst of 960 victims.

Berenice joined Titus at Rome, in his palace, as if he were already her husband. He had promised to marry her in 75 A.D., and Titus seems to have considered it seriously enough. But the Romans hated the Judeans too much to permit such a marriage. The scandal was immense and in 78 A.D., Titus was resigned to sending her away.

Little was lacking for the Jewish princess to become Roman Empress. But she returned to her brother, in Palestine. She nevertheless kept her influence and intervened on several occasions in favour of her fellow Jews. In 79 A.D., Titus succeeded his father Vespasian, but he died after two years of his reign, in September 81 A.D., never having seen his former mistress again.

## 16

### Domitian and the *Fiscus Judaicus*

Domitian, Titus' brother, reigned from 81 to 96 A.D., and was able to satisfy the Jewish community. In *Life of the Twelve Caesars*, Suetonius describes him this way: "Domitian was tall, had a modest, blushing face, big eyes, but rather poor eyesight; in addition, he was handsome, well-proportioned, particularly in his youth".

Immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, as we have seen, Titus forced the Jews to pay him the two drachmas which they had formerly paid their Temple; to evade the *Fiscus Judaicus*, explains Graetz, "numerous Judeans denied their Jewish origins".

But Domitian well understood that the laws of Rome were to be respected. "The greedy and cruel Domitian", as Graetz describes him, caused the tax to be collected with great strictness, ordering an audit of those who declared that they did not belong to the Jewish community. The historian Suetonius recalls that he had seen a 90-year-old man undergo a public inspection because the tax collectors wished to know whether he was circumcised and liable to the Jewish tax.[23]

"Necessity rendered the Jews inventive, and many of them employed a ruse to evade the Jewish tax", writes Graetz. "They arranged themselves in such a manner as to render the sign of the alliance unrecognisable on their bodies".

## 17 Trajan

The Roman Empire underwent its greatest period of expansion under the reign of Trajan (98–117). Republican Rome, more than Imperial Rome, had never experienced such brilliant victories. The campaigns of this emperor were nothing but a series of triumphs. When he took winter quarters at Antiochus to receive homage from the defeated (winter of 115–116), Trajan might well have considered the war in the East to be over. During the following spring, he set off on campaign once again to break the last enemy resistance and make these landscapes into the boulevard of India, which he dreamed of conquering. But the triumphant victor was troubled in his joy by the defection of the peoples whom he had subjugated between the Tigris and the Euphrates. This defection had been prepared by the Judeans, who had organised a revolt in a large part of the Roman Empire. The Judeans of Babylon, like those of Egypt, Cyrenaica (the Libyan coast) and the Island of Cyprus, had conceived the plan of shaking off the Roman yoke by force of arms.

“This animosity between all the Judeans causes one to suppose that they followed a premeditated plan”, writes Heinrich Graetz. A pseudo-Messiah named Andreas excited the fanaticism of the Jews. Judea itself rose in revolt, and organised the insurrection in the adjacent territories, on the Euphrates and in Egypt (fall of 116 and winter of 117). “The Temple will soon be rebuilt”, the Jews repeated, animated by a prophetic faith which also assured them of their universal triumph.

In Egypt, the revolt lasted three years, from 115 to 117. There are no sources available on the preparations and various stages of this struggle; only the outcome is known. The leaders of the insurrection seemed to have been Julian Alexander and Pappos. The rebels first attacked the neighbours of their city, and massacred the Greeks and Romans. Emboldened by success, they formed bands and attacked the Roman legions led by General Lupus. In the first encounter, the Judeans triumphed despite Roman strategic skill and Lupus was compelled to withdraw. This first battle was accompanied by frightful massacres; both victors and vanquished delivered themselves up to acts of barbarism and savage cruelty, which were explicable only by an implacable racial hatred, long cooped up and exploding in a fury which could only be sated with blood.



The pagans who fled following the defeat entered Alexandria, where all the Jewish inhabitants capable of bearing arms had joined the rebels. The pagans seized the Judeans whom they found there and tortured them to death. The Jewish army conducted reprisals; the Jews invaded Egypt, took the armed fortress of Alexandria, took all the inhabitants prisoner and inflicted torture for its own sake. The pagan population of the city sought refuge and attempted to reach the port. The Judeans set out in pursuit and reached them near the ships. There was a terrible struggle. Appius, then prosecuting attorney in Egypt, recalls that he only escaped massacre by chance, stating that the Jews “devoured the flesh of Greek and Roman prisoners, smearing themselves with their blood and tearing off their skin to make rough garments”. Graetz hurries to add here: “These are certainly pure calumnies”.

Alexandria had been seriously harmed by the Jews. In their fury, the Jews destroyed numerous monuments of the city, including that of Nemesum, temple of the Greek goddess Nemesis, protectress of armies and races, and goddess of vengeance. The Judeans are said to have compelled the vanquished to descend into the arena to fight wild beasts or kill each other. These were in reprisal for the bloody games in which Jewish prisoners had been forced to take part, on the order of Vespasian and Titus.

“It was reported”, writes Graetz, “that in Cyrenaica the Jews killed 200,000 Greeks and Romans and depopulated Libya, that is, the region which extends along the east coast of Egypt, that a few years later it was necessary to send new colonists”.

On the Island of Cyprus, where a numerous Jewish population remained, having built several synagogues, the revolt was led by a certain Artemion, the insurgents destroyed Salamis, capital of the island of Cyprus, and killed 240,000 Greeks.

Graetz relies here on a version from Dio Cassius (150–235), the author of a *Roman History* in 24 volumes: “At Cyrene, the Jews rose up under the leadership of a certain Andreas, massacring Greeks and Romans without distinction. Some of them ate the flesh of their victims, others made belts out of their bleeding entrails, others covered themselves with their skin. Many of their victims were sawn in half; others were delivered to wild beasts or forced to participate in gladiatorial contests; thus they killed 220,000 individuals, committing similar atrocities in Egypt and Cyprus under the leadership of a certain Artemon”.[24]

Trajan, who was in Babylonia at the time, sent a powerful army against the Judeans. He placed one of his principal generals, Martius

Turbo, at the head of large forces, on both sea and land, and ordered them to combat the Judeans in Egypt, Cyrenaica, and on the Island of Cyprus. In the region of the Euphrates, where the Jews exhibited a provocative attitude, despite the proximity of the Emperor and a large army, Trajan entrusted the command of the groups to his favourite general Lusius Quietus, whom he had already appointed his successor.

At Alexandria, Martius Turbo conceived the plan of harassing the Jews without letup in minor skirmishes, and it was only after a long and bitter struggle that the Jews laid down their arms. Turbo was inexorable with the vanquished. The legions surrounded the prisoners and cut them in pieces, raped the women, and those who resisted were killed. The Jews remaining alive were assigned for the first time to live in an enclosure, to preserve the rest of the population from their dangerous hysteria.

Turbo then committed his troops against the island of Cyprus. We do not know the details of this war, but it is certain that the Jews of the island were exterminated to the last man. They no doubt rendered themselves guilty of the worst atrocities, since, writes Graetz, "hatred of the Jewish race was hereditary in the island, to the point that the Cypriots passed a law prohibiting the Jews from setting foot on the island, even in the event of shipwreck".

Trajan was motivated by such a desire for vengeance against the Jews that, in Babylonia, he ordered Quietus to exterminate the Judeans to the last man, woman or child. The details of the war of extermination waged by Lusius Quietus are not known. We only know that thousands of Judeans had their throats cut and the cities of Nisibe and Edessa were completely ruined. The houses, streets and roads were piled high with bodies. Trajan, to reward Quietus for the considerable role which he had played in the war, appointed him governor of Palestine and invested him with very extensive powers to enable him to stamp out any germ of revolt.

Because they believed that the time had come to dominate all nations, Andreas and Artemion incited their fellow Jews to commit these massacres.[25] It is this spirit of domination which has always rendered them odious to all peoples.[26]

The famous historian Tacitus (55–120), born in Gallia Narbonensis (perhaps at Vaison-la-Romaine), was a familiar of the Emperor Trajan at the beginning of his reign. He then retired from politics to dedicate himself to his literary work. His *Histories* were published between 104 and 109, and his *Annals*, in approximately 110 or 115. It is clear from his writings that the Jews did not enjoy great consideration in Rome:

"Moses", writes Tacitus, "to ensure his authority over his nation in

the future, instituted rites never before known and contrary to those of all other mortals. Among Jews, what is profane among us, is sacred to them, and inversely, everything that is abominable among us is permitted among them... They have an obstinate attachment to each other, an active commiseration which contrasts with the implacable hatred which they bear to the rest of humanity. They never eat, they never sleep, with strangers, and this race, although much inclined to debauchery, abstain from all commerce with foreign women” (*Histories*, V, 1). Tacitus writes again on this subject: “No people has ever been hated as vehemently by others as the Jewish people, none in turn ever inspired other peoples with such repugnance, and none has ever attracted as much implacable and well-justified hatred.”[27]

## 18

### **Hadrian and the Siege of Bethar**

Hadrian succeeded Trajan. At the beginning of his reign, he wished to establish cordial relations with the Jews, to avoid a new war. He thought that the Jews might fight on his side if the Parthians invaded Roman territory. Hadrian also authorised the Jews to rebuild the Temple at its former location and to rebuild Jerusalem from its ruins. The Judeans, who had waited fifty years to possess a religious centre once again, were filled with joy. The work of rebuilding the Temple progressed rapidly, and the Senate decided to perpetuate the memory of the event by striking various medallions, representing the Emperor in a toga, with Judea before him on its knees, while he attempted to raise them from this humble posture. But the good relations between Hadrian and the Judaic nation only lasted ten years. Hadrian had in fact conceived the project of raising Jerusalem from its ruins, but only for the purpose of transforming it into a pagan city, which led to a new revolt.

The insurrection, led by Simon Bar Kochba, in 132, was the last great revolt of the Jews under the Empire. Bar Kochba, "the Son of the Star", described himself as the Messiah, and he was recognised as such by the greatest rabbi of his time, Akiva ben Joseph. The Romans retreated at first, abandoning one fortress after another to the Jews. At the end of a year (132–133), 50 fortresses and 985 open cities and villages were in the hands of the Jews, who conquered all of Judea, Samaria and Galilee from the Romans.

The new state organized by Bar Kochba ("ch" as in "chutzpah") had already enjoyed nearly two years of existence (summer of 132–134). The Judeans supported themselves essentially on the country extending along the Mediterranean, with Bethar at the centre. Hadrian had to recall his ablest general, Julius Severus, from Britain to be sent against the Judeans. Julius Severus attacked the various enemy military units and crushed them with cavalry. To strike terror into the hearts of the Jews, he put all prisoners to death. The siege of Bethar, which lasted nearly a year, was the final act of this war which had lasted three and a half years.

The conquerors committed horrible massacres in Bethar. "It is said", writes Graetz, "that their horses waded in blood up to their

nostrils, that a river of blood extended from the city to the sea, 4 miles away, and was powerful enough to carry large rocks. 300 children's skulls were found broken against a rock".[28] According to Jewish tradition, Bethar fell on the 9th day of the month of Av in the year 135, which corresponds – as if by chance – with the date of the anniversary of the destruction of the two temples (486 B.C. – 70 A.D.) and which was also – in the imagination of the Jews – to be the date of their expulsion from Spain in 1492.

The reported figure of the numbers of victims at Bar Kochba was so high that it is hardly possible for them to be true. It is however unanimously confirmed by Jewish and Greek historians. After three years of war, the losses in human life were unheard of: half a million deaths in combat, innumerable deaths from malnutrition, plus those killed by fire, according to Dio Cassius.[29]

The Romans did not admit their losses, which were very large, and the Senate refused to grant Hadrian the honours of the triumph, since he had remained far from the field of battle. These honours were granted to his general Julius Severus. Hadrian nevertheless caused a commemorative medallion to be struck, for distribution to the soldiers as a token of gratitude for their services rendered during this campaign. This medallion bore the legend *Exercutis judaicus* – Honour to the Conquerors of the Jews.

The day after the war of Bar Kochba, thousands of Jewish prisoners were sold as slaves at knock-down prices on the markets of Hebron and Gaza. The Judeans who remained in their country hid in caves to escape Roman soldiers. Hadrian thought that the Jews were not yet sufficiently humbled, and devised a plan to obliterate their religion. He ordered Tineius Rufus to carry out the plan, while Severus returned to Britain.

Titus had left a few houses standing in Jerusalem, and unfortunates came to build shacks in the midst of these ruins which were so dear to them. But Rufus ordered the ground surrounding the city of Jerusalem – including the entire former site of the Temple – ploughed up. Jerusalem was thus entirely razed to the ground. Hadrian was finally able to realize his plan of transforming the holy city of the Jews into a pagan city. At the place of the ancient city, a Roman city, Aelia Capitolina, was built, named after the Emperor Aelius Adrien and Jupiter Capitolinus. In all his published acts, Jerusalem was thenceforth referred to as Aelius, and the ancient name of Jerusalem fell into oblivion. Judea itself was henceforth called Palestine. Temples of Bacchus, Venus, and Serapis were erected. The temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the goddess protectress of Rome, was erected upon the former

location of the Jewish Temple. Statues to other Roman, Greek and Phoenician divinities ornamented the streets. A theatre, public baths and various buildings were erected. Hadrian established veterans, Phoenicians and Syrians, in the city. As for the Jews (but not Christians of Jewish origin), they were prohibited from dwelling there, under pain of death. They were only permitted to enter the city one day a year, at the time of the great fair, and again, upon payment of entry duties. They even sculpted a pig on the main door, in the idea of causing true Israelites to recoil at this detested emblem. The Jews tolerated in the surrounding areas, at Tiberias, Capharnaum, and Nazareth, threw looks of envy and regret on this soil which had formerly been theirs.

Hadrian followed the policies of Antiochus Epiphanes. He published a decree, in Palestine, prohibiting circumcision under pain of the severest penalties, as well as the observation of the Sabbath and the study of the Law. But, contrary to Greek law, Roman law did not require the Jews to worship Roman divinities.

Observance of the slightest Jewish religious practice was very severely punished, so much so that the reading of the Talmud was performed on rooftops, far from the inquiring eyes of anti-Jewish inquisitors. Violators were severely punished. Heinrich Graetz provides the details as follows: "Red-hot iron balls were placed under the armpits of the condemned men, pointed reeds were forced underneath their fingernails, while the torso of those condemned to be burnt to death was wrapped in wet wool, to prolong their agony".

The Judeans attempted to deceive the vigilance of the Roman authorities and informers. Among the latter, some were former Jews who had preferred to leave the sect. The apostasy of Elisha ben Abuya, an eminent scholar in the faith, had disastrous consequences for the Jews. Elisha ben Abuya thus learned from the Roman authorities to recognise Jewish practices and Roman spies were able to sniff out the progress of a prohibited ceremony from far away. The noise of a windmill told them, for example, of the preparation of the powder required for the healing of a newly circumcised child; illuminations indicated the celebration of a marriage. These clues enabled spies to surprise the Jews and denounce them to the courts.

Elisha ben Abuya was qualified by the Jews with the name Akher (other), as if his conversion had made him another man. According to Elie Wiesel, Abuya is "the symbol of apostasy and treason... he had his pockets full of anti-Jewish pamphlets... Worse: he began to militate for forced assimilation... He sympathised with the occupant, became a collaborator and finally an accomplice of the Roman army." This rabbi Elisha "was Akher – he represented the dark forces among the Jews,

the forces of Evil among men... First he was called Rabbi Elisha, then Elisha ben Abuya, then Abuya, and finally Akher".[30]

Rabbi Akiba, the leader of the Judeans, was treated with the greatest strictness by Rufus, the governor of the province. After having kept him imprisoned in a dungeon for a long time, Rufus delivered him up to the hands of the executioner. Before dying, he was subjected to the most atrocious tortures. Graetz tells us that the executioner then tore off his skin with iron hooks.

The death of Hadrian, which occurred three years after the fall of Bethar, during the summer of 138, produced a perceptible improvement in the situation of the Jews. The Emperor had become, as Antiochus Epiphanes, the personification of hatred against "the Jewish race" (Graetz). The Judeans and the Samaritans never pronounced his name without following it with the following formalised curse: "May God reduce his bones to powder!"

The separation between Jews and Christians became definitive in Hadrian's time. The Christians were indifferent to the fate of the Jews even in the year 70. Under Hadrian, as a result of the acts of violence and persecutions committed against them by the Jews, they resolutely sided with the Romans.

## 19

### The Severus Dynasty

Emperor Septimus Severus, who reigned between 193 and 211, inaugurated a new era. Septimus Severus was born in Tripolitania, on the coast of contemporary Libya. On the side of his mother, he descended from Italian immigrants married to natives, probably of Libyan origin. Through his father, he came from a Libyco-Punic family, and the Punic religion. The historian Dio Cassius describes him as a small man, thin, very lively and taciturn. He had a strong accent which caused him to be teased by his contemporaries. For the first time, the Empire was in the hands of a provincial – Romanised, of course, but the offspring of a Berber family, who retained certain African attachments. The advent of this African prince was referred to as “Hannibal’s revenge”.

This avaricious prince was thoroughly corrupted by Jewish gold. Septimus Severus promulgated laws which assimilated the Jews to Roman citizens, and they were admitted to the highest public offices. These were the first positive provisions which fixed their state within the Roman Empire, and they were respected throughout the lifetime of the pagan Empire. From persecuted, the Jews became persecutors. In Palestine and elsewhere, they exercised their vengeance against those of their compatriots who embraced Christianity.[31]

His son Caracalla, who succeeded him and reigned from 211 to 217, was of Berber origin on his father’s side, and Syrian on his mother’s. He began his career by assassinating his brother Geta with a sword blow to the throat, while the latter sought safety in his mother’s arms. He then committed a series of systematic murders (20,000 according to Dio Cassius), targeting Geta’s friends, relations and partisans, or even possible competitors. Caracalla was always obviously under the influence of the Jews, when in 212, he granted the rights of citizenship to all inhabitants of the Roman Empire. This law, which contributed in large part to Roman decadence, is, in fact, of typically Jewish inspiration. The Jews in fact have systematically encouraged immigration and the dissolution of the national identity wherever they have ever lived.[32] Caracalla, who has hated by the Romans, was assassinated in April 217 during a military campaign against the Parthians in the East.



His nephew, Heliogabalus, who reigned from 218 to 222, was born in Syria. Heliogabalus wished to be a strict follower of the practices of Baal, the god of the sun, of whom he declared himself the preacher. He had himself circumcised and abstained from eating pork. He attempted to introduce Jewish, Samaritan and Christian practices publicly into Rome, naturally subordinating them to Baal. A rumour had it that he had converted to Judaism.

Heliogabalus left the reins of government to his grand-mother and his Syrian mother. This female empowerment, a superstition of the Emperor, his childish caprices, his unconsidered expenditure, and his homosexual marriages horrified the old Romans and precipitated his downfall. In July 221, his grand-mother, with a presentiment that her grand-son's vices would ruin him, her and her family, persuaded him to adopt his cousin, Alexius Bassanius, under the name of Severus Alexander, and to associate him with authority under the title of Caesar. This severe, astute, virtuous, patient and wise young man, had succeeded in making himself popular with the only force that really counted in the Empire: the army. Thus, when the soldiers wished Heliogabalus to get rid of his cousin and associate, they began to murmur against him. Heliogabalus wished to have the ringleaders arrested but a furious mob invaded the Imperial palace and massacred the Emperor. His body was dragged through the streets of Rome, then the populace attempted to throw the body in the sewers, but, since the pipes were too narrow, the imperial cadaver was finally thrown into the Tiber, on 11 March 222.

The new Emperor, Severus Alexander (222–235), also held Judaism in high esteem. The Judeans even saw in him the Messiah (Graetz). For their part, the people of Antioch and Alexandria had already given him the title of Head of the Synagogue (archisynagogus). In 234, he visited Mayence to repel the Germans, in particular, the Alemanni, but he hesitated to fight and preferred to purchase peace. He was assassinated in his tent and the army proclaimed one of their own number, Maximinus, the new Emperor. This marked the beginning of a period of military anarchy which was to last until the reigns of Aurelian (270–275) and Diocletian (284–305). The Severus dynasty had ended as it began: with a coup d'état.

## 20

### The Christian Emperors

Constantine, who reigned from 306 until 337, was the first Roman Emperor to convert to Christianity. By the edict of Milan in 313, he put an end to an era of persecution and assisted the Church in becoming established and in establishing the freedom of religion. He made grants in money and lands, subsidised the construction of large basilicas and often used Christian symbols on his coins. Constantine thus took measures to protect the Christians against the fury and intolerance of the Jews. On 18 October 315, he prohibited Jews from persecuting their fellow Jews who had converted to Christianity, under pain of death by burning at the stake. On 7 March 321, he made Sunday an obligatory holiday, except for when field work was required. Constantine was not unaware that this deprived the Jews of one day's work per week, since their day of rest was on Saturday. The Emperor prohibited the Jews from encouraging apostasy on the part of Christians, and decided that all slaves who had been circumcised by the Jews would be freed.[33]

His son Constance II, who reigned until 361, promulgated a law according to which the circumcision of the slave of a Jew would result, not only in the automatic liberation of the slave, but also the confiscation of all the goods of the slave's owner, plus the death penalty. On the other hand, it was decided that a Christian who married a Jewish woman would forfeit all his property to the Imperial treasury; a Christian woman from the Imperial *fabricae* who married a Jew would be sent away and all her husband's goods would be forfeit.

In 335, from Constantinople, the new Imperial capital, Constance granted his cousin Julian full powers in Gaul to combat the incursions of the Alemanni. In 361, upon his death, Julian became master of the Empire. His reign, which lasted two years (from November 361 to 363), was a parenthesis during the course of which Julian attempted to restore paganism. Julian re-opened the temples and prohibited Christians from teaching classical letters. He published an essay, *Against the Galileans*, in which he described the Christians as uncultivated and crude people.

On the other hand, the Jews were no longer subject to special legislation. Julian called the patriarch Hillel his "true friend". The Emperor Julian, in fact, "felt a very keen sympathy for the Jews", writes the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz. A letter, signed by the

Emperor, was sent to all the Jewish communities of the Roman Empire to announce the provisions taken in favour of the restoration of the Temple of Jerusalem. This document, signed at Antioch, is dated from the fall of 362.

Julian didn't just leave it at a promise: he took all steps to raise the temple from its ruins. He attached great importance to the success of this enterprise and was never discouraged by the expense, no matter how high. Numerous workers were sent to Jerusalem to clear away three centuries of ruins from the location where the temple had stood, and construction materials were transported there in considerable quantities.

Julian "the Apostate" therefore found his most loyal allies among the Jews in his war on the Christians. The Jews, writes Mgr Delassus, "hastened to benefit from the Emperor's edicts to assuage their traditional hatreds. In Asia, they were seen burning Christian basilicas with impunity".[34]

Unfortunately for the Jews, Julian failed in his expedition against the Persians and was killed by an arrow, fired at him (according to legend) by a Christian in his own army. The Jews long felt the happy effects of his reign. Thus the restrictive measures issued against them by Constantine and Constance, which Julian had abolished, were no longer applied.

An assembly of high functionaries and officials deliberated and chose as Emperor Valentinian I, who reigned starting in 364. He was the son of an officer of Pannonian origin (present-day Croatia), and reigned over the western part of the Empire. He ordered respect for the religious beliefs of all his subjects. He delivered Gaul from the Alemanni, rebuilt the fortifications of the Rhine and reinforced the army in Gaul. His great general Theodosius the Elder, took over the province of Britain, invaded by barbarians from Scotland and Ireland.

Valentinian entrusted the East to his brother Valens, who reigned at Constantinople. Valens belonged to the Arian sect of Christianity – according to which the divinity of God is superior to that of His Son, who became Man – and was the butt of attacks from the Catholic party. He thus protected the Jews and granted them numerous proofs of his esteem. It was under his reign that the Council of Laodicea was held (364). He was enjoined by the Christians to avoid leisure on the Sabbath (canon 29), to avoid accepting unleavened bread from the Jews, nor take part in their festivals and sacrileges (canons 37 and 38).[35]

Saint Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, an illustrious Father of the Church who lived at that time, did not confine himself to theological

debate alone, and noted that the Jews had rather peculiar customs, writing that “the Jews were not the People of God, but the chiefs of Sodom and Gomorrah”.[36]

In the Balkans, Valens had to fight the Visigoths and Ostrogoths. He met his end during the battle of Andrianople, on 9 August 378, presaging the general invasion of the Empire by the Germanic tribes.

In 367, at Amiens, Valentinian, seriously ill, proclaimed his son Gratian, then aged 8, Emperor. Gratian reigned from 375 to 383, proved himself highly benevolent towards Pope Damasus I; he was also the first Emperor to refuse to bear the title of Pontifex Maximus (sovereign pontiff) of the Roman religion, which was later granted to the bishop of Rome.

In January 379, Gratian proclaimed that Theodosius, a native of Galicia and son of the great general Theodosius the Elder, should be the next Emperor, granting him authority over the eastern part of the Empire. In 380, with Gratian, he stopped the Goths in Epirus and Dalmatia. He installed a part of the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and installed himself at Constantinople, while a usurper, Magnus Maximus, took power in the West.

Emperor Theodosius (379–395) elevated Christianity to the rank of the sole official and compulsory religion. Christianity became the religion of the State by virtue of the Edict of Thessalonica of 28 February 380. In 381, Arianism was condemned as a heresy by the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. Theodosius also promulgated laws against the Jews, speaking of a “bestial sect” (*feralis secta*). “Theodosius declares that being Jewish is a desperate, incurable malady”.[37]

Despite the exhortations of Ambrose of Milan and other members of the Catholic clergy, Theodosius the Great prohibited civil functionaries from interfering with the religious affairs of the Jews. Christians who molested them were severely punished. But imperial orders were powerless to change the spirit of the times. Besides, before Theodosius’s reign, there were already a certain number of restrictive laws in effect against the Jews, and these laws remained in effect.

## 21

### The Fathers of the Church

Saint Ambrose (340–394), bishop of Milan and famous Father of the Church, was Theodosius' contemporary. Learning that the Emperor Theodosius had sentenced a bishop from Callinicus, in northern Mesopotamia, to rebuild a synagogue which he had first set fire to, he became indignant and wrote to the Emperor. While recognising that the bishop had taken his zeal to an extreme and should be reprimanded, he protested in such keen terms that the Emperor felt himself obliged to revise his decision.[38]

Saint Ambrose moreover declared that the Synagogue “was a house of impiety and a receptacle of sick people”. When, as the result of the actions of the Israelites, the Christian mobs could no longer restrain their anger and set fire to a synagogue in Rome, he gave his support in these terms:

“I have declared that the synagogue caught fire or at least I ordered these persons to set fire to it. And if anyone objects that I did not personally set fire to the synagogue, I protest that it began to be burnt by the judgement of God”.[39]

Heinrich Graetz writes of him: “Ambrose of Milan outdid Chrysostom in violence and odious calumnies against the Jews. He called the usurper ‘Maximus the Judean’, for ordering the Roman Senate to cause a synagogue in Rome burnt by the Christians to be rebuilt at the city’s expense”.

Saint Ambrose of Milan is recognised by the Church as a model worthy of imitation for bishops, and as one of the most illustrious examples of Christian charity. “This shows that one must not use charity to protect the forces of evil”, writes Maurice Pinay, correctly.

At this time, the Jews could no longer persecute the Christians as they had done previously. The great theologian Tertullian, Father of the Church and prolific author, left a testimony regarding the synagogue as the origin of Jewish persecutions of Christians. Tertullian was born at Carthage between 150 and 160 to a centurion father in the Roman army and introduced Christian literature in the Latin language in the first half of the 3rd century. In his treatise *Adversos Judaeos*, he clearly accuses the Jews of persecuting Christians. In *Escopiase*, he states that “the synagogues are the points whence issue the persecutions against the

Christians”, and in *Ad Nationem*, he writes again: “It is the Jews who issue calumnies against the Christians”.[40]

As Saint Ambrose reports, the Jews reduced to ashes a large quantity of churches during the reign of Julian the Apostate, including the basilica of Alexandria and no one demanded that anyone crack down on them.

200 years later, Saint Gregory of Nyssa, another illustrious personage, who was the theological head of the Council of Constantinople in 381, also accused the Jews, describing them as follows:

“Murderers of the Lord, killers of the prophets, enemies of God... they despise the laws. They are the advocates of the Devil, a race of vipers, of informers, of slanderers, the yeast of the Pharisees, an assembly of demons, of perverse men, of stoners, of enemies of honesty”.[41]

The most vehement of the Christian anti-Judaists at that time was Saint John Chrysostom (349–407), the most revered of the Fathers of the Eastern Church. He was born at Antioch and was the bishop of Constantinople. His eloquence was at the origin of the name Chrysostom, “mouth of gold”.

At Antioch, he showed the Jews occupying the foremost commercial positions of the city, causing all business to cease whenever they celebrated their festivals. He consecrated no fewer than eight homilies warning Christians against their seductions.[42]

Chrysostom again denounced the Jews as “a nation of assassins”, “lustful, rapacious, voracious and perfidious thieves”, stating that they would continue to be punished for their crimes until the end of the world.[43] The Jews are “child-killers... guilty of ten thousand horrors”. He thundered: “The synagogue is not a meeting place for criminals and innkeepers like the house of the devil, it is something more... The synagogue is worse than a brothel. It is the cave of no-goods and a hide-out for wild beasts”.

Saint John Chrysostom noted, even at this time, the inclination of certain Jews towards pimping: “Their synagogues”, he said, “are nothing but places of debauchery where impure women go”.[44] Already, the anti-Semites sensed that Judaism is an illness: “One must be beware of the Jewish disease”, said Chrysostom.

Saint Jerome (340–420), born in a family of Roman aristocrats living in present-day Croatia, had a perfect upbringing at Rome, where he converted to Christianity at age twenty-five. He was secretary to Pope Damasus and remains known for his Latin translation of the Bible, based on Greek and Hebrew (the Vulgate). He also professed a

profound hostility to Judaism. In this regard, the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz writes: "His enemies having reproached him for being contaminated by heresy due to his Hebraic studies, Saint Jerome convinced them of his orthodoxy by expressing his hatred for Jews. While it is necessary to despise them as individuals and as a nation", he said, "as far as I am concerned, I abhor the Jews with an unutterable hatred".

In his letter to the brothers Pammachius and Oceanus, Saint Jerome wrote: "If I have an interest in hating men, in detesting a race, I am against the circumcised ones [the Jews] with a hatred that astonishes me. They continue to persecute Our Lord Jesus Christ in the synagogues until this very day".

Saint Jerome cites the words of Christ, cited by John: "You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own resources, for he is a liar and the father of it" (John 8:44).

In describing the Apocalypse, Saint John warned us to beware of the calumnies of the Jews: "I know your works, tribulation, and poverty (but you are rich); and I know the blasphemy of those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan" (Revelation 2:9).

The very Catholic Maurice Pinay confirmed Saint Jerome's opinions in the 19th century: "If it were necessary to abominate the Jews and Judaism to be a good Christian, he wished to do so in an exemplary manner". And Maurice Pinay added: "It is in no way strange if one takes account of the fact that the Jews are the principal enemies of Christianity and the human race".[45]

Bishop Cyril, of Alexandria, who was firmly opposed to the hysteria and aggressiveness of the Jews, succeeded in having them expelled from the city in 415, which gave rise to a few excesses. Despite the energy he expended in defending the Jews, the prefect Oreste was powerless to suppress the riots and could only bring a complaint against Cyril. The court of Constantinople, however, upheld the bishop's case.

This anti-Judaism of the Fathers of the Church had already been professed by the founders of Christianity. Saint Paul claimed to be a Jew, "born in Tarsus, in Cilicia", an ancient city on the southern coast of present-day Turkey. But he abandoned Judaism and turned against the sect. He later claimed to hold Roman citizenship, on three occasions, as we may read in the Gospel of Luke.

In his epistles, he systematically denigrated the Jews and their teachings and defined the Jews as the enemies of all men: "Who both

killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost" (Thessalonians 2:16). Saint Paul was decapitated, probably in 67, after a trial held under Nero's reign.

The fate of Christ, sacrificed for the renewal of the world, corresponded profoundly with the schema of the great Graeco-Latin mythologies. He particularly resembled the god Dionysus, son of Zeus, dismembered by the Menades and offered to the gods, and that of Adonis, the god who is reborn from his own blood to signal the coming of spring.

Likewise, the taking of the Eucharist, which implies the symbolic consumption of the divine flesh and blood, was foreshadowed long beforehand by the Dionysian, Elusinian and Orphic mysteries. Finally, in authorising and encouraging depictions of that which is sacred (sculptures, paintings, mosaics), Christianity fits squarely into the straight line of Graeco-Latin culture.



## 22

### **The End of the Western Roman Empire**

With the death of Theodosius the Great, the Roman Empire fell to his two sons and was officially divided in two: the Western Empire, extending to present-day Bosnia, and the Eastern Empire.

The Eastern Empire was ruled over by Arcadius (395–408), or rather his two all-powerful Councillors, Rufinus and Eutropius. The Jews, writes Graetz, “were rather well treated. Rufinus loved money, and the Jews had already become familiar with its magic power”.

After defeating the Goths, in the year 400, Arcadius reigned alone and, with the aid of the patriarch of Constantinople, John Chrysostom, pursued a firm religious policy. As the Jews manifested their solidarity before the courts to pervert the decision of the judges through false testimonies, they were prohibited from testifying before Christian courts.[46]

In the West, Emperor Honorius prohibited the Jews from occupying any official function in the Empire, but their religion was respected. They were free to practice their national customs, and had judges of their own nationality, except in capital cases. They were only excluded from the highest dignities of the State. Apart from civil careers, they were free to engage in trade, industry and letters, and, judging by the complaints made against them by Christians, they did so with the ardour which has been characteristic of them at all times and in all locations.

Rutillius, a pagan poet of the early 5th century, a native of Toulouse, complains that the once vanquished nation was oppressing its conquerors. Saint Augustine (354–430), the bishop of Hippo (in present-day Algeria), the famous Father of the Church, thought it his duty to take the Jews down a peg by reminding them that they were excluded from the highest State dignities, and were absolutely never invited to table with the great lords.[47]

Theodosius II (408–450), Arcadius’ successor, was a weak prince, “motivated by excellent sentiments” towards the Jews, writes Graetz. It was nonetheless necessary to take certain measures to restrain the aggressiveness of the Jews. In 425, Theodosius II and Valentinian III (for the West) prohibited the Jews from holding Christian slaves, from holding public offices, and from pleading before the courts.[48] But

these laws were very imperfectly applied, due to the fact that the wealth of the Jews permitted them to evade the law.[49]

Rich Jewish merchants often abused their positions to oppress or pervert lower-class Christians. In the year 430, the Jews of Inmestar, a locality in Syria between Aleppo and Antioch, celebrated one of their festivals by crucifying a Christian.[50]

In his *Histoire des Juifs*, written at the end of the 19th century, Heinrich Graetz conceded that the Jews might have been the cause of certain exaggerations, while excusing his fellow Jews from any act of malevolence. Once again, the Jews are said to have been punished despite their innocence:

“In the lamentable situation in which they were placed in Christian countries”, he writes, “the Jews had no other weapon against their oppressors except mockery. But they sometimes carried it out clumsily, particularly on Purim, where the excitement of the festival often led to drunkenness, and, therefore, to impulsive demonstrations. On this day, noisy youths hanged a Haman – the traditional enemy of the Jews – in effigy, to a gibbet designed, accidentally or on purpose, to resemble a Cross, and which was then burned. This act naturally irritated the Christians, who accused the Jews of outraging their religion. To put an end to the scandal, Theodosius II ordered the rectors of the province to punish the persons responsible, with severe penalties: but it was insufficient to put an end to the disturbances. This carnival joke was to produce the most disastrous consequences sooner or later. The Jews of Inmestar, a small village in Syria, located between Antioch and Chalcis, having erected one these gibbets to Haman, the Christians accused them of fastening a Christian child to it and whipping it to death. All the defendants were severely punished by order of the Emperor”.[51]

At Rome and in Italy, since the advent of the Christian Emperors, the Jews had lost their power and were no longer the boss.

“It is probable”, writes Graetz, “that they participated in the invasion of the barbarians and in the fall of Rome, once the mistress of the world, with a joyful heart”. It is equally possible that they were the principal architects of Roman decadence.[52]

Rome had by that time long been at loggerheads with the Germans. The capital of the Empire was finally conquered by the Visigoths under Alaric in August 410, and the Jews may have imagined that the “end times” presaging the coming of the Messiah were at last approaching, when they would finally wreak their vengeance on the goyim. But according to certain Talmudic scholars, it was not even possible for the Messiah to appear before the 85th Jubilee. After that date, “one might hope, but one could have no certainty, that He would appear”.

In 439, Carthage was taken and pillaged by the Vandals under Genseric. Once again, Graetz insists on this point: "The punishment inflicted by God upon the Roman Empire awakened the messianic hopes in Jewish hearts. Jewish mobs in all parts of the Empire repeated that the prophet Elias had announced that the Messiah would come in the 85th Jubilee (4200th year of creation, 400 AD of the Vulgate era). These Jewish hopes have appeared throughout history and always ended in a blood bath."

The invasion of the Huns in the mid-5th century once again reinforced the idea, among the Jews, that the messianic times had finally arrived. Heinrich Graetz writes here: "In these innumerable Huns who threw themselves onto the Roman Empire and whose attacks brought about its collapse, the Jews saw the army of Gog mentioned by the prophet, launching themselves from the land of Magog with the speed of a hurricane, the rapidity of a cloud, to cover the land and the coming and going of peoples, the spectacle of one Empire disappearing while another was coming into being, convinced them of the eternity of the Jewish nation. One people was rising, another was eclipsing itself, but Israel still existed".

The entire Western Empire was collapsing. Only Gaul was successfully defended by the Roman general Aetius, who defeated the Huns on 11 September 451 at the Catalaunian Fields, between Troyes and Châlons-en-Champagne, forcing them to withdraw into northern Italy.

Upon Attila's death, in 453, the Empire of the Huns disintegrated, and the Asians returned whence they had come. In 455 came the sack of Rome by the Vandals under Genseric. Once the Western Empire had been destroyed, the anarchy into which society fell was eminently favourable to Judaism.

## 23

### Emperor Peroz

In Babylonia and Persia, a bloody series of persecutions was directed against the Jews under Emperor Peroz or Pheroces (457–484). The reason for this persecution is said to have been, we are told, Peroz's desire for vengeance against the Jews of Ispahan, a few of whom had killed and skinned two priests.

"Half the Jewish population of Ispahan was massacred", writes Graetz. The movement then extended to the Babylonia communities, where it persisted until approximately 469–470.

A few years later, the persecution took on a more serious tone: schools were closed, popular assemblies which had been held upon the approach of the festivals were prohibited, and Jewish courts were suppressed and Jewish children converted by force to the religion of the Magi (474). The city of Sora seems to have been destroyed at this time.

"Like Hadrian", writes Graetz, "he [Peroz] has been blackened by Jewish history with the epithet of malevolent and was nicknamed Peruz Reschia". The immediate effect of these persecutions was to compel the Jews to leave Babylon. In the "year 4250 of the era of creation" according to the Jewish calendar (490 A.D.), the Jews of Babylonia then emigrated south, to Arabia, and, in the east, to the Indian Ocean, on the coast of Malabar, where they resumed their old ways.

## 24

### Theodoric's Weakness

Under the leadership of their chief Theodoric, the Ostrogoths destroyed what remained of Roman power. The peninsula was then in the hands of a Herul [Eastern Germanic] chief named Odoacer, who passed down to posterity for deposing Romulus Augustus, the last Emperor of the Western Empire, in 476. Ravenna was taken by Theodoric in 493 and Odoacer was killed by Theodoric's own hand. Rome then ceased to be the capital of Italy, and Ravenna, alternatively with Verona, became the political centre of the new Ostrogoth state.

One day, on Theodoric's order, the minister and councillor, Cassiodorus, wrote as follows to the Jewish community of Milan. "Thou seekest, Oh Judea, rest upon this earth, and, in thy blindness, thou dost not concern thyself with rest in eternity!"

When the Jews of Genoa requested authorisation to restore their synagogue, Theodoric responded: "Thou seekest that which thou should'st seek to flee from! We grant the authorisation which thou demandest, but we criticize the vow which thou hast formulated in thy folly. Nonetheless, We do not wish to impose our religion upon anyone, nor constrain heretics to act against their conscience".

Theodoric prohibited the Jews from building new synagogues and from renovating old ones; he only permitted them to restore those which threatened to fall into ruin. But while he granted the Jews only rather limited freedom, he at least protected them from any aggression.

Theodoric's policy with regards to the Jews exasperated the people, oppressed by the economic and financial domination of the Jews. Until one day, in the year 500, a few slaves in Rome rebelled against their Jewish masters, and the mob, in solidarity with the slaves, mistreated the Jews and pillaged their houses. Informed of these disturbances, Theodoric ordered the Senate to punish the guilty parties and to rebuild the synagogues at their expense. As the guilty parties were never found, the municipality was sentenced to rebuild the structures which had been destroyed.

Despite these various vexations, Italian Jews were happy under Theodoric. They prospered not only at Ravenna and Rome, as well as at Milan and Naples.[53] The great protection granted them by the Ostrogoths was no doubt one of the principal reasons which compelled

the Italians to wish to be governed by the court of Constantinople, which imposed less restrictive laws upon the Jews.

Theodoric died at Ravenna, in 526. Cassiodorus, for his part, became a monk, founded a monastery and composed a commentary on the Psalms, among other things. In it he frequently apostrophised the Jews, writes Graetz, showering them with insults, calling them "scorpions, lions, wild asses, dogs and unicorns".

## 25

### Zeno, Byzantine Emperor

The Roman Empire of the West was submerged by the Germans; but in the East, the Byzantine Empire lasted another thousand years, until the capture of Constantinople by the Turks.

Eastern Roman Emperor Zeno reigned from 474 until 491. In 466, while he was a general, he succeeded in repelling the Huns, led by Attila's eldest son. It was under his reign that, 10 years later, in 476, the Roman Empire of the West was buried forever. This same year, Odoacer, the king of the Heruls, a Germanic tribe from Scandinavia, overthrew the last Emperor, Romulus Augustus, and sent the imperial insignia back to Zeno. Between 478 and 483, Zeno was also compelled to wage war against the Ostrogoths under Theodoric, who renounced the recapture of Constantinople.

At this time, some serious disturbances occurred during a horse race. The city of Antioch, like most large cities in the Byzantine Empire, was divided along party lines, the parties being called the Blues and the Greens. The Greens caused all the disturbances, attacking their adversaries, killing, among others, many Jews, throwing their bodies into fires and burning several synagogues. "When Emperor Zeno was informed of this event", writes Graetz, "he declared that the Greens deserved to be punished because they had contented themselves with burning dead Jews and had spared live ones".

The inhabitants of Antioch distinguished themselves in particular through their hostility to the Jews. One day, a famous chariot driver, Calliopas, came from Constantinople to Antioch, where he drove under the banner of the Greens. On 9 July 507, disorders occurred at Daphne, near Antioch, where his party had gone to meet, and, "for no reason at all", writes Graetz (which we are not required to believe), the entire crowd attacked the synagogue, killed the Jews inside and destroyed all the sacred objects which the building contained.

26

The Legislation of the Church

The Church has never varied on the Jewish question. It has always wished for the Jews to be respected in their persons and their religion, but always, too, that they be kept in a state of submission and isolation which would deprive them of the means to harm others. The councils were particularly anxious to isolate the Jews in the midst of society, by prohibiting all communication with them; but the frequent renewal of these defences proves how difficult it was to ensure compliance.

In October 1893, the *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit* published a long and scholarly study of ecclesiastical law concerning the Jews. Under his signature of the Catholic jurisconsultant Charles Auzias Turenne, we find the prescriptions of the councils, as well as the advice given by the Popes or the provisions issued by them, the bulls, letters, and other pontifical documents, as well as the doctrine of the Church scholars in this regard. It is from this study that we draw the information which we present below.[54]

In his *Histoire des Conciles*, published in 1870, Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé, bishop of Rottenburg, recalls that the first council which appears to have concerned itself with the Jews was held in Spain, at Elvira (305–306). Elvira, in Latin *Illiberis*, was a city in Andalucía, not far from Granada. Canon 16 prohibits giving daughters in marriage to Jews.[55] Bishop Osius (Hosius), of Córdoba, member of the Council of Nice and organiser of the Council of Elvira, caused the adoption of a decision by virtue of which the penalty of excommunication was pronounced upon Christians who had relations with Jews or contracted marriages with them. This prohibition was renewed by the ecumenical council of Chalcedon in 451.

Canon 50 of the Council of Elvira also prohibits eating with Jews. This prohibition was taken up by the Council of Vannes in the year 465, that of Agde in the year 506, and that of Epaone in the year 517 (modern-day Yenne, in Savoy, in the diocese of Vienna).

Canon 34 of the Council of Agde (Agatha) says that Jews wishing to become Catholic had to remain in the catechumenate for 8 months before being baptised.[56]

In 530, 533 and 541, three Councils were held at Orleans. Marriage with the Jews was once again prohibited, and the prohibition against eating with them was renewed; they were moreover prohibited from



leaving their houses for four days, starting on Maundy Thursday, and from attempting to convert any person whatsoever to Judaism, under pain of confiscation of all their slaves. The second Council of Orleans prohibited marriages between Jews and Christians, a prohibition which was renewed at several Councils. That of Clermont, in 535, excluded the Jews from the magistracy; the Council of Macon in 581 prohibited them from acting as tax collectors.[57]

The Council of Epaone, in 517, where major canons were adopted or renewed concerning the administration of the Church and the discipline of clerics, was presided over by Avitus, a close relative of the Roman Emperor of the West, Avitus, a nobleman from the Auvergne who reigned from 455 to 456. Left a widower at 40, Avitus distributed all his goods to the poor and withdrew into a monastery. In 490, he succeeded his father as bishop of Vienna. A theologian and poet, he cared for the poor, as well as for Church life in general. Appointed archbishop, metropolitan of a province located in the kingdom of Burgundy, Avitus' first aim was to combat Arianism. The letter in which he congratulated Clovis at having become converted in 496 has survived. He also contributed to the conversion of King Sigismond, the king of the Burgundians, who abandoned the Arian heresy in favour of the Catholic religion in 516. Once again, it was Avitus who sanctioned the measures of the Council of Epaone in 517.

Avitus pronounced inflammatory discourses against the Jews. "It was Avitus", writes Graetz, "who gave the Franks the signal to begin the persecutions of the Jews". Gregory of Tours, who was his student, has left us the following testimony on this subject: in 516, at Clermont, Avitus repeatedly exhorted the Jews to convert, without the slightest success. On Ascension Day, a riot occurred, encouraged by the bishop, during which the synagogue was destroyed. Avitus then once again ordered the Jews to convert or leave the city, but they refused to obey and took refuge in a building, which was soon surrounded by Christians. It was then that the Jews sent a messenger to the bishop to help them, declaring that they were prepared to do what he wished. The bishop hurried to the spot, calmed down the mob, and 500 Jews were baptised on Pentecost, in the presence of a large mob.[58] Jews who refused to obey took refuge in Marseilles.

The poet Vanantius Fortunatus was made responsible by Gregory of Tours with celebrating this triumph. As for Avitus of Vienna, who died in 519, he remained one of the saints of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. His feast day is 5 February.

The bishops of Arles and Marseilles acted in the same manner, and it was necessary for the Pope, on the complaints of the Jews trading at

Marseilles, to write to these two prelates to show more moderation and to use only methods of persuasion in the conversion of Jews. But a short time afterwards, the bishop of Bourges excluded from the city all Jews who refused to convert.

Chilperic I, King of the Franks from 561 to 584, followed the impulse given by Avitus and obliged the Jews of his kingdom to be baptised, personally holding the neophytes over the baptismal fonts. "It is true", writes Graetz, "that while he contented himself with apparent conversions, he also permitted the Jews to continue observing the Sabbath as well as all the other prescriptions of Judaism after baptism."

In his *History of the Franks*, Gregory of Tours (538–594), a French bishop and historian, describes King Gontran's entrance into Orleans under the acclamations of the Jews, and describes Gontran's discontent:

"Woe to this Jewish nation, wicked and perfidious, always deceitful by nature! Today they make me listen to praises full of flattery, proclaiming that all the nations adore me as their lord, to try to trick me into ordering the reconstruction of their synagogues at public expense, after they have been destroyed by the Christians; which I will never do, since the Lord prohibits it."

Gregory of Tours denounced the major role of Jewish merchants in the slave trade, as well as the purchasing of stolen goods.[59] In the trading of goods from the East, the Jews naturally added the trade in slaves. Christians were increasingly turning away in horror from this trade, but the Jews never felt such scruples. They were moreover protected by the barbarian kings at that time, who found in them the means to take advantage of the numerous captives taken during their military campaigns.

Once again, it was the Jews who purchased the sacred vessels looted from churches, which was a common occurrence in those days. A major part of all the precious metals possessed by Jews originated in this manner.[60] Thus enriched, the Jews bought landed properties. The letters of Saint Gregory the Great and other documents describe the Jews as wealthy land owners all over Italy. But they were not farmers. As the Jewish historian Bernard Lazare has correctly stated: "They had their lands cultivated by slaves, since their intense patriotism prohibited them from hoeing foreign soil".[61]

The Council of Macon, in 581, dedicated its canons 13 to 17 to the Jews, since then often reproduced and inserted in the *Corpus Iuris*. The Council prohibited the Jews from possessing Christian slaves and ordered that any slaves which they had owned should be resold at the price of 12 golden soldi. The Jews were prohibited from the exercise of any function which would permit them to penalise Christians. They

were prohibited from exercising the functions of judge or tax farmer, “so that the Christian population may not be placed under their orders”.

Jewish intolerance was also prohibited. They were compelled to show respect for Christian priests, and could not sit in their presence without their permission. Finally, the Council of Macon renewed the prohibition for the Jews to appear on the street during Easter Week.

Four Councils for Spain and Gallia Narbonensis were held at Toledo in the years 589, 633, 638, and 681; another was held at Paris in 614 – the most important of the Frankish Councils (with up to 79 bishops in attendance). Another Council at Reims (in 625, with 40 bishops), reaffirmed these provisions while adding a few more. All these Councils – particularly, the Council of Paris – insisted on the provision that no civil or military public office was to be entrusted to them. The council of Toledo in 633 extended this disability to the sons of converted Jews. The Jews were also prohibited from working on Sunday.

Canon 11 of the Council of Constantinople (692) prohibited Christians from accepting medicine from them, from eating or even bathing with them, on pain of loss of position for clerics and excommunication for laymen.

Many of the prohibitions already mentioned, particularly against eating with Jews, were reaffirmed by the Councils of Rome (743), Nicaea (787), Regiaticina (Pavia, 850), Metz (888). The prohibition against keeping, not just slaves but Christian servants and wet nurses, was reaffirmed by the Councils of Coyaca (near Oviedo, 1050), Szable (1091), and Gran (in Hungary, 1114, canon 61).[62]

In his *Histoire des Conciles*, Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé summarises the principal ordinances of ecclesiastical legislation:

1. Christians must never enter into the service of Jews, nor accept any employment paid for by Jews. 2. Christians are prohibited from having recourse to the services of Jewish physicians, and from taking medications prepared by Jews. 3. Under pain of excommunication, Christians are prohibited from living in the same house or in the same family as Jews. 4. Christian women are especially prohibited from accepting positions as wet nurse in any Jewish family. 5. Jews must not be permitted to exercise public functions giving them any authority whatsoever over Christians. 6. Christians must never be present at the marriage of any Jew or accept invitations to dinner.[63]

There are also a considerable number of pontifical acts relating to Jews: advice or criticisms of bishops and princes, reminders of the council canons, bulls properly speaking, constitutions for the pontifical states, etc. These documents naturally present much more variety and

even differences than the Conciliar decrees, which were general regulations, since the Popes most often decided on particular cases. Nevertheless, the policies followed by the Popes, exhibit, overall, a remarkable and consistent unity which can hardly be said of secular princes or governments.

Some Jewish intellectuals deny the legislative provisions and doctrine of the Church. Complacently, they draw up long lists of Popes who, they say, have been full of benevolence towards them. They cite a few acts of protective measures, even the concession of privileges granted in the pontifical states: they most often reproduce a certain number of letters or bulls in their favour.

But the guiding principle of the Church has never ceased to be that enunciated by the Lateran Council in these terms, in 1179: "*Judaeos subiacere christianis oportet et ab eis pro sola humanitate foveri*", that is, that the Jews must be treated with humanity: that if Jews permit themselves to commit excesses requiring repression, then only lawfully constituted authorities may intervene. But they must not be allowed to escape from the position of inferiority which must be theirs, and Christians are to have as little to do with them as possible.[64]

As soon as the vigilance of the goyim is relaxed, in fact, the Jews start moving their little pawns around, taking advantage of the situation and enriching themselves so excessively that gold and silver run through their hands like water and thousands of unfortunates who made the mistake of having recourse to them are reduced to misery.

"The prescriptions of the synods or councils were often forgotten or even openly violated", writes Charles Auzias-Turenne; "The result was that the Jews were not long in enriching themselves, appropriating to themselves all the goods and money of the country; so much so, that, far from being independent of the Christians, it was they who imposed their yoke upon the Christians. When this yoke became intolerable, and the princes failed to intervene, exasperated mobs sometimes resorted to the most deplorable forms of violence, throwing themselves upon the Jews and massacring them, or burning or drowning them by the thousands. Atrocious crimes like these are understandable, but cannot be excused in the slightest. Of course, the Popes and bishops naturally intervened forcefully in their favour, giving them asylum, writing very strongly-worded letters or documents which are then produced by their modern defenders".

There were, of course, Popes who were inclined to indulgence, in the hopes of gain or of converting the Jews; they always began by softening the measures already issued. But, almost always, if their reign was of a certain duration, these same pontiffs were always compelled to retrace their steps.

## 27

### The Justinian Code

Justinian acceded to power at Constantinople in 527, at the age of 45. He was born in a rather modest family of Romanised Illyrians in present-day Croatia. That he possessed good qualities is undeniable: he had a great sense of the State and the Imperial ideal, coupled with a great capacity for work. He was a cultivated, sober man, which was rather rare for the time; he was vegetarian and drank no wine. His wife, Theodora, a former actress, was also of humble origins.

Master of the Byzantine Empire, Justinian attempted to rebuild the Roman Empire. The Emperor attacked the kingdom of the Vandals in North Africa. The capture of Carthage on 15 September 533 was the death knell of the kingdom founded by Genseric. In the rush, Byzantine armies overran Corsica, Sicily and Sardinia. In 533, two armies, one from Dalmatia and the other from Sicily, caught the Ostrogoth armies in a pincer movement and entered Naples, followed by Rome, on 10 December 536, occupying Ravenna in 540. The greater part of the Mediterranean was once again under the rule of the "Romans".

Above all, Justinian reorganised the administration and implemented a great legislative reform. The *Corpus Juris Civilis*, known as the Justinian Code (529), was written in Latin, the vernacular language of the Roman Empire, but which was not understood by the majority of citizens of the Eastern Empire. A summary of antique jurisprudence took shape in new laws: the *Novelles*, written in Greek (534). Justinian's legislative work was fundamentally important since the medieval West, starting in the 12th century, adopted Roman law from this source.

Justinian was also a great builder. In particular, he ordered the construction of the majestic Church of Saint Sophia, at Constantinople. In the whole Empire, he financed the construction of villas, bridges, baths and roads. He was also the champion of religious Orthodoxy, but in exchange for his protection and his favours, he intended to impose his will upon the Church.

Justinian did everything in his power to contain the power and influence of the Jews. The Justinian Code prohibited the Jews from holding public offices, thus depriving them of all honours. Their testimony in court against Christians was declared null and void due to

the numerous false testimonies which the Jews were in the habit of providing to assist fellow Jews. Jewish fathers and mothers were prohibited from disinheriting converted children.

It is interesting to note that, starting at this time, the authorities of the Empire and the Church came to an understanding to exclude not only declared Jews from top positions and from military careers, but baptised Jews as well.

"The reason for such measures", writes Maurice Pinay in *The Plot Against the Church* (1962), "is easily explained if one takes account of that which other Jewish historians such as Graetz and Cecil Roth have clearly admitted, that is, that the conversions of the Israelites to Christianity were feigned, and that, even if they practised the new religion in public, they remained secret Jews, just as Jewish as before, and that, among these false Christians, the secret practice of Judaism was transmitted from father to son, even when the latter had been baptised and lived officially as Christians".

These measures were the distant origin of the "purity of blood" laws, which excluded Catholics of Jewish ancestry from administrative posts in the State and dignities in the Church in Spain in the 14th century, so as to avoid infiltration and destruction from within.

In 533, Emperor Justinian prohibited the dissemination of the Talmud throughout the Roman Empire. The Talmud is the compendium of the teachings of the rabbis, "the soul of the Jewish nation", as Heinrich Graetz writes. Its elaboration was closed at the end of the 5th century, and the following generations made it their principal, if not sole, intellectual fare. For over one thousand years, the Jews remained indifferent to the outside world, to nature, to men and events. They had no knowledge of the Bible, the history of their ancestors or the eloquence of their prophets, except through the Talmud.

Later, during the 13th century, Popes Gregory IX and Innocent IV also condemned the Talmud and ordered it burned, on the grounds that it contains all sorts of blasphemies and that it teaches Jews to harm non-Jews by any possible means. Other Roman pontiffs later condemned the Talmud as well: Julius III, Paul IV, Pius IV, Gregory XIII, Clement VIII, Alexander VII, Benedict XIV, among others, but to Justinian falls the honour of having been the first to prohibit this frightful book.

28

Gregory I (590–604)

After Justinian, a large part of Italy fell to the Lombards (589), a half-pagan, half-Arian, people, who cared little about the Jews and allowed them to grow and prosper as they wished. In Western Europe, in Gaul and Spain, where the Church had trouble establishing its power, the Jews were, at first, much happier than in the Byzantine Empire and in Italy. The collapse of the Roman Empire created a vacuum which was highly favourable to the Jews, who could corrupt officials, judges and ministers as much as they liked.

The Jews then dedicated themselves to the slave trade on a large scale. In this regard, the Jewish historian, Heinrich Graetz, observed that “the repeated invasions of barbarian tribes and the frequent wars had increased the number of prisoners, and the Jews actively dedicated themselves to the slave trade... Among the Franks, who had no spirit of fanaticism or intolerance, lived a great Pope, Gregory I, whose pontificate lasted from 590 until 604. Gregory I favoured an absolute prohibition of the ownership of Christian slaves by Jews (*omnino grave essecrandumque est christianos in servitio esse Judaeorum*). Such slaves should be confiscated without delay, or purchased, if it was impossible to proceed in any other manner. If the Jew converted, the slaves were not returned to him”.[65]

In 593, he took measures against a Jew from Sicily named Nasas, who worshipped the prophet Elias – as did many Christians at the time – and practised the slave trade. Gregory enjoined the prefect of Sicily to break the sect of the Jew and free the captives.

Gregory became even more irate when he learned that the Jews of Catania had purchased pagan slaves to have them circumcised and raised in Judaism. He recalled the laws of the Emperors, prohibited the circumcision of slaves and ordered that all slaves already circumcised be freed on the spot.

The wealth and pride of the Jews multiplied the conflicts between them and the Christians. Once again, a Christian, having been held in slavery for eighteen years by a Jew, implored the protection of the Pope against the son of his former master, who, having converted to Christianity, wished to take the former slave back into servitude. The Pope declared that since the first act of enslavement had been illegal, the son, although a Christian, had no claim to enforce.[66]

Gregory the Great wrote to Theodoric, the king of the Burgundians, to Theoderbert, the king of Austrasia, and Queen Brunhilda, to exhort them to “provide a prompt remedy to this evil and deliver the believers from the hands of their enemies”. He concerned himself with assuring the enforcement of imperial constitutions and the decisions of the councils, and ordered the bishops to crack down on those who used their wealth to pervert the Christian people.[67]

On the other hand, the Pope prohibited the use of violence for purposes of conversion, and even ordered that goods taken from the synagogues should be returned.[68] Gregory I believed on principle that the Jews should be converted, not by force, but through persuasion and kindness.

He thus wrote to Virgil and to Theodore, bishops of the Gauls, to prohibit the use of force to compel Jews to submit to baptism. Once again, he reproached the bishop of Terracine who had taken their synagogue away, before ordering him to return it. In fact, the Theodosian Code (L. 83 *de his qui super.*), with the approval of the Popes and Fathers of the Church in this regard, had stipulated that the Jews could retain and repair their old synagogues, but not build new ones. Now those which the three bishops in question had taken away or had removed by the people were old synagogues.

Gregory also promised to exempt Jewish farmers or property owners from part of the land tax if they converted to Christianity. Of course, he did not fool himself into believing that these proselytes would be fervent Christians; but, he said, “if we do not win them over to Christianity, we will at least have their children”.



## 29

### Jerusalem, 614

In 608, at Antioch, there was a new episode illustrating the secular confrontation between the Jews and the rest of humanity. "The Jews threw themselves upon their enemies", writes Graetz, "killed a great number of them and burned their bodies. They attacked the patriarch Anastasius, known as the Sinaite, in particular, inflicting the cruellest treatment on him and dragging him through the streets before killing him". The Jewish historian justified these excesses in the following manner: "What frightful sufferings must the Jews have endured at the hands of imperial functionaries and the clergy to drive them to such excesses!"

As soon as Emperor Phocas was informed of these disturbances, he appointed Bonosus governor of the East and charged General Kotys to punish the rioters. In September or October 608, many Jews were killed and others were sent into exile.

The Jews soon found an unexpected occasion to revenge themselves, when Khosrow II, the king of the Persians, invaded Asia Minor and Syria. Under the command of general Scharbarzar, a body of the Persian army then descended from the heights above Lebanon to invade Palestine. Once again, the Jews sided with the invader.

Let us allow Heinrich Graetz to describe it: "When the Jews of this country learned of the defeat of the Christians and the continued progress of the Persian army, they felt an ardent desire to take part in the struggle. They thought the hour had come in which they would be able to revenge themselves for the evils which the Romans and the Christians had heaped upon them for centuries! At the instigation of a certain Benjamin, from Tiberias, who dedicated his immense fortune to fomenting trouble and in arming Jewish soldiers against the Romans, a proclamation was issued ordering them to join the Persian army. To this appeal, the robust Jews from Tiberias, Nazareth and other mountains of Galilee lined up in a mob under the Persian flag. It is probable that they first massacred the Christians and sacked the churches of Tiberias; they joined Scharbarzar's soldiers to march on Jerusalem and take back the holy city from the Christians. En route, these troops were joined by Jews from the south of Palestine and Jerusalem was taken by storm (July 614). It is said that 90,000

Christians were killed in the city. The chronicle adds that the Jews purchased Christian prisoners from the Persians in order to kill them; this accusation is not based on any concrete fact. Convents and churches were burned at Jerusalem by the enemy. It is probable that the Jews took a greater part in these scenes of destruction than the Persians, because they felt that the holy city was no less soiled by the presence of the cross and relics of the martyrs than it had been in the past by the idols of Antiochus Epiphanes and Adriane."

For fourteen years, the Jews were once again the masters of Palestine, until the Byzantines regained the upper hand under Emperor Heraclius, who succeeded in defeating the Persians. Upon his entry into Jerusalem, in 630, Heraclius brought back the Holy Cross, personally bearing it along the Via Dolorosa, to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, which had been rebuilt.

The Jews of Palestine had to pay for the atrocities which they had committed: "All those who do not succeed in taking refuge in the mountains or in reaching Egypt were massacred", writes Graetz. "Of all the Palestinian Jews, Benjamin of Tiberias, the instigator of the revolt against Rome, was the only one spared, because he converted to Christianity".

## 30

### Visigothic Spain

The Visigoths, converted to Arianism, caused the Catholics to carry a heavy yoke, while they allowed the Jews to remain in possession of their civil and political rights, admitting them to public functions and permitting them to circumcise their pagan and Christian slaves. This prosperous situation for the Jews of Spain lasted for over a century, until King Reccared abjured his Arian faith in January 587, with most of the members of the nobility and clergy.

The third Council of Toledo in May 589 was dedicated to the triumph of the Catholic Church in the peninsula. The pride and power of the Jews was about to be brought down a peg. They were thereafter prohibited from occupying public offices and from marrying Christians. The children born of mixed unions would be baptised by force. They were also prohibited from holding slaves, a measure which irritated them to an extreme. The Jews attempted to bribe the prince, as was their wont. "They sought", writes Graetz, "to cause this prohibition to be lifted by offering Reccared a large sum of money; Reccared refused the gift and maintained the prohibition". Pope Gregory the Great, who had, for a certain time, attempted in vain to win over the Jews with kindness and tolerance, highly praised the conduct of the Visigoth prince.

The Jews could nonetheless easily evade the laws issued against them by Reccared, since the king had only very limited power at that time. The fact is that the Visigoth lords, who elected their kings, were absolute masters over their lands and continued to permit them to own slaves and appoint Jews to public offices, so much so that after twenty years, Reccared's laws had fallen into total desuetude. His successors paid no attention to them at all and showed themselves generally favourable to the Jews.

This situation ceased in 612, with the advent of Sisebut. This king, a contemporary of Emperor Heraclius, who reigned over the Byzantine Empire, was, like him, a bitter enemy of the Jews. Sisebut, Heinrich Graetz writes – without even laughing – "persecuted the Jews without reason, voluntarily, almost against the will of the Church".

As soon as he was elected by the Visigoth chiefs, the first thing Sisebut ordered done was to put an end to the abuses of the Jews by

rendering effective the canons of the third Council of Toledo, which had largely ceased to be applied. He renewed Reccard's edicts and ordered the ecclesiastics, judges, and even the people to supervise their application with great attention. He went further than Reccard, in prohibiting the Jews not only from purchasing new slaves, but even from keeping those they already possessed. Only the converted Jews were authorised to possess them, and they even had the right to accept those they inherited from any Jewish relative. Sisebut solemnly commanded his successors to cause this edict to be respected, and expressed the wish that any king who abrogated it "would be exposed to the vilest ignominy on this earth and delivered to the eternal flames of purgatory in the other world".

Despite these entreaties, the lords of the country often granted protection to Jews who advanced them money. Sisebut then issued an even stricter measure, requiring all the Jews of the country to accept baptism within a fixed period or to leave Visigoth territory. Recalcitrant Jews would be punished by whipping and the confiscation of all their goods. Some, motivated by the fear of losing their property, accepted baptism; others emigrated to France or Africa.

This was probably under Sisebut's reign that the Jews of Toledo, converted, but then, having relapsed, under pain of punishment, signed a promise to live in a more Christian manner in the future. In this singular act,[69] the converts declared that they would henceforth have no more commerce with the Jews (those who had refused to accept baptism); that they would no longer practice the customs of the Jews; that they would no longer observe the Sabbath; that they would not marry their former fellow Jews; that, if they could not eat pork, because they were not used to it, at least dishes prepared with pork would no longer disgust them; that they would believe in Jesus and the Gospels; that they would do nothing against the Christian religion; and that, if any one of them violated this commitment, they would burn him or stone him, or would place his person and his property at the disposal of the king.

Sisebut died in 620. The new king, Suintila, a weak, corrupt man, allowed himself to be bribed to abrogate the laws of Sisebut, so much so that the Jews came back to the country and the converts returned to Judaism.

Under Suintila's protection, the Jews recovered great power and once again threatened the nation and its institutions, which explains and justifies the conspiracy of the Catholic clergy to depose this felonious monarch.

The chief of this new episode of resistance to Judaism was Isidor of

Seville, one of the most illustrious Fathers of the Church. Suintila was dethroned and replaced by Sisenand. The clergy regained its influence, and, once again, the ecclesiastical assemblies were intended to reduce Jewish power in order to protect the Christians.

In 633, the fourth Council of Toledo was held, presided over by Isidor, archbishop of Hispalis (Seville). This prelate was well-educated, intelligent and moderate. Sisebut's measures seemed so forceful that that the council formally disapproved of them, declaring that it was necessary to persuade, rather than force, those who lacked faith. Canon 57 of the Council of Toledo thus prohibited the use of compulsion: "No Jew may in future be constrained by force to embrace Christianity". The Council did not however annul that which had been done and declared that Jews baptised by order of Sisebut remained Christians.

Great disadvantages resulted from these forced conversions. As it was impossible to supervise so many neophytes or to keep them in isolation, many of these converts relapsed into Judaism.[70] Canon 59 also says, on the subject of these baptised Jews, that many of them remained secret Jews.

Strict measures were taken against Jews who, baptised under Sisebut, had relapsed into their ancient faith. We see, in the acts of the councils, several depositions against these relapsed converts. To prevent such apostasy, canon 62 prohibited baptised Jews from having any relations with their former fellow Jews.[71] They were to be prevented by force from observing the prescriptions of Judaism and their children were to be raised in convents. Converts who observed the Jewish Sabbath and festivals, or who married according to Jewish rites, practising circumcision or abstaining from foods prohibited by Jewish law, were to be reduced to slavery. According to certain canonical legislation, neither Jews converted by force nor their descendants would be permitted to testify in courts of law. Thus, this ancient council already established an essential difference between true Jews and those among them who were Christians in appearance.

Protected by the Hispano-Visigoth nobility, the converted Jews did not suffer overmuch from the measures imposed upon them by the fourth Council of Toledo and King Sisenand. But, a new king ascended the throne in 636, and this prince, named Chintila, cordially hated the Jews.

Chintila convened a new council at Toledo, renewed all the old exceptional laws relating to the Jews and decreed that no one could remain in the Visigoth Empire who not profess the Catholic religion. The Jews were therefore expelled, and those who preferred to convert were obligated to sign an undertaking by means of which they pledged themselves to observe the Catholic religion.

But frequent palace revolutions, the instability of the authority of the kings and the disturbances which accompanied each new coronation hindered the strict enforcement of the decrees of the councils. "At the bottom of their hearts", writes Graetz, "these unfortunates, secretly attached to the faith of their fathers, nourished the hope that the times would change and that one of these revolutions – so frequent among the Visigoths – would change the situation". Their expectations were not in vain and their situation improved after Chintila's brief reign.

## 31 Dagobert

The situation of the Jews deteriorated considerably in France with the Merovingian kings. In 540, Childebert had prohibited them from holding Christian slaves, "it being unjust", he said, "that he who has been redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ should be subjected to serve an infidel who blasphemes His holy name".

During the following century, the situation of the Jews continually worsened. In 615, Clothaire II, who had united the entire empire of the Franks under his sceptre, applied the decisions of the Council of Paris, prohibiting the Jews from exercising any top-level function or to serve in the army.

His son Dagobert "also manifested a violent hatred of the Jews" (Graetz). In 633, he published an edict by virtue of which all those who would not confess faith in Jesus Christ had to leave his states.[72] It is probable that they flowed back to the south of France and the lands of the Rhine.

During the midst of their intestine quarrels, the Franks were nevertheless compelled to relax their strictness, and the Jews, always on the lookout to seize the slightest favourable circumstance, gradually re-entered the Kingdom to dedicate themselves to profitable undertakings, particularly the slave trade. In the new establishments formed in Andalucía, the Jews hated the Christians and speculated on everything without scruple, readily becoming suppliers of slaves to the Moors.

The Council of Chalon-sur-Saône, held around 630, prohibited the sale of slaves outside France.[73] Clovis II, Dagobert's son, prohibited the transport of slaves into his kingdom and even redeemed those who had had the misfortune to fall into the hands of these ignoble merchants in human beings.

## 32

### Mohammed

When, in 622, a handful of adepts of Mohammed left Mecca to travel to Medina (year zero of the Muslim calendar), a few Jews, by conviction, recognised him as the long-awaited Prophet, and embraced Islam. But the Jews of Medina were not convinced and, over time, the Moslems understood that they would not convert and distanced themselves from the "People of the Book".

Among the adversaries of Mohammed, was a certain Abdullah, son of Saurah, who was considered the wisest Jew of Hedjaz. He ridiculed Mohammed, "sent by God", treated him with contempt, ridiculed his revelations and preachings. He did not know that the poor fugitive from Mecca, who had come to beg assistance at Medina, would soon subjugate or exterminate the Jews of the peninsula.

The war against the Meccans continued, and the Jews of Medina became increasingly dissatisfied with domination by Moslems. Some high-born Jews took advantage of a defeat of Mohammed to visit Mecca and incite its inhabitants to try again. To finish off, the Meccans formed a coalition uniting several Arab tribes and, in the year 627, an army of six thousand soldiers marched on Medina.

The siege of the city was interminable, and the besiegers exhausted themselves in their vain efforts. In the end, Mohammed succeeded in sowing discord among Mohammed's allies, who decided to raise the siege.

As soon as the members of the coalition were far from Medina, Mohammed, with three thousand men, marched against the Jewish tribe of the Qurayza. The latter, too weak to wage war on open terrain, retrenched themselves behind the ramparts of their fortresses. After a siege of 25 days (February-March 627), they had no more provisions and considered surrender. They requested the Prophet to permit them to emigrate with their wives, children and some of their property, but Mohammed refused, and nearly 700 Jews, including the chiefs Kaab and Houyey, were executed by throat-cutting in a public square of Medina; their bodies were piled up in one and the same mass grave. The location of this execution was thereafter known as the Market of the Qurayza.

Mohammed took two beautiful female captives back with him,



Safia, the daughter of his implacable enemy, Houyey, and Zainab. The latter attempted to revenge herself upon him whom she regarded as the murderer of her brother Marhab and her fellow Jews. Dissimulating her feelings of hatred, she feigned a profound attachment for Mohammed and thus gained his confidence. One day, she served him poisoned meat.

Mohammed, finding the dish disagreeable, rejected it, but one of his concubines died from it. As a result of this incident, Zaineb was obviously executed and Mohammed ordered his soldiers never to use dishes handled by Jews except after dipping them in boiling water.

Mohammed had warned his followers against the Jews: "The hour of judgement will never arrive before you have fought the Jews to such a point that the stones they hide behind them call out: 'Oh, Mohammed! There's a Jew hiding behind me, kill him!'" [74]

The Jews then sought to smash Mohammed's growing power: Negotiations were opened at Medina, in the house of a Jew named Suwailim, but the latter was denounced and his house burnt down.

When Mohammed died, in 632, "the Jews were very glad", writes Graetz. They believed that, with the death of the Prophet, the religious beliefs of his Arabic followers as to his immortality and his divine mission would disappear. But the Koran had already acquired the force of law and Mohammed's violent diatribes against the Jews were considered by all Moslems as articles of faith.

Towards 640, the second caliph, Omar, decided to expel the Jewish tribes which the Prophet had left on their lands. He did not wish the sacred soil of Arabia to be soiled by their traffic. The Moslem warriors thus had to share vast domains with the Jews.

And nonetheless, as writes the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz, "despite these various acts of hostility by the Arabs against the Jews, one might say that the triumph of Islamism was beneficial to Judaism."

After Mohammed's death, the Moslems spread beyond the frontiers of Arabia, the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other, electrified by their war cry: "Allah alone is God, and Mohammed is his prophet".

The old Kingdom of Persia fell in the initial shock. The Jews, here as elsewhere, opted for those who guaranteed them the greatest freedom for all their trafficking. Since the Sassanid kings who then governed the country restricted their financial power, the Jews naturally sided with the invaders. "The Moslem faith was beneficial to the Jews, particularly in ancient Babylonia, then called Iraq by the Arabs", Graetz tells us.

The Byzantine provinces, Palestine, Syria and Egypt, fell under Arab domination. "The Jews and the Samaritans favoured the Moslem

conquest, particularly in Palestine. The fortress city of Caesarea, the political power of the country, where it is said that there were 700,000 men capable of bearing arms, was betrayed to the Arabs by a Jew”.

In 638, Jerusalem fell under the power of the caliph Omar, who built a mosque on the location of the old Temple. Omar prohibited the Jews from lodging in Jerusalem and subjected them to a certain number of restrictive laws, which also applied to Christians. Thus, they were prohibited from building new synagogues and from renovating the old ones; they could chant in a low voice during their services; they had to recite their prayers for the dead in a low voice; they could not occupy any public office, or judge Moslems, nor prevent their fellow Jews from converting to Islam. Finally, they, as well as all Christians, were required to wear garments of a particular colour, and they were not permitted to ride horseback.

While the Moslems were exempt from all taxation and paid only an insignificant tax to help the poor, the Jews and Christians were subjected to a personal tax and land tax.

But despite these restrictions, Heinrich Graetz insists, “the Jews felt themselves freer among the Moslems than among Christians. First, Omar’s laws were not strictly applied to them, even during the caliph’s lifetime. Then, the Moslems, although convinced of the superiority of their religion, did not despise the Jews, as Christians did. They were able to recognise their merits and occasionally manifested the greatest regard for them”.

33

Visigothic Spain II

The Jews of Spain, as we have seen, had been forced to emigrate or convert to Catholicism and promise in writing, on King Chintila's orders, sincerely to reject Judaism.

"These converted Jews remained no less attached to the faith of their fathers with all their soul", writes Graetz.

They were, moreover, protected, to some extent, against the rigors of the King by the Visigothic nobility, independent of their sovereign. After Chintila's death, under the reign of his successor Chindasuinth (642-652), they all reverted to Judaism publicly as fast as they could.

Chindasuinth's son and successor, Recesuinth (652-672), was quite hostile to the Jews. They keenly recommended to the ecclesiastic officials, in council at Toledo, to take energetic measures against the Jews, and against relapsed Jews in particular. The council voted no new measures and restricted itself to confirming the provisions taken by the Fourth Council of Toledo. The Jews could remain in their country, but had no right to own slaves, nor occupy public offices, nor testify against Christians.

Recesuinth, who noted that the nobility of the country defended the Jews and permitted those among them who had been baptised by force to live according to their customs, promulgated an edict by virtue of which no Christian should protect those practising Judaism in secret, under pain of excommunication or exclusion from the Church. This law failed to produce the desired effect. The Judaising Christians, as those who remained attached their old religion were called, "learned", writes Graetz, "to wear out the distrustful vigilance of their enemies through their tenacity. Inside their houses, they continued to celebrate their Jewish festivals and to neglect the observance of Christian holidays".

Under the reign of King Wamba (672-680), the Jews once again established themselves in the country in large numbers. Nevertheless, as he owed his election to the clergy, the new king was obliged to take an oath prescribed by the Council of Toledo and to order all non-converted Jews expelled from the kingdom.

This time, the decree was executed pitilessly. The numerous Jews who did not wish to accept baptism traversed the Pyrenees and sought refuge in Septimania (a medieval Jewish kingdom in eastern France).

The governor of this province, Count Hilderic, had, in fact, refused to acknowledge the recently elected king and brandished the standard of revolt. With the aim of gaining partisans, he offered converted Jews refuge on his territories, guaranteeing them religious freedom, and at his invitation the Jews flocked there in large numbers.[75] Hilderic's insurrection acquired large proportions at Nîmes, but the insurgents were finally defeated. Wamba finally appeared with an army before Narbonne and expelled the Jews from the city.

The false converts also attempted to infiltrate the Catholic Church by purchasing the highest ecclesiastical offices. The problem was raised at a new council, at Toledo. Canon 9 insisted upon the repression of simony, against those who "attempted to purchase the bishop's dignity".

Wamba was dethroned by a lord of Byzantine origin named Erwig. Before the council which was to crown him, in 681, Erwig pronounced a fanatically anti-Jewish speech, beginning as follows: "It is with tears in my eyes that I beg the venerable assembly to apply itself to the purification of the country of the leprosy of corruption. Rise up! Rise up! ... Exterminate these pestiferous Jews who harden their hearts without letup in new follies, examine the laws of Moses which our Majesty will promulgate against them."

Heinrich Graetz has distorted his translation here. Maurice Pinay, in *Complots contre l'Église*, presents the original text: "Most reverend fathers and honourable Fathers of the Celestial Ministers... show the discipline of your fervour against the perfidious, and extinguish the bitterness of the proud, lighten the burden of the oppressed, and the more you will deracinate the Judaic pestilence which is daily growing in fury" (*et quod plus hic omnibus est, judaeorum pestem quae in novam semper recrudescit insaniam radicitus exstirpate*).

Of the twenty-seven paragraphs which King Erwig submitted for approval by the Council, only a single one concerned the Jews. All the others concerned those which had caused themselves to be baptised out of self-interest, and which, despite their written declarations, continued to practice Judaism in secret. Erwig proposed quite simply to oblige them to present themselves for baptism within one year, including their wives and relatives, and, in the event that they failed to comply with this order, to confiscate their property, to flagellate them with 100 strokes of a rod, tear the skin off their foreheads and expel them from the country.

The Council also approved a measure aimed at destroying the Jewish fifth column in the Church. Canon 18 established a veritable system of espionage in the very homes of Christian descendents of

Jewish ancestors, and required their Christian servants to report their Judaic practices, offering them their freedom in reward. This law, addresses to these servants, ordered: "whether at any time, those who proclaim, say, or swear that they are Christians, and who discover the disbelief of his or her masters and who renounce their error, shall immediately obtain their freedom."

Judaising Christians travelling on the territory were also compelled to present themselves before the ecclesiastical authorities of the localities where they stopped, to cause it to be observed that they faithfully fulfilled their religious duties.

A new council, presided over by the metropolitan Julian, from Toledo, of Jewish origin, approved all the measures proposed by Erwig and decided that they should never be abolished. Two days after the closure of the assembly, on 25 January 681, all Jews were convened to announce the provisions of the measures taken against them. For the third time, baptised Jews were compelled to abjure Judaism and sign an act of faith. The Jews were ordered to carry the text of the laws concerning them on their person at all times, so that it might not be possible to allege an ignorance of the law in the event of disobedience.

The power of the Jews in Spain was completely annihilated by King Egica, who had married Erwig's daughter and who reigned from 687 to 702.

In the year 694, a vast conspiracy was discovered. False Christians, in contact with their brothers in Africa, were plotting to foment a revolution. Felix, the archbishop of Toledo, then reacted promptly, and convened a new council which took cognisance of the proofs of the crypto-Jewish conspiracy. The eighth canon of the 17th council of Toledo, *On the Condemnation of the Jews*, ordered as follows:

"Their wicked deeds are without number; for this reason, those who, due to their wickedness, have not only sought to perturb the state of the Church, but have, with a tyrannical boldness, gone so far as to attempt to destroy the country and the nation, must weep for having incurred such a grave sin of hatred; so much so that in rejoicing in the belief that their time has now come, they have caused a variety of ravages to Catholics. For this reason, their stupefying and cruel presumption must be extirpated by an even crueller punishment. So that the judge might deal all the more severely with them, and that we must chastise those whom we know to have been conceived with an even greater perversity".

King Egica totally expropriated the Jews, prohibited them from possessing houses and lands, prohibited them from navigation and trading with Africans, and, generally, from engaging in any business

relationships with Christians. The Jews were obliged to cede their immovable property to the tax authorities, which gave them a sort of compensation. Moreover, they were expelled from their residences.

All the Jews of Spain were reduced to servitude and distributed among the great lords of the country, without the possibility of ever being freed. Jewish children under the age of 7 were taken away from their parents, so as to be raised as Christians:

“And as regards their children of both sexes, we hereby decree that, starting at the age of seven, they shall be separated from the company of their two parents, without ever being permitted to see them again or have any contact with them, their own Lords being required to entrust them to the most loyal Christians, in such a way that the boys are placed among Christian women and vice versa, and, as we have said, that they never permit the parents, or, even less, the children to hold any ceremonies of the Judaic superstition under any pretext.”

The punishments, approved by the Council against the crypto-Jewish conspirators, were applied in all the provinces of the Visigoth empire, with the exception of Gallia Narbonensis (Septimanie), which was then being devastated by a mortal epidemic. This tolerance was granted on the condition that the Jews become sincere Christians. Numerous Jews then emigrated, but as could be observed over the subsequent centuries, these fake Christians did not abandon Judaism and the south of France was transformed into a new Judea. The region was fated to become the new headquarters of the most destructive revolutionary heresies.

The Visigoth empire was coming to an end. In April 711, Tarik, a Moslem conqueror, crossed the narrow straits of Gibraltar and invaded Andalucía with considerable forces. The Moslem armies were swollen with all the Jews who had been banned from Spain, as well as by those who remained in the peninsula.

During the month of July, the armies of Roderick, the last king of the Visigoths, were defeated, and the Moslems advanced rapidly towards the interior of the country. Thanks to the support of the Jews, to whom they entrusted the government of the cities they had conquered, the Moslem generals were free to use almost their entire army to continue the conquest of the country.

At Toledo, on Palm Sunday, 712, the Jews allowed the Moslems to enter the city. The grandes and clergy had fled, and, while the Christians invoked divine protection in their churches, the Jews opened the doors of the city walls and joined the Moslems in massacring the Christians.[76]

The testimonies of the Christian historians are moreover in

accordance with that of Heinrich Graetz, who assures us, once again, that the Jews "opened the gates of the city to the Arab general, whom they acclaimed as a liberator".[77]

Another Jewish intellectual, Jacques Attali, confirms this statement: "With their assistance, the Moslem troops defeated King Roderick in July 711 and quickly conquered the entire peninsula".[78]

All of Spain became a Moslem province. To reward the Jews for their services rendered, the Moors treated them favourably, permitting them to practice their religion openly, with their own private courts. They thus recovered all their power and acted any way they liked towards the Caliph.

The first omeyyad caliphs were "tolerant and enlightened" sovereigns, writes Graetz, "whose conduct was not inspired by the narrow doctrines of the Koran".

Spain under Moslem domination remained for the Jews a Golden Age for which they long with infinite nostalgia.

The Jewish historian Leon Poliakov writes in this regard: "In 711, the Arab invasion propelled the Jews to the top of the social scale, as the advisors and allies of the conquerors".[79]

And Jacques Attali confirms: "The Jews had never experienced such a wonderful place to live as this European Islamic paradise of the 8th century". Jewish financiers were triumphant.[80]

34

**Agobard and Amulo**

The reigns of Charlemagne (768–814) and his son Saint Louis, also called Louis the Pious (814–840), were a happy period for the Jews. They were treated “with benevolence”, writes Graetz, “and were permitted to possess lands, practise professions and become shipowners... they were no longer troubled by harassment or vexations”.

At this time, the Jews established themselves in several regions of Germany, where they spread into the regions inhabited by Slavs, beyond the Oder, into Bohemia and in Poland. Large-scale trade was largely in their hands. They were “the principal import-export brokers”, writes Graetz, “purchasing and selling goods and slaves”.

The activities of Western Jews were expanding everywhere. Bernard Lazare writes here: “Protected in Spain by the caliphs, supported by Charlemagne, who allowed the Merovingian laws to fall into desuetude, they expanded their commerce, which had until then consisted principally of slave-trading. They were moreover particularly well-favoured for this trade. Their communities were in constant contact with each other”.[81]

Charlemagne nevertheless imposed a specific formula which distinguished them from Christians, upon Jews who appeared as witnesses or complainants against a Christian: “They could only swear”, writes Graetz, “except after being surrounded by spines, holding the rolls of the Law in the right hand and calling upon themselves the leprosy of Naaman in the event of perjury”. That is to say, that the Christians distrusted the testimonies of Jews, always systematically ready to take the defence of their fellow Jews.

But the happiest time for the Jews of France was that of the reign of Louis the Pious (also called Saint Louis). The emperor protected them from the hostility of the barons and the clergy, permitted them to travel freely throughout the kingdom, authorised them not only to employ Christian workers, but to deal in slaves as well. The merchant Abraham de Saragossa was also free to purchase slaves in foreign countries – most of them still pagans – and to resell them in the empire of the Saracens. The emperor also prohibited the clergy from baptising the slaves of Jews and from removing them from their masters by means of manumission.[82]



Under Charlemagne and his son, the Jews, thanks to their relations with their fellow Jews, concentrated all the trade of the country in their hands, especially the exportation and importation of goods.[83] Fairs which had previously been scheduled for the Jewish Sabbath (i.e., Saturday) were rescheduled for Sunday. It was enough for them to pay a franchise tax and render annual accounts of their income and they could trade without hindrance.

They could only be sentenced to the punishment of flagellation by their own courts. A special official, bearing the title of master of the Jews (*magister Judaeorum*), was responsible for supervising compliance with their laws. Some were appointed tax farmers. Louis I, Saint Louis, showed himself "very favourable to the Jews", Graetz confirms. One might perhaps attribute this attitude to the influence of his second wife, Judith, who had a profound veneration for Judaism.

Agobard, archbishop of Lyon from 814 to 840, denounced the weakness of Saint Louis with regards to the Jews, and opposed their influence with his strength, with an indefatigable ardour. Graetz calls him a "bitter enemy of the Jews". But at court, all-powerful Jewish financiers had bribed the political personnel and won over the principal officers and lords to their cause. Proud of their imperial letters, which they ostentatiously displayed, the Jews thought they could do anything they liked, defying the threats of the clergy and the statutes of the ancient councils.

We have seen how, under the Merovingian kings, a simple order from a bishop was sufficient to banish all Jews from a diocese. Agobard, bishop of Lyon, and, by consequence, one of the heads of the French clergy, was not even capable of enforcing the decrees of the kings and councils against them.

Agobard, who suffered much at their hands, exposes their excesses and complains in a first letter to Louis the Pious, *Espistola de baptizandis Hebraeis*. Five other letters were to follow.[84] In his treatise *De insolentia Judaeorum* (827), he once again warned the emperor against the Jews; they built synagogues, extorted money by all possible means, refused to tolerate the existence of public markets on Saturday, although they were the custom everywhere; finally, they went so far as to kidnap Christian children, taking them to Spain and selling them to the Saracens as slaves.

Agobard cited precise facts, such as the arrival in his diocese of a Spaniard originally from Córdoba, who, twenty-five years earlier, had been kidnapped by Llyonnais Jews and sold as a slave while still a child. The Codoban succeeded in fleeing in the company of another victim, a native of Arles, who had been in the same situation for six

years. Agobard requested an inquiry into this shameful traffic, which showed that the kidnapping and sale of Christian children by Jews was nothing exceptional.[85]

One day, Agobard baptised a slave, a Jew from Lyon who had fled from his master's house, so that he might regain his freedom. The Jewish officials had requested the imperial administration to return the fugitive slave to his owner, and Agobard, who had refused to obey, had been deposed. He obtained the support of the ecclesiastical party at court, so that the canonical laws might simply be applied, while, for their part, the Jews pulled all the strings required to exert an influence over the Emperor. Louis the Pious appointed a commission to examine the matter in dispute, which was finally decided in favour of the Jews.

Retired in his diocese, Agobard nevertheless continued to fight the enemy. He dealt with the question in five epistles, which followed the traditional doctrine of the Church: "Keep the Jews at a distance, do not allow them to dominate".[86] At his order, the priests attacked the Jews in their sermons, prohibited their members from maintaining relations with them, from buying from, or selling to them, from taking part in their meals or entering their service. The Jews of Lyon then obtained letters of protection (*indiculi*), bearing the imperial seal, and Agobard received the order to put an end to their propaganda (around 828).

But the bishop of Lyon never lost heart. He organised a collective procedure and wrote to all the bishops in France so as to put pressure on King Louis to re-erect the bar which had previously protected the Christians. Perhaps he already knew that the conspirators were preparing to raise the son of the Emperor's first marriage against the Empress and arch-chancellor Bernhard, who had advised the monarch to make a new division of the Empire to the benefit of the child of Judith. On Agobard's reiterated instances, numerous prelates met at Lyon, in 829, and an address was sent to Louis to set forth the dangers resulting from the liberties granted to the Jews. He also wrote a letter to Nibridicus, bishop of Narbonne, another booklet, *De cavendo convictu et societate Judaeorum*, and, finally, in collaboration with Bernard, archbishop of Vienna, a small treatise entitled *de Iudaicis superstitionibus*.

This treatise, *On the Superstitions of the Jews*,[87] is preceded by an introduction in which Agobard justifies his past conduct regarding the Jews. He accuses them of all sorts of misconduct and, in particular, draws up a harsh indictment of their protectors and of those corrupted by them.

But Louis the Pious paid no attention to this indictment drawn up by the synod of Lyon. In 830, Agobard, who took part in the conspiracy

formed against Empress Judith and her friends, was deposed and obliged to flee to Italy. He was later canonised by the Church.

In 840, upon the death of Saint Louis, war broke out immediately between his sons related to the distribution of the vast empire of Charlemagne. The favours granted to Charles the Bald, son of Louis and Judith, to the detriment of his elder half-brothers, were the cause of the troubles which agitated the end of his reign. In 843, Charlemagne's empire was divvied up into three parts.

Charles the Bald, who was awarded western France, seemed to have inherited his mother's predilection for Judaism. This sovereign employed Jews at court, like the other Carolingians. An Israelite, Judah, was his banker and treasurer. In a letter, Charles calls him *Juda son féal*, and mentions the good services being rendered him by the Jew.[88] His doctor was another Jew named Sedekias. "Under his reign", writes Graetz, "the Jews were able to continue to occupy themselves freely with their trafficking and acquire lands". The Jews succeeded in establishing themselves in various offices as tax collectors, from which office they seem to have been excluded under the Merovingian kings, and the Christians complained of the humiliating harshness with which they were treated by the Jews.[89] Charles imposed only slight restrictions on Jewish merchants, obliging them to pay 11% of their income to the tax authorities, while other merchants paid only 10%.

Their bitterest enemy at that time was Agobard's disciple and successor, Amolon, the archbishop of Lyon. In his *Amulonis Epistola contra Judaeos*, Amolon writes: "Cursing the infidelity of the Jews and seeking to protect the Christian people from their contagion, I demanded three times, publicly, that the faithful keep away from them, that no Christian should serve them, neither in the cities, nor the villages, allowing them to have their work done by pagan slaves; I then prohibited them from tasting their food and drinks. And I published several strict orders so as to root out the evil and imitate the example of our pious pastor, master and predecessor Agobard".

Hincmar, the bishop of Reims and favourite of the emperor Charles, as well as the archbishops of Sens and Bourges and other ecclesiastics, supported him in his struggle. In 845, meeting in council in the city of Meaux, these prelates decided to reinstate the effectiveness of the ancient canonical laws. They informed the king of precisely which measures which they intended to apply to the Jews, and contented themselves with indicating the edicts promulgated against them since Constantine, mentioning the prohibition passed against them by Theodosius II, forbidding them from occupying any employment or

dignity and recalling the decisions of the councils, such as the edict of the Merovingian king Childebert which prohibited them from exercising the functions of judge or customs duty farmers or appearing in the streets during Easter Week. They also invoked the synodal decisions taken outside of France, particularly the provisions enacted by the Visigoths against relapsed Jews.

Charles the Bald took no account of the decisions of the bishops and dissolved the council, although his favourite, Hincmar, was a member. On 14 February 846, on his order, a new council met in Paris to examine the amendments to be made to the organisation of the Church, but the king prohibited them from discussing the Jews.

Amulon advised the high clergy to put pressure on the princes and lords to abolish the privileges of the Jews. In the letter which he sent to the prelates with this aim in mind, we find the complaints enumerated by Agobard. Little by little, anti-Judaism was making progress. At Béziers, the bishop at that time pronounced inflammatory sermons every year, starting on the evening before Palm Sunday and ending on the day after Easter Sunday, accompanied by serious disturbances. People picked up stones, the only weapon permitted on these occasions, and threw them at the Jews' houses. The Jews, according to the same ancient custom, were permitted to defend themselves in the same way. The city was in a state of anarchy and near civil war, which lasted until Easter Sunday. A chronicler assures us that many people were injured on both sides.[90] "Blood flowed on both sides", Graetz writes. These disorders became traditional in the city of Béziers, and were renewed every year for centuries. It was only by force of money that the Jews of Béziers succeeded in having this custom abolished in 1160. The Viscount Raymond, nicknamed Trincavalle, by a solemn act which has been found in the archives of Béziers cathedral, committed himself to pardon the Jews for their customary insults, by virtue of the sum of two hundred sous and a rent of four livres, payable on Palm Sunday and intended for use in ornamenting the church.[91]

The counts of Toulouse had the right, on Holy Friday, to slap the trustee of the Jews of the city, before the cathedral. This was the so-called "colaphisation" ceremony. In 1018, the chaplain of the Count Aimeri de Rochechouart, named Hugo, demanded authorisation to exercise this lordly right, and gave the trustee a slap so violent that the victim died.[92] This custom had been instituted following a treason committed by the Jews at the time of the Moslem invasion.

We find the Jews at the beginning of the 10th century, during the time of Charles the Simple. The Jews had been expelled from the county of Narbonne and the king made a gift to the archbishop and the

churches of the lands, vineyards, houses and mills which had belonged to them.[93] But France was too disturbed by the invasions of the Normans for them to pay much attention to them.[94]

**35**

**The Kings of the Eastern Trade**

In the East, the Jews hardly had to suffer under the reigns of Harun-al-Rashid and his sons, who succeeded them at Baghdad. But they were distinguished from the other inhabitants: in the year 807, Harun-al-Rashid obliged them to attach a piece of yellow cloth to their garments as a distinctive mark. It is possible that this measure was only the reaction to persecutions directed against the Christians, who, for their part, were obliged to wear a piece of blue cloth.

In Palestine, the situation, however, deteriorated. In 809, after the death of Harun and the division of the empire, war broke out between his two sons, Mohamed Alemin and Abdullah Almamun. Graetz writes here:

“The sufferings of the Jews of Palestine were such that one preacher declared that painful trials were surely announcing the coming of the Messiah.[95] At the end of time, two brothers would reign over the Ishmaelites (the Moslems): at this time, David’s offspring would once again flourish and the master of the heavens would give birth to a kingdom which would never again disappear... God would exterminate the sons of Esau (Byzantium), the enemies of Israel, as well as the sons of Ishmael, his adversaries.”

In Jewish eschatology, as we know, Christians and Moslems were to be definitively vanquished and annihilated. But “this messianic hope was not to be realised”, writes Graetz. The caliphate was shaken but not destroyed by the civil war; Alemin was killed and Almamun proclaimed sole head of the empire. After Almamun’s death, the Jews were gradually subjected to certain restrictions, as in the Christian countries. The caliph Almutawakki, Almamun’s successor, reinstated Omar’s laws and required the Jews – and the Christians – to wear clothes of a certain colour and shape, transformed the synagogues into mosques, prohibited Jews from holding public office, and prohibited Moslems from teaching them (849–856). They no longer had the right to ride on horseback, and could only travel about by mule or donkey (853–854). If they purchased a house, they were required to pay the caliph the tenth part of its value.

While waiting, the Jews exercised their dominion over trade and finance. Around the year 1000, they were the masters, as is confirmed

by the Jewish historian Léon Poliakov: "Kings of finance at Baghdad and bankers to the caliphs, for a quarter century, were ben-Pichras and ben-Amram, who, although they were the first, were not the only ones. Another chronicle informs us that the majority of the Jewish merchants from Tustar in Persia were Jews.

"At Ispahan, called for its flourishing commerce 'the second Baghdad', the Yiddish quarter was the business centre." [96]

There are very few sources concerning the Radhanites, these Jewish merchants of the Middle Ages who dominated trade between the Christian and Islamic worlds. During the High Middle Ages, they were the only traders dealing with the Near-East and Asia. Based in the valley of the Rhône, they travelled to North Africa, traversing Spain, Italy and the Near East, reaching India and China over the Asian continent. Ibn Khurdadbeh, who was the director of the post office and police in the province of Jibal, in approximately the year 870, wrote: "These merchants speak Arabic, Persian, Greek, Frank, Spanish and Slavic. They travel from the West to the East, partly by land, partly by sea. They transport eunuchs from the West, slaves (both women and boys), silks, beaver, marten and other furs, and swords".

The merchants could also take another route, always through the valley of the Rhône, through Germany and the Balkan countries, or through the north, through Russia. The historians Cecil Roth and Claude Cahen actually situate the centre of Rhadanite activity in the valley of the Rhône, the Latin name for which was Rhodanus. But other specialists affirm that their name was derived from Persian, from rah ("road") and dan ("he who knows").

The Rhadanites played an essential role in the slave trade, which experienced a strong development in the 9th and 10th centuries. Verdun at that time was one of the principal markets. The slaves were captured from the Slavic and pagan tribes of the oriental marches of the Carolingian empire, and resold all over the Islamic world. The traffic dominated by Jewish merchants was important, since, among us, the word *servus* disappeared in favour of the word *slavus*, which we transformed into "slave".

Nevertheless, the Jewish community of Verdun, which was considered the centre of this trade, consisted of no more than a few dozen members. [97]

Verdun was also an important location for the castration of slaves. The Jews of Verdun, in actual fact, were accustomed to castrate their Christian slaves to make eunuchs out of them, intended for the harems of Saracen princes. [98] The charters of the Emperor Louis the Pious have left us the names of two merchants from Lyon, David and Joseph,

who benefited from the privilege to practice this lucrative commerce. From Lyon, the merchants travelled with their merchandise to Arles, where there was a major Jewish community, then proceed on to Narbonne, which at that time sheltered the largest Jewish community in Europe, before crossing the Pyrenees.[99] Trading in European slaves declined somewhat over the following centuries, when the Moslems began to replace them with African Negroes.



36

**Granada, 30 December 1066**

All of southern Spain was then in the hands of the Moslems. Since Tarik's invasion in the year 711, the Jews had been experiencing a Golden Age on the peninsula. The medievalist historian Jacques Heers writes: "Our authors, Moslems and Christians, insist particularly on the role of the Jews who, in Moslem Spain, often formed the majority of the population in the large cities, particularly Granada, commonly called the 'city of the Jews' in the 8th century. Traders in luxury products, metals, jewellery and silks, more rarely lenders at interest, they gathered in small societies of relatives and friends".

The white slave trade was their business. Roberta Strauss-F Feuerlicht, a Jewish woman historian, confirms this: in central Europe, "Jews from Bohemia purchased female Slavs and resold them to Spanish Jews who resold them to the Moors".[100]

During the 10th century, Moslem slave merchants disliked travelling into Gaul, where they encountered only hostile populations. "You didn't see them frequenting the slave markets while the Jews were commonly depicted as the masters of this unhappy trade", writes James Heers... "People were assured that since the Moslems refused to do it, these Israelites supervised the correct management of the slave castration centres".[101]

Nevertheless, here, as elsewhere, their prosperity, their arrogance, their immorality, their manner of ceaselessly ridiculing the customs of other people and their determination to gain undivided domination led to their being the target of the hostility of the peoples.

At the head of Andalucían Judaism was a certain Samuel ibn Nagrela or Nagdela. Towards 1025, he became the intimate secretary of King Habus, who consulted him for all matters of importance. In 1027, upon the death of his vizir, the Berber King Habus raised Samuel to the dignity of Minister of State (katib), and conferred upon him the management of diplomatic and military affairs. Old Samuel ibn Nagrela died in 1055 and was buried at Granada, near the Puerta de Elvira. His son, Abu Hussein Joseph ibn Nagrela (born in 1031) erected a magnificent mausoleum for him, and succeeded his father in all his offices. To his misfortune, the people were exasperated by Jewish domination at this time.

Edouard Drumont describes this episode in his *La France juive*, in 1886: "He revolted everyone through his insolence (*insolentia Judaeorum*), he grossly insulted the religion of the country and it was not long before everyone had only one desire: to get rid of him and the clique which followed him at every step. 'The kingdom then', says an Arabic historian, 'was worth less than a night light when daylight has long since appeared'".

A religious poet, the glorious Abu Ishak Al Elbiri (of Elvira), went from city to city, excoriating weaknesses and personal defects, preaching devotion, reconciling amongst themselves the Cindhadjites and the Berbers, who had long been enemies, reciting his famous *Kacid* rhymed in *noun* to excite people to courage. Everywhere, the crowds joined in repeating the refrain from his song with him: "The Jews have become great lords... they reign everywhere in the capital and in the provinces; they have palaces encrusted with marble, ornamented with fountains, they are magnificently dressed and dine sumptuously, while you are poorly dressed and badly nourished".

The Jewish historian Léon Poliakov presents the remarks of the poet Abu Ishak of Elvira: "The head of the monkeys has enriched his town house with marble inlays; he has had fountains constructed whence flows the purest water, and while he makes us wait at his door, he mocks us and our religion. If I said that he is as rich as you, oh my king, I would be telling the truth. Ah, make haste and cut his throat and offer them as a holocaust, sacrifice him, he is a fat sheep! Nor should you spare his relatives and allies; they, too, have amassed immense treasures".[102] It is here one of the very rare examples, from the pen of a Jewish author, where the anti-Semitism of the population seems nearly explicable.

The murder of the Jew was resolved upon by a small number of conspirators. The occasion was supplied by the incursion of soldiers from a neighbouring sovereign, Almotassem, prince of Almeria, who came to invade Granada. One Saturday night, the Berbers took Joseph's palace by storm, killing the Jew and nailing his body in the form of a cross to the gate of Granada. This was 30 December 1066.

The minister's death overexcited the fury of the people, who resolved to finish off the Jews in the kingdom. More than four thousand Jews were killed. The cleansing of Granada produced a profound impression all over Spain.

Edouard Drumont continues his tale as follows: "Legend has conserved the memory of the superb disinterestedness shown by Abu Ishaq. When in the gardens of his persecutor, the crowd came to bring the poet before whom the military leaders had respectfully lowered

their bloody scimitars, with piles of gold, sparkling jewellery, precious necklaces, shimmering materials, and art objects piled up on the ground by the thousands, Abu took a pomegranate hanging from a tree, opened it, wet his lips and said: 'The heat is very great today, I was thirsty; share these treasures, my children, but do not forget to say your prayers this evening, since God alone is great!' "[103]

## 37 Gregory VII

The situation of the Jews in the heart of Europe did not begin to darken again before the start of the 11th century. In 1012, the Germanic Emperor Henry II ordered the expulsion of the Jews from Mayence. To save their lives or their property, numerous Jews had already embraced Christianity. But the Jews pressured the prince through one of them: "Thanks to pressing procedure, supported by large sums of money", writes Graetz, "Simon ben Isaac succeeded in stopping the persecutions and in obtaining the authorisation for his fellow Jews to resettle in Mayence".

But in 1078, at the Council of Rome, Pope Hildebrand, known under the name of Gregory VII, son of a modest carpenter, resolved to reduce their power. He prohibited admitting the Jews to public posts or granting them any authority whatsoever over Christians. Heinrich Graetz now writes, rather comically: "He deemed it necessary to humiliate the weak Jews and outlaw them in the regions where they were loved and esteemed!"

In the Holy Roman Empire, despite the prohibition under canonical law and the Pope's express desire, the Jews were once again able to buy Christian slaves and hire Christian wet nurses and domestic servants. On 6 February 1095, he promulgated an edict which prohibited them from baptising Jews or their slaves by force, and which ordered that trials between Jews and Christians be judged according to Jewish law.

In a document written in 1090, the Jews of Prague, which was then a city of the Empire, are described as merchants and money changers possessing large sums of money; they were the richest merchants of all peoples. The Jewish author Julius Brutzkus writes: "As early as the 11th century, the Jews possessed salt mines at Nuremberg. They traded in arms and exploited the treasures of the churches. But their great specialty was slavery".

Jewish merchants coming from the Far East and traversing the frontiers by caravan are also mentioned in documents written in 1124 and 1222. The interest rates among the Jewish bankers of Prague, whose business affairs were quite extensive, fluctuated between 108 and 180%.

In Poland, as well, certain Jewish merchants prospered from slavery. The chronicler Gallus says that in 1085, Judith, the wife of the prince Ladislas Herman, of Poland, attempted to buy back Christian slaves from Jewish merchants.[104]

## 38

### The First Crusade

At the end of the 11th century, the umteenth crank Jew, taking himself for a prophet, awakened the messianic hopes in the hearts of the Jews of Germany and the north of France. He calculated that, towards the end of the 256th lunar cycle, between 1096 and 1104, the Messiah would come to reunite the dispersed sons of Israel, transport them to Jerusalem and bring them mastery of the world. But instead, the Jews witnessed the violence of the Crusaders, departing for the Holy Land.

On 27 November 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II launched an appeal for the Crusade to go and assist the Byzantine emperor threatened by the Turks, and free the Holy Land. The first two armies of the Crusades, directed by Peter the Hermit and Walter Sans-Avoir, did not particularly mistreat the Jews: but the other bands, also arriving from France, England, Lorraine and Flanders, prepared for holy war against the Moslems by massacring all the Jews they could find. They were "proud", "malevolent", "insolent", wrote the monk from Cluny, Raoul Glaber. In France itself, whence the Crusade departed, such massacres were very rare. Only at Rouen, a city which at that time belonged to England, did the Crusaders attack Jews, forcing them to convert, and cutting their throats if they refused. An event described as follows in an old French translation: "And those who did not wish to believe were killed and sent to the devil".[105] Neither excommunication pronounced by the priests nor the threats and prohibitions promulgated by princes were able to prevent such occurrences.[106]

Guibert de Nogent (1055–1125) abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, born in the Beauvaisis, was one of the principal chroniclers of the First Crusade, which he described in his *Gesta Dei per Francos*: "We wish to go fight the enemies of God in the East, but we have our eye on the Jews, a race more hostile to God than is any other".[107]

Pierre de Cluny, who was then the most important person in Christendom after the Pope, reiterated Guibert de Nogent's question addressed to Philip I of France: "Why must we seek the enemies of Christ in faraway countries, when the blasphemous Jews, who are much worse than the Saracens, live in our midst and outrage Christ and the sanctuaries of the Church with impunity?" In 1096, Philip I

followed the advice of Peter from Cluny and expelled the Jews from his lands.

Christian vengeance found an outlet in Germany in particular. The bands that penetrated the land were led by a French knight, William the Carpenter of Melun. The Jews of Trier were shaking with fright at the mere news of the approach of the Crusaders. Having met to deliberate, they decided "to adopt Christianity in appearance" at the suggestion of one of their chiefs, named Michele (according to Heinrich Graetz). Archbishop Égilbert read the Credo to them aloud, the Jews repeated it, and they were then baptised.

From Trier, the Crusaders turned towards Spire. The Jews of this city had been declared inviolable by the bishop and Emperor both, but the Crusaders paid no attention and the Christians revenged themselves for all their humiliations on 3 May 1096. The Jews escaped massacre by seeking refuge in the palace of bishop Johansen, who granted his protection, as well as in the imperial fortress. The bishop also had a few Crusaders seized and hanged, which put an end to the disorders.

The bands waited for more pilgrims, and, thus reinforced, marched on Worms. Bishop Allebrand did not wish to defend the Jews of the city, but nevertheless offered asylum in his palace to a certain number of them. On Sunday 16 May, the Crusaders pillaged and destroyed the houses of the Jews, tearing up and burning the rolls of the Torah. 800 Jews were killed that day.

At Mayence, the Crusaders were led by a certain Count Emich of Leiningen (in Rhenania), who was a close relative of the archbishop Ruthard. More than three thousand Jews were camped in the courtyard of the archbishop's palace when, on Tuesday 27 May, at dawn, Emich arrived with his bands and invaded the bishop's residence. None of the Jews enclosed in the archbishop's palace escaped alive. The only protector able to come to their assistance, Emperor Henry IV, was then in Italy, occupied with defending himself.

After Mayence, it was Cologne's turn. Under the leadership of William the Carpenter, the Crusaders gathered around the city on the evening before Pentacost. On Midsummer's Night, they invaded Neus, one of the villages in which Jews had hidden themselves, and massacred them. From there, they visited other villages, looking for Jews who had taken refuge there, killing all those they found.

The number of Jews from the communities of the Rhine who were killed between the month of May and July 1096 is estimated at twelve thousand. The others, who had momentarily embraced Christianity, hoped that, upon his return from Italy, the Emperor would renew his protection and once again permit them to live according to their ancient faith.

In actual fact, upon his return from Italy, in 1097, Emperor Henry IV publicly announced his compassion for the Jews and, at the request of the head of the Jewish community of Spire, Moses ben Guthiel, authorised all Jews who had been baptised by force to return to Judaism. "There was general joy among the Jews of Germany", writes Graetz. "All the baptised Jews threw off their Christian mask". In 1103, the Emperor again ordered the princes and bourgeoisie to swear that they would refrain from mistreating the Jewish population and that they would allow them to live in peace.

At this news, the Jews of Bohemia also resumed their old religion. But, in the fear of renewed persecution, they resolved to emigrate with their wealth to Poland and Hungary. Upon learning of the decision of the Jews, the Duke of Bohemia, Vratislaus, who had just returned to the country, had their houses occupied by soldiers, gathered their leaders together and declared that all their property was thereafter forfeit to the state. "When you came here", he told them, "you brought none of the treasures of Jerusalem with you. Defeated by Vespasian and sold for derisory prices, you were dispersed all over the world. Naked you came forth into this country, and naked shall thou depart from it" (Graetz). The Jews of Bohemia were thus despoiled of all the wealth which they had amassed at the expense of the Christians.

When, after long travails, Godfrey of Bouillon succeeded in taking Jerusalem by storm, both Jews and Saracens were seriously mistreated: "If you want to know what was done with the enemy at Jerusalem, know that at the Gate and Temple of Salomon, our people had the blood of the Saracens up to their horses' knees." As for the Jews, they were locked inside their synagogues, which were then set on fire. This occurred on 15 July 1099.



## 39

### Saint Bernard

The audacity of the Jews went so far as to attempt to occupy the throne of St. Peter. But the partisans of Cardinal Pier Leoni met with determined resistance.

At the beginning of the year 1130, while Pope Honorius II was in articulo mortis, Cardinal Aymeric persuaded him to institute a commission of eight cardinals to elect his successor. He would then remain at the Holy College to approve this choice. Pier Leoni's partisans, who held a majority in the Holy College, but were a minority on the commission, were thus defeated. When Honorius II died in the night of 13–14 February, Aymeric gathered the members of the commission present on the spot, and the virtuous Papareschi, Cardinal of Sant Angelo, with Judeo-sceptical tendencies, was thus elected by six votes to one, taking the name of Innocent II. The vote was confirmed by ten other cardinals of the same faction, most of whom were French. But a few hours later, three-quarters of the cardinals elected Pier Leoni, a false Christian, who took the name of Anacletus II. The result was the Great Schism.

Anacletus II was supported by the Jews of Rome and the Normans under King Roger II of Sicily, although Innocent II was compelled to leave Rome. He first took refuge in Tuscany, then Liguria, and finally in Provence.

When Saint Bernard, doctor of the Church and abbot from Clairvaux, became aware of these unfortunate events, he resolved to abandon his peaceful and tranquil life in a monastery and enter battle, at the very moment when the battle seemed lost, since the crypto-Jewish Pope entirely dominated the situation thanks to his gold and the support which he continued to receive, while Innocent II was abandoned and a fugitive, excommunicated by Anacletus. In a letter addressed to the Emperor Lothair, Bernard wrote that "it was an affront to Christ for a descendant of a Jew to occupy the throne of Saint Peter".

Emperor Lothair II did not prove himself in a hurry to decide, but the King of France, Louis VI, was more reactive, no doubt on the wise promptings of Abbot Suger, his advisor. He convened the archbishops of Sens, Reims and Bourges at Sens, as well as the bishops and abbots, among them Saint Bernard. In October 1130, Innocent II, in turn,

convened a synod at Clermon-Fernand to excommunicate Anacletus, and after the Council of Reims, in October 1131, the only remaining support for Pier Leoni was from Italy (in the majority) and, in particular, his brother-in-law, Duke Roger II of Sicily, who dominated the situation on the peninsula. This was the purpose of the marriage between the anti-Pope's sister, a converted Jewess, and the duke in question. Married to a sister of Pope Pier Leoni, Roger II supported the Jewish anti-Pope with all his resources, while simultaneously opening his court to Jews and Moslems.

To triumph over the crypto-Jew occupying Rome required a military invasion. Saint Bernard and Saint Norbert, founder of the Norbertine order and archbishop of Magdeburg, convinced German Emperor Lothair II to undertake such an invasion. Joining Innocent in northern Italy with a small army, he advanced on Rome, which they took without meeting resistance in 1133, since many nobles betrayed Anacletus at the last moment. Lothair installed Innocent at Lateran, while Pier Leoni took refuge in the castle of Sant Angelo. But, as Roger II advanced at the head of an army, Lothair was forced to withdraw, leaving the new Jewish anti-Pope master of the situation. His position as "Jewish Pontiff" continued until his death, on 25 January 1138.

Innocent was obliged to flee to France. There, the combative monk obtained the support of King Louis VII and put together an army at the head of which he again invaded Italy. At the gates of Rome, this time, he received the unexpected support of Roger II of Sicily. The Norman chief had much changed over the years, and he understood that he had been tricked. He promulgated laws requiring the Jews in his States to convert. In offering Innocent his support, Roger of Sicily was doing a complete turnabout compared to his former policy. The Pope accepted his assistance, and Innocent II entered Rome with Roger's troops on 28 November 1149. Innocent II died in 1153, the same year as Saint Bernard.[108] The Crusade organised by Bernard had saved the Church from the clutches of Judaism, which led to his canonisation.

## 40

### The Second Crusade

Under the two Capetian kings, Louis VI and Louis VII, during the first half of the 12th century, the Jews of France enjoyed a prosperous situation. "Great affluence reigned among them", Graetz writes.

"They possessed, not only houses, but the countryside and the vineyards, which they either cultivated themselves or had cultivated by Christian servants. The story is even told, not without exaggeration, that half the city of Paris, not yet very important at that time, belonged to Jews."

Jewish financiers dominated the situation. A Jew from Dijon, named Salomon, was the creditor of several of the great abbots of Burgundy, such as Sainte-Benigne and Sainte-Seine, whose debts were only paid by Duchess Alix de Bourgogne in 1122, as attested by two charters of the said duchess.[109]

The count of Montpellier owed the sum of 50,000 sous to a Jew named Bendet. In a letter to the king of France, Pope Innocent III expressed his indignation at the fact that the Jews appropriated to themselves the property of the Church, acquiring lands and vineyards.[110]

If the powerful lords and great religious communities were indebted to the Jews, numerous private parties also found themselves dependent upon usurers, whose capital increased from day to day thanks to skilful speculations. The French were sunk so deeply in debt that they despaired of ever being free of them.

The slave trade was always one of the activities most favoured by Jewish merchants. In 1105, Count Bernard III granted a monopoly on the importation of Sicilian slaves to three Jews, merchants and ship owners from Barcelona.[111] In Germany, the slave trade was flourishing at this same time. In the customs duty tables of Wallenstadt and Coblenz, we note that the Jewish merchants had to pay four dinars for each slave. A document written in 1213 says of the Jews of Laubach "that they are extraordinarily rich and that they carry on a large-scale trade with the Venetians, the Hungarians and the Croats".[112]

The minds of the time were also concerned by the recapture of Jerusalem, in the hands of the Saracens. On 31 March 1146, at Vezelay,

in the presence of King Louis VII and an immense crowd, Bernard de Clairvaux preached a Crusade, promising absolution for all sins to those who took the cross. The following year, Louis VII departed on the Crusade, accompanied by Queen Eleanor.

Saint Bernard is always cited by the defenders of the Jews, because of two letters written in 1146 in which he expresses indignation against those who were massacring them. In the first, addressed to all Frankish bishops and the Frankish people, he in fact recalled that it was not permitted to kill, mistreat or pillage the Jews. But in his sermons, he insisted strongly on the bull issued by Pope Eugene III, who, to raise troops for his Crusader army, dispensed all those departing on the Crusade from payment to the Jews of the interest on their debts.

One of Saint Bernard's contemporaries, Pierre de Montboissier, abbot of Cluny, better known under the name of Peter the Venerable (1092–1156) was the author of a *Treatise against the Inveterate Hardening of the Jews* (*Tractatus adversus Iudeorum inveteratam duritiem*). He seems to be the first person in the Christian West to have used the Talmud as a source. He wrote to Louis VII in 1146: "What's the use of going to distant countries in search of the enemies of Christianity, while we allow the Jews, who are worse than the Saracens, to outrage our most holy practices in peace amongst us. Since the Saracen, while denying the dogma of the incarnation, at least admits that Jesus was born of a virgin, while the cursed Jew rejects all our beliefs. Loyal to the law which prohibits murder, I do not ask you to order the massacre of these blasphemers; God does not wish them exterminated; they must wander through the world like Cain, charged with shame and opprobrium, leading a life a thousand times worse than death. Their existence is vile, miserable and troubled by constant fears. It is not therefore necessary to kill them, but to inflict upon them a punishment in relation to their condition".

Peter the Venerable finished his letter by advising the king to despoil them of all their goods: "They must be execrated and hated", he says. "Of course, I do not demand that they be put to death; but that they be punished in a measure proportional to their perfidy... What could be more just than to despoil them of that which they have accumulated by fraud... What I say is known to everyone. If they fill their granaries with wheat, their cellars with wine, their sacks with gold coins, their chests with silver and gold, it is not by working the land, nor by serving in war, nor by practising any other useful and honourable labour; it is by tricking the Christians, it is by secretly buying at rock-bottom prices objects of great value which have been stolen or which they buy from thieves".[113]

The abbot also denounces the Jews as the principal receivers of stolen goods, particularly sacred objects stolen from churches: "When a brigand steals sacred vases, chalices, censers, at night, he hides among the Jews and sells them the objects of his theft. An ancient, but detestable, law, nevertheless passed by Christian princes, seemed to protect them in this scandalous commerce. According to this law, a Jew in whose house sacred ornaments are found, even if stolen by means of sacrilege, is not obligated to return them, nor to report the thief. Thus their crime remains unpunished, and that which would draw down the ultimate torment upon a Christian enriches a Jew and causes him to swim in abundance".[114] Then he continues: "Let us therefore take this ill-gotten overabundance (*pingüedo*) of riches from them, or at least strongly reduce it, and let the Christian army which, for the love of Christ, spares neither its gold, nor its goods, to permit them to triumph over the Saracens, refrain from sparing these treasures which the Jews have so criminally acquired. Let us spare their lives; but let us take their money. *Reservatur eis vita, auferatur ab eis pecunia*".[115]

Louis VII was not disposed to crack down in that manner. He was of course obliged to order the implementation of the papal bull which dispensed the Crusaders from paying their debts to the Jews. But under his reign, there was no legal measure of reprisals against the Jews. Pope Alexander III also wrote to the Archbishop of Bourges to complain of the king's overly great tolerance, and to remind him of the obligations recently prescribed by the Lateran Council.[116] The king simply ordered that converts who returned to Judaism could not remain in the kingdom, and that, if they were arrested, they would be subjected to capital punishment.

Thanks to the kindness of the king and his ministers, and the energetic intervention of Abbot Singer and Saint Bernard, the Jews were thus preserved from the fury of the Crusaders.

The situation was somewhat different in Germany, principally in the Rhenanian communities, which had already suffered from the First Crusade. It was a French monk, Rodolphe, a former Cistercian monk from Clairvaux, who, through his inflammatory speeches, caused an outburst of anti-Jewish violence. He took the lead in the revolt, went from city to city, from village to village, preaching extermination everywhere. The popular revolt would have been bloodier than the first one if Emperor Conrad III had not granted the Jews effective protection.

In his own domains, at Nuremberg and in other fortresses, Conrad offered them asylum, and requested the princes and ecclesiastics to defend them in the cities or regions where he had no direct power.

Nevertheless there were victims. The Jews of the banks of the Rhine purchased the right of refuge in their castles, from the princes, for money. Cardinal Arnold, of Cologne, gave them the fortress of Wolkenburg, near Königswinter, as well as arms with which to defend themselves; but as soon as they went out, they fell into the hands of the Crusaders.

The archbishop of Mayence, Henry I, chancellor of the Empire, also gave asylum in his palaces to a few Jews fleeing from the people's vengeance, but men succeeded in penetrating the archbishop's residence and massacring them before his very eyes. The archbishop announced this fact to Saint Bernard and asked him to attempt to repress these outbreaks of violence. The abbot of Clairvaux then published an order in which he said of the monk Rodolphe that he was "an unworthy son of the Church, a rebel against the superior of his convent, disobedient to the bishops, and preaching murder, contrary to the laws of religion". He added that it was indispensable not to mistreat the Jews, because the Church demanded their conversion in a special prayer on Holy Friday. "Now", he said, "it is impossible to convert them, if they are all killed". This order was addressed to the ecclesiastics and Christians of France and Bavaria.

He wrote to the clergy: "The Jews must not be persecuted; one must not sacrifice them or hunt them like wild beasts. See what the Gospels say in this regard. I know that it is prophesied with regards to the Jews in the Psalm: 'The Lord', says the Church, 'has revealed to me His will regarding His enemies: do not kill them, so that My people do not become forgetful'. They are, it is certain, the living signs which recall the Passion of the Saviour to us. Moreover, they have been dispersed all over the world, they may be witnesses to our redemption".[117]

In the abbot's letter 365, addressed to Henry, archbishop of Mayence, Bernard wrote again: "Does the Church not triumph every day over the Jews in a more noble way in showing them their errors or in converting them than in killing them? It is not in vain that the universal Church has established throughout the world the recitation of the prayer for the obstinately incredulous Jews, so that God may raise the veil which covers their heart, and bring them out of their obscurity to the light of Truth".[118]

He did not hesitate to preach before the burnt synagogues. But the rioters of the valley of the Rhine did not understand his Latin, nor his French. He nevertheless succeeded in causing the cessation of the persecutions. The monk Rodolphe, for his part, did not listen to Saint Bernard's injunctions and continued his work to free the people.

One day, the body of a Christian was found near Würzburg. Mobs immediately attacked the Jewish community of Würzburg, and more than twenty Jews were killed, including the rabbi Isaac ben Eliakim. Others were so badly beaten that they were left for dead. The bishop of the city caused the bodies to be taken into his palace and buried in his garden. It was 24 February 1147.

When Emperor Conrad left Germany, after having joined the Crusade with his knights and the largest part of his army, the revolts against the Jews multiplied. In May 1147, the people again massacred Jews in multiple locations on the territory.

The insurrection propagated itself in France, but there were only local disorders. At Carentan, in Normandy, in a courtyard in which various Jews had gathered, there was a real battle with the Crusaders. The Jews were killed, not one being spared.

In England, where numerous Jews from France had established themselves since William the Conqueror, they did not have to suffer any persecution at all, either, since King Stephen did not permit these excesses.

The second Crusade was therefore less painful for the Jews than the first; on the one hand, because the princes and high dignitaries of the Church protected them, and also because the German Emperor and the King of France, who had placed himself at the head of the Crusades, did not accept bands such as those of William the Carpenter and Emich of Leimingen in their armies.

The Jews of Germany nevertheless paid dearly for the protection accorded them; the Emperor considered himself the protector of the Jews from that time onwards, and the Jews, until then free and independents like the Germans and the Romans, became "serfs of the imperial chamber". They became inviolable, as servants of the Emperor, but in exchange, they had to pay an annual tribute to the treasury from that time onwards.

## 41

### The Almohads

In North Africa, a reformer named Abdallah ibn Tumart, a former student of the mystical philosopher Alaghazali at Baghdad, founded the sect of the Almohads, that is, "partisans of unity". Ibn Tumart propagated his doctrine with the sword, in the empire of the Almoravids, and after him, his disciple Abd el Mumen continued his work. From victory to victory, he overthrew the dynasty of the Almoravids and took control of the whole of northern Africa.

In 1146, close to taking control of Marrakesh, which had withstood a long siege, Abd el Mumen convened all the Jewish inhabitants and gave them the choice of conversion to Islam or death. Abd el Mumen permitted them to emigrate and even gave them time to sell their immovable property and other objects which they could not take with them. Those who remained had to become Moslems or die. Many Jews then abandoned Africa and crossed over into Spain, Italy, or other countries, but the majority accepted Islam. In the entire empire of the Almohads, which gradually extended from the Atlas mountains to Egypt, all the synagogues were destroyed,

"Most of the Jews who adopted Islam were only Moslems in appearance", writes Graetz. The Moslems were not very strict in this regard. It was enough to acknowledge that Mohammed was the Prophet and to visit the mosque from time to time, and "they were allowed to practice Judaism in secrecy". Even pious rabbis did not hesitate to become Moslems, because they were only required to declare that Mohammed was the prophet, without having to renounce their religion.

Abd el Mumen crossed the strait and marched into Andalucía. Torn by intestine divisions, Moslem Spain was rapidly conquered. Córdoba fell into the hands of the Almohads in the month of June 1148, and in less than a year, the largest part of Andalucía suffered the same fate. Wherever they passed, the Jews were condemned either to choose between apostasy, emigration or death, and the synagogues were destroyed. The Jewish schools of Seville were closed. "The others became Moslems in appearance and practised Judaism in secret, waiting for a favourable opportunity to return openly to their old religion."



## 42 Toledo, 1180

With the conquest of Moslem Andalucía by the Almohads, the Jews disappeared, at least in appearance. Many of them emigrated to the North, among the Christians whom they had betrayed centuries before, in the five kingdoms of Castile, Leon, Aragon, Portugal and Navarre.

Toledo, the capital of Castile, had more than 12,000 Jews and possessed several synagogues.[119] The country was governed at that time by Alphonse VII Raimundez, who was bought off, and who took a Jew named Judah ibn Ezra as his advisor. After conquering the fortress of Calatrava, located between Toledo and Córdoba, Alphonse entrusted the government of this city to Judah ibn Ezra, and granted him the title of prince at the same time.

In Christian Spain, the Jews exercised the professions of banker, tax farmers, and suppliers to the king, among other things. Royalty protected them in return for economic and political support. In Aragon, Jehudah de Cavallera was one of these big Jewish “capitalists” of the 13th century. They rented saltworks, coined money, supplied the army and owned large tracts of land and multitudes of livestock.[120] Israel Abraham also notes in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (volume II, page 402), that in the 12th century, “Spanish Jews owed their fortune to the slave trade”.

King Alphonse VIII was compelled to appoint the Jew Jehudah minister of finance. Married to an English princess, Alienor, Alphonse VII also had a favourite Jewess for seven years, Rachel, who was the daughter of his minister of finance. Rachel’s legendary love affair with King Alphonse inspired Lope de Vega’s play, *Las paces de los Reyes y Judía de Toledo*, four centuries later, reworked in the 19th century tragedy *Die Juden von Toledo* by Franz Grillparzer. Their love aroused the jealousy and hatred of the Queen.

In 1180, there was a plot to eliminate the woman who had bewitched the monarch’s heart. The conspirators forced their way into the palace, assassinated Rachel and her friends under the King’s eyes, a murder followed by a general attack on the Jews. Alphonse, seeing his subjects’ fury, from the nobility down to the commoners, dared not punish the assassins for fear of sharing the fate of his favourite. To Alphonse, this was a terrible warning.

After having done all they could to encourage the Moslem invasion of the peninsula in the 8th century, it was now in the Jews' interests to oppose them. As was their custom, they sub-contracted the undertaking, and, thanks to their gold, charged the Christians with this task. The Jews of Toledo, who were prospering in the Christian kingdoms, thus supported King Alphonse in his struggle against the Moors, supplying him with major subsidies. At the battle of Alarcos, on 19 July 1195, Alphonse was defeated and lost the elite of his knighthood. But on 16 July 1212, Alphonse took his revenge and crushed the Saracens at Las Navas de Tolosa.

43

**Philip Augustus**

Some of the Jews who had left Moslem Spain after the Almohad conquest found refuge in the south of France. At the end of the 12th century, the Jews of Languedoc and Provence were therefore rather numerous. They were "highly devoted to the interests of the country", writes Heinrich Graetz, without laughing, who adds; "The communities were closely linked to each other, lending each other mutual support under difficult circumstances. They generally lived in great ease, practising agriculture and maintaining commercial relations with Spain, Italy, England, Egypt and the Orient".

In the north of France, their situation remained rather prosperous until the last 20 years of the 12th century. King Louis VII, as we have seen, protected the Jews. He did not wish to enforce the decision of the Lateran Council against them, which prohibited them from employing Christian wet nurses or domestic servants, and despite the Pope's prohibition, he allowed them to build new synagogues. In the population, however, the Jews were the object of quite particular hatred.

It was starting with this epoch that accusations of ritual murder and the profanation of the host began to be made. Starting with the 12th century, there have been over 100 cases of profanation of the host and over 500 ritual murder trials, but these figures are probably lower than the true figure.[121]

In 1144, the body of a murdered apprentice was found in a wood near Norwich, England. Three years later, at Würzburg, the body of a Christian discovered in the Main caused the massacre of about 20 Jews.

In 1171, at Blois, all the Jews (men, women and children) were burnt after being condemned by a tribunal. For the first time, then, the Jews were accused of using Christian blood for the celebration of their Passover. One evening, at twilight, the servant of a lord saw a Jew throw the body of a child into the Loire, frightening the servant's horse and nearly throwing him into the Loire, too. The count Theobald (Thibaut) of Chartres then had all the Jews of Blois, about 50 persons, thrown into prison. The Jews attempted to buy their lives and offered him 100 livres of silver in cash and 180 livres in IOUs, but Theobald did not allow himself to be bribed, and sentenced them all to be burnt

alive. 34 men and 17 women perished in the flames. It was the 20th of the month of Sivan (26 May 1171).[122]

In 1180, Philip Augustus succeeded his father, Louis VII. According to the historian Rigord, the Jews owned almost half of Paris by this time.[123] Served by Christian domestic servants, the Jews lived in luxury while the entire Christian bourgeoisie, soldiery and peasants owed them money. In the cities, villages and suburbs, debts to the Jews were everywhere. A great many Christians were even expropriated by them as a result of Christian indebtedness to the Jews.

At this point, one must read the text by Abbot Claude Fleury (1640–1723). A native of Rouen, abbot Claude Fleury was the author of an *Histoire ecclésiastique*, a monument of erudition. He was elected to the Académie Française and appointed religious instructor to the future Louis XV. His description of Philip Augustus gives an idea of contemporary complaints against the Jews:

“King Philip was still anti-Jewish, because the antiquity of their establishment at Paris and the reputation of their doctors had made them so wealthy that they owned nearly half the town, which, despite the laws and the canons [rules of ecclesiastical law] they had Christian slaves of both sexes living in their houses with them, and made Jews out of them, and practised limitless usury against the Christians, the nobles, bourgeois and peasants, some of whom were compelled to sell their estates, while others had to live in the Jews’ houses, as prisoners, bound to servitude by oath”.[124]

“They live solely by trafficking, in the most sordid business deals imaginable; they are resellers, brokers, usurers. Some of them study medicine, and have dominated the trade since I’ve lived here... The Gospels speak of a woman who had suffered under several doctors, spending all her money on medications”.[125]

One of Philip’s first decisions was to regulate the problems linked to the presence of Jews in French territory. On 19 January 1180, a Sabbath, he ordered all the Jews in the royal estate arrested, without any formal charges against them, threw them in prison and only freed them for a ransom of 1,500 silver marks.

The same year, he cancelled all debts owed to Jews by Christians, obliging all the debtors to pay one fifth of their debts to the national treasury.

On 10 March 1182, an edict of the king despoiled the Jews of all their goods and expelled them from the royal domain. The Jews all had to leave between April and St John’s Night (24 June). As usual, they offered large sums of money, but the king remained intransigent. Despite all the gold offered him by the Jews, Philip Augustus remained firmly resolved.

The Jews were only allowed to take movable property with them; that which remained was redistributed to the guilds. The fields, vineyards, farms and other immovable property reverted to the crown. Philip was considered almost moderate in taking only one fifth of the amount of all the debts to the Jews, remitting the rest to the debtors.

This measure concerned above all the Jews of the Isle-de-France, who emigrated to southern France, in Burgundy, Champagne, Alsace and Lorraine.

Rigord remarks as follows on this event: "This year", writes Rigord, "deserves to be called a jubilee year, since the king's actions enabled the Christians to recover their property, encumbered by debts to Jews".

The following year, the king ordered all the synagogues transformed into churches, which aroused the blessings of his entire people.[126] Only a few Jews who had gotten themselves baptised retained the ownership of their property and their liberty.

In October 1187, the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin made a profound impression on the Christian world, and the event determined Philip Augustus and the king of England, Richard the Lion Hearted, to leave together on a third Crusade. King Richard distinguished himself in particular, and saved the Latin states of the East.

Philip for his part, was compelled to return suddenly to France to manage the Flemish succession.

Hardly had he returned from the East when he had to concern himself with a very painful matter. In 1192, at Saint-Germain-en-Laye, he learned that at Braisne (today Bray-sur-Seine, upstream from Paris), in the estates of one of the vassals of the count of Champagne, the lady of the place, Agnès, countess of Dreux, had handed over for Jewish vengeance a man accused of theft and the homicide of a Jew. The Jews tied his hands behind his back, put a crown of thorns on his head, and whipped him through the town, before hanging him from a gallows.

The king was informed that the man was innocent, and that the Jews had caused him to perish like Christ, solely out of derision. There was general indignation. On learning these facts, Philip left for Bray immediately, surrounded the village, seized all the Jews and ordered them burned in his presence, without delay.[127] 82 Jews perished in flames on that one day.[128]

A few years later, in 1198, the energetic Pope Innocent III launched a fourth Crusade. The preacher Foulques de Neuilly went from village to village exhorting the Christians to take part. Following the example of the monk Rodolphe, Foulques encouraged people to pillage the houses of the Jews to take back what they had stolen from the

Christians. Over-excited by his inflammatory speeches, many of the good barons allowed the exasperated people to take the law into their own hands, after which he expelled the Jews from their lands.

In July 1198, Philip Augustus permitted the Jews to return to their estates, but they were attached to the soil as serfs and no longer had the right to own anything, which did not deter them in the least. "The fortunes of the Jews belong to the Baron" was an accepted principle all over the north of France, where the Jews were appreciated in proportion to their revenues. Thus it was that a noble sold his property and his Jews to the Duchess of Champagne.

It remains nonetheless true that the Jews continued to prosper until September 1206, right after the fourth Crusade, when Philip Augustus had to publish an ordinance officially regulating loans: no Jew could accept interest at a rate exceeding two pennies per livre per week. The maximum rate of interest was fixed at 43%. That is to say that before then, usurers used to take more. There were to be two "honest men" in each city who would keep the great seal of the Jews, and they would swear on the Gospels that they would not affix the seal without personally verifying that the sum was lawfully due.[129]

The 1206 ordinance moreover prohibited the Jews from receiving collateral in the form of sacred vessels and blood-stained clothing, which was obviously another habit of theirs.

## 44

### **The Coronation of Richard the Lion Hearted**

William the Conqueror, who had victoriously invaded England in 1066, had prohibited the Jews from possessing Christian serfs or hiring Christian wet nurses. In England, and on the French territories dependent upon the English crown, the Jews nevertheless lived in safety. Established chiefly in the large cities, "they acquired considerable wealth", writes Graetz. "At London, the Jews resided in magnificent palaces".

During the reign of King Henry II, in the second half of the 12th century, the Jews already practised usury on a huge scale. "They are generally very rich", writes Abraham Léon, "and their clientele consists of large landed property owners. The most famous of these bankers was a certain Aaron of Lincoln, who was very active at the end of the 12th century. King Henry II, alone, owed him 100,000 livres, a sum equivalent to the annual budget for the entire kingdom of England at the time. Thanks to extremely high interest rates – between 43 and 86% – a mass of lands formerly owned by the nobility had passed into the hands of Jewish usurers".[130]

Their problems began on 3 September 1189, the day of King Richard's coronation. Upon his return from the cathedral where he had just been crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury, Richard received numerous deputations coming to pay him homage, including a delegation of Jews. In view of the magnificent presents which the Jews were offering him, Baldwin, the archbishop of Canterbury, remarked to the prince that it was his duty to refuse these presents, and to command the Jews to leave the room. Richard acquiesced, and throughout the city of London, the rumour spread that the king had expelled the delegates from the palace. This was the signal for the insurrection.

The people and the Crusaders immediately agreed to pillage the Jews, who were locked inside their palatial houses, which were then set on fire. Houses and synagogues were burnt and large numbers of Jews were massacred, in London, Lincoln and Stamford.[131]

The next day, King Richard had the principal ringleaders arrested and executed, declaring the Jews to be inviolable. But as soon as he left England with Philip Augustus at the head of the Crusade, the London massacres were imitated in various cities in England. Bloody riots

occurred at Lynn and Norwich, where the Jews were killed and their houses pillaged.

The chronicler Richard de Devizes, a monk in the convent of St. Swithun, Winchester, wrote: "The same day as his coronation, at the same solemn hour, people began to immolate the Jews of the city of London, sending them to their father the devil. And it took so long to celebrate such a great sacrifice that the slaughter was barely even finished on the next day. Other villages and cities imitated the act of faith of the Londoners, and sent all these bloodsucking leeches to hell with the same devotion, along with all the blood spilled in cutting their throats. On this occasion, and nearly all over the kingdom, but with an unequal fervour, there were similar actions against these same reprobates. Only the city of Winchester spared the vermin which it nourished; the population of the city is wise and clever and always showed signs of moderation".[132]

A year later, the tragedy of York occurred. "In this city", writes Graetz, "there lived two very rich Jews, Josse and Benedict, who resided in superb palaces". The debtor-knights of the Jews of York, under the direction of a certain Mallebidde (or Malebydde) attacked the Jews. But it was not so much the jealousy and fanaticism, but exasperation which motivated the Christians. All of them, peasants, artisans, bourgeoisie, nobles and monks, wanted to fight these ignoble usurers, who never stopped, what is more, ridiculing their religion, receiving stolen goods, in addition to an addiction to other morally disgusting practices. The people pillaged and burned Benedict's house, which had been burnt before, during the London riots. All the other Jews of the city took refuge in the fortress with their families and precious personal effects, where they withstood a siege against the insurgent populace.

On 17 March 1190, after fruitless attempts to pacify the Christians, the besieged Jews in the fortress resolved almost unanimously to follow the advice of a rabbi and commit suicide. They buried their gold or silver, burned their other effects, cut the throats of their wives and children, and killed each other. We still see, near York, the ruins of the old tower of Clifford, who, according to tradition, was the scene of the massacres. The legend, maintained by Jewish historians, said that not a single member of the Jewish community of York survived; the number of Jews killed is said to have amounted to approximately five hundred.

The people, whose rage was not yet satisfied, moved on to the cathedral, where they forced public officials to hand over all the loan contracts, after which they burnt the lot in the nave of the cathedral.

The government did not remain a passive spectator in this popular



insurrection. The principal guilty parties were prosecuted; the sheriff and governor of the city were forced to resign, and the citizens were summoned to court to answer for their conduct.[133]

That day, which was Palm Sunday, and in all the localities where there were still Jews in England, old scores were settled all over England, wherever there were any Jews left.

At Bury Saint Edmunds, 75 Jews were massacred. King Richard charged his chancellor to open inquiries and have the guilty parties executed, but the Crusaders had disappeared, and the nobles and citizens who had participated in the disorders had fled to Scotland. The Jews were nevertheless permitted to continue residing in the country and pursuing their business affairs. Richard contented himself with simply submitting their loan contracts to additional formalities.

King John, who succeeded his elder brother Richard in 1199, was a little bit less sentimental. When a Jewish financier, Abraham of Bristol, refused to pay the contribution demanded of him, the king ordered him to have all his teeth pulled out, one per day. At the seventh extraction, Abraham submitted to the royal will.

## 45

### In the East

The Byzantines had always prohibited the Jews from occupying public positions, and they were compelled to pay considerable taxes. In Christian cities, only a few Jews were met with. In all of Palestine, which was in the hands of the Christians, there were not a thousand Jews. Benjamin de Tudela, a Jew from Navarre, who, in the 12th century, travelled to all localities where he believed there were synagogues so as to become informed as to the state of his religion, reported that he found no more than two hundred Jews in Jerusalem. They were almost all wool dyers, gathered in a separate quarter, under the tower of David.[134] His tale is confirmed by that of Rabbi Petachia, from Regensburg, who also visited his brothers in Judea over the course of the same century.[135]

If Jerusalem was depopulated of Jews, the rest of the Holy Land was no less so. Tiberias was no exception. Benjamin de Tudela found only 50 persons of his religion, one synagogue and a few graves.

In the cities of Asia Minor where Islam was dominant, on the other hand, Jews were numerous. The largest communities at the time were located in the region between the Tigris and the Euphrates. The community of Mosul was at least as important as that of Baghdad.

In the Maghreb and in Andalucía, the Almohads protected Judaism but regulated it firmly to prevent it from doing harm. But in Egypt, Jewish bankers were kings. The Jewish community there had “flourished under the reign of the Arabs”, writes Jewish historian Cecil Roth. “Although the lunatic Hakim (996–1021) had exercised the most fanatical of repressions regarding the adepts of the dissident religions, his successors treated the Jews with kindness, even employing them in the public administrations: from 1044 until his assassination in 1047, the banker and court intendant, Abraham (Abu Said) ben Sahl, vizir of the Sultan’s mother, effectively governed the country”.[136]

It was in Egypt that the greatest Jewish intellectual of the Middle Ages, Maimonides, born at Córdoba in 1135, found refuge with his family. Men in all the parts of the Jewish world respected his judgement. “A false Messiah appeared in Yemen; there was an epidemic of persecutions in the Maghreb; philosophical doubt was of concern to the rabbis of Marseille, the greatest Egyptian scholar wrote

indicating the attitude to be taken in the clearest terms so as to be in accordance with the principles of Judaism".[137]

Moses Maimonides also undertook to justify the conduct of these Jews who pretended to practice Islam solely for the purpose of undermining the enemy from the inside. An author nonetheless rather favourable to the Jews, George-Bernard Depping, writes here: "It is annoying to find in the works of Maimonides the typical Jewish hatred for those practising another religion. Not only does he permit them to deceive people, but he forgets himself so much as to express his conviction that one must exterminate traitors, epicureans and heretics".[138]

Sheikh Abd al Qadir al Jilani (1081–1166), an Iranian saint of the lineage of Ali, was doubtlessly correct when he wrote: "The Jews, who live dispersed all over the world, are nonetheless firmly loyal to each other, are dishonest, the enemies of men; they are dangerous creatures who must be compared to venomous serpents; as soon as they approach, you must crush their heads, since if you allow them to raise their heads, even for a moment, they will bite you, and their bite is deadly".[139]

At Baghdad, Benjamin of Tudela, visiting the city, counted 28 synagogues and 10 yeshivas (Jewish universities). About 40,000 Jews lived in the city at that time. If the Almohads had imposed yellow clothing on them, the Mamluks, in Egypt, required them to wear a turban of the same colour (blue for Christians). But their *dhimmitude* [minority status under Islam] was rather gentle in comparison to what the Jews endured in the Christian world.

In the Ottoman Empire, in the 16th century, some Jews occupied the highest positions in the land. We also know that they played a considerable role in the Kemalist revolution of 1922 in Turkey.[140] In the Moslem world, in general, the situation deteriorated for them after the Second World War, with the creation of the State of Israel.

## 46

### Innocent III

The Papacy, like most other authorities of the time, was relatively tolerant of Jews until the 13th century. Pope Alexander III (1159–1181) had been favourable to them. His tax administrator was the Jew Yehiel ben Abraham.

But in Innocent III (1198–1216), the Jews met with real resistance. Innocent III was for them, writes Graetz, “an adversary as powerful as he was malevolent”, “the implacable enemy of the Jews and Judaism”. The great bulls concerning the Jews therefore appeared after the year 1200.

At the beginning of his reign, however, Innocent III showed himself to be rather partial to the Jews, intervening against the violence of soldiers departing on the Crusades, prohibiting the baptism of Jews by force and the pillaging of their property without legal authorisation, attacking them with whips and stones during their feast days or profaning their cemeteries. But he detested them nonetheless.

One of the principal letters from Innocent III is the one he sent to the archbishop of Sens and the bishop of Paris in 1205. The same year, he criticised the King of France, Philip Augustus, for his lack of vigilance after readmitting the Jews to his kingdom, and recommended more severity: “I have learned that in France the Jews have appropriated to themselves the goods of the Church and the Christians; that, contrary to the decision of the Lateran Council held under Alexander III, they are hiring Christian wet nurses and domestic servants; that the courts do not accept the testimony of Christians against the Jews; that the community of Sens has built a new synagogue which exceeds in height the neighbouring church, and where their Jewish prayers are recited, not in a low voice, as before their expulsion, but so loudly that, in a word, it disturbs the offices of the Christians; and finally, that the Jews are authorised to show themselves in public during Easter Week, in the cities and villages, and to divert the faithful from their faith”.[141]

Here, we learn that the houses of the Jews remained open until the middle of the night, and were used for the receipt of stolen goods.[142] Innocent III recalled once again that the Jews secretly cut the throats of Christians and he enjoined Philip Augustus to treat them with greater strictness.

During the month of May, the Pope sent a severe letter to Alphonse VIII, king of Castile, because this prince had not wished to permit ecclesiastics to confiscate Moslem slaves owned by Jews and baptise them, nor compel the Jews and Moslems to pay their tithes to the clergy.

Here is another letter addressed to the Count de Nevers in January 1208. The Pope wrote to him, saying: "The Jews should wander, like Cain, through the world, and bear the mark of their abjection upon their faces. Instead of humiliating them and reducing them to servitude, the Christian princes protect them, receive them in the cities and villages and use them as bankers, to make them extort money for them from the Christians. What is more, the Jews are permitted to throw Christian debtors into prison, and accept as collateral Christian-owned castles and estates. The tithe is then no longer paid by the Church. Is it not scandalous that the Christians are allowed to have their animals killed and the grapes pressed by Jews, allowing them to take what they want and leave the rest to Christians?"

But Innocent III did not preach a war of extermination against the Jews, although such a war was preached and practised against the Albigensians. The doctrine of the Church established that the Jews were destined to remain the people witnessing the victory of Christianity.

Innocent III summarised Church doctrine and case law concerning the Jews (*Constitution Licei perfidia Iudaeorum* of 15 September 1199): Under pain of excommunication, he wrote, no one should be permitted to force the Jews to be baptised, nor beat them, pillage their property without court order, attack them with sticks during their feast days, nor, finally, invade their cemeteries and dig up Jewish bodies to rob their graves.[143] The number of pontifical documents on this topic – constitutions, bulls, letters, etc. – is considerable.

Every time the exasperated Christian population committed massacres or pillaging, the Popes raised their voices, condemned the crimes of the Christians and enjoined the bishops to intervene and protect the victims, congratulating them on what they themselves had done. The Popes also permitted fugitive Jews to install themselves in their States, in the Comtat Venaissin or in Italy. Likewise, on many occasions, the Popes prohibited Christians from baptising the Jews by force, or from robbing or desecrating their cemeteries.[144]

These facts did not prevent the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz, like the totality of his fellow Jews, from distorting history in any way they like: "Innocent III was the first Pope to treat the Jews with an inhuman severity", he writes.

The heretical sect of the Albigensians experienced widespread growth in the 12th and 13th centuries in Languedoc, where it was protected by segments of the local nobility. This heresy – no doubt not accidentally – took root in a land where the Jews had installed themselves in large numbers. Raymond V of Toulouse exercised a benevolent sovereignty over them, and his successor Raymond VI (1195–1222) “was perhaps still more favourable to the Jews than his father”, writes Graetz. “even entrusting public offices to them”.

It was not therefore without reason that Pope Innocent III ordered the Albigensian heresy and the Jews of the south of France to be kept under the same strict surveillance. Raymond VI was the object of these vexations as much for being a friend of the Jews as for being a protector of the Albigensians. In 1209, he was humiliated by Milo, the Pope’s legate: the count of Toulouse was flagellated and taken naked to the Church with a rope around his neck. He had to confess his sins in public and swear, among other things, to fire all his Jewish officials. Thirteen barons, accused, like himself, of showing favour to the Albigensians and Jews, were also compelled to swear that they would fire all their Jewish officials and refrain from appointing any more.

The Pope finally decided to mount an expedition against the Cathars, granting the combatants the same indulgences and favours which he granted those who fought in the Holy Land. He first demanded of Philip Augustus that he head the expedition, but the latter, still at war with King John, the King of England, did not wish to open a second front. Initially, the King of France even prohibited the barons of his kingdom from taking part in the Crusade against the Albigensians, before changing his mind and giving his authorisation. The Pope also obtained a promise from the King that Christian debtors of the Jews who went to fight the Albigensians would be declared quit of all back interest, and that the payment of the capital would be adjourned.[145]

The Crusaders, directed by Count Simon IV de Montfort and the papal legate Arnaud Amauri, Abbot of Cîteaux, met near Lyons and headed south. To avert the threat to his states, Raymond VI of Toulouse made honourable amends (18 June 1209).

Arnaud Amauri then decided to attack the fiefs of Raymond-Roger Trencavel, Vicount of Albi, Béziers and Carcassonne, which sheltered large numbers of Cathars and Jews. On 22 July 1209, the Crusaders took Béziers by storm and put the city to the sword. Arnaud was asked how to distinguish the heretics from the believers: “Kill them all”, he replied, “God will recognise His own”.

After the capture of the city, he wrote to the Pope: “We took account of neither sex, nor age; nearly 20,000 persons fell under our

blows. After the massacre, they pillaged and burnt the city". Two hundred Jews died in the carnage, and numerous others were taken prisoner.

During the month of September, the Council of Avignon, presided over by Milo, papal legate, decided that all the barons and all the free cities should promise under oath not to entrust any office to the Jews, and not to permit the Jews to hire Christian domestic servants.

This same council prohibited the Jews from working on Sunday or Christian holidays and from eating meat on Christian fasting days. The fourth canon prohibited the Christians from having any financial transactions with Jews, and the Jews were usually sentenced to return everything which they had extorted through usury.[146]

Arnaud Amauri's soldiers later covered themselves with glory in Spain, where the Christians were fighting the Moslems. At this time, an Almohad leader from north-west Africa, Mohammed Alnassar, led half a million of his fellow-Moslems in crossing the Mediterranean. In view of the approaching danger, the Christian kings of Spain united and called upon Pope Innocent III to preach a Crusade against the Moslems. Numerous Christian warriors crossed the Pyrenees to fight the Moslems, among them, the Abbot of Citeaux, Arnaud Amauri and his soldiers, the "ultramontanists", as they were called. In 1212, they threw themselves upon the Jews of Toledo and would no doubt have massacred the entire community without the intervention of King Alphonse VIII and the bourgeois Christian citizens of the city, who took the Jews under their protection.

The Twelfth Ecumenical Council, or Fourth Lateran Council, meeting in Rome in November 1215, in the Lateran basilica, renewed the ancient restrictions against the Jews and added others. The disinclination of the princes and peoples to obey rendered such frequent reminders necessary.

In the canons (67, 68, 69), the Jews were prohibited from demanding excessive rates of interest, on pain of being "deprived of all relations with Christians". The latter, for their part, were prohibited from having sustained relations with Jews, under pain of excommunication. The Jews were prohibited from holding any public office; in the event of violation, the Christian was to be punished and the Jew, after being dismissed in a shameful ceremony, was to remit all the money received by him during his period of employment, and the money was to be given to the poor.

These canons also introduced the obligation for the Jews to wear a distinguishing mark in order to distinguish them from the Christians, starting at age twelve. This custom was actually much older, but this

was the first time it was ever required by a Church council; from this time onwards, the order to do so was often renewed.

The mark most usually prescribed was a circular piece of yellow cloth, called a *rouelle* ("little wheel"). The Jews ceaselessly attempted to get its size reduced, or even to render it almost invisible, by converting it into a sort of ornament so nobody would notice.

Women were also supposed to wear the *rouelle*, or, as prescribed by certain councils, particularly that of Avignon (1326), the *cornalia*, a sort of hairstyle with points. In Italy, it was also through the headwear that Jewish men were supposed to be marked, that is, by a yellow beret, the *birettum glaucum*.

The "*rouelle*", as it was called, was not a novelty at all. The Pope seemed to have borrowed the idea from the legislation prevalent in Moslem countries. It was, in fact, the Almohad prince, Abu-Yusuf Yacub Al-Mansur, who first obliged the Jews of his kingdom, who should have converted to Islam by obligation, to wear special clothing by law: a crude robe with long sleeves, and a veil of a ridiculous design instead of a turban.

"If I were sure", said the perspicacious prince, "that the Jews were sincerely converting, I would permit them to contract marriages with Moslems. If I knew, on the contrary, that they were persisting in their ancient faith, I would stab them right through with a sword, I would reduce their children to slavery and I would confiscate their property. But I am in doubt, therefore I force them to wear clothes that make them look ridiculous."

Innocent III introduced this law into Christian countries on 30 November 1215. As the result of this papal decision, the provincial councils, states and princes deliberated on the subject of the *rouelle* to determine the colour, design, length and breadth in minute detail. But, whether it was round or square, yellow or red, placed on the hat or on the breast, the result was the same: the *rouelle* permitted Christians to forearm themselves against the sneakiness of the Jews, always inclined to pass for natives so as to deceive people with greater effectiveness.

The councils of Narbonne (1227), Rouen (1231), Tarragona (1239), Béziers (1246), renewed the prescriptions cited above, in whole or in part, and added a few. All insisted on the *rouelle*, like Fritzlar (1259) and Aschaffenburg, near Mayence (1292), which, what is more, prohibited the Jews, on pain of a fine of one silver mark, first, from leaving their homes, and second, from even showing themselves at their windows on Holy Friday.[147]

Innocent III's successor, Honorius III (1216–1227), with equal strictness, insisted that the Jews be forced to wear the *rouelle*. In 1222,



the Council of Oxford renewed the measures dictated by the Fourth Lateran Council seven years earlier. Here, the *rouelle* took the form of two white squares, evoking the Tables of the Law, which the Jews had to sew onto their coats. For the rest, since the death of King John and during the minority of King Henry III, the true sovereign was Étienne Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, “an implacable enemy of the Jews”, writes Graetz.

In the Holy Roman Empire, Emperor Friedrich II, who reigned until 1250, was a “liberal and enlightened prince”. At his court, Jewish scholars translated philosophical works from Arabic into Latin, distorting the texts to further their interests. “Nevertheless”, writes Graetz, “he hated the Jews just as much as the pious Saint Louis”. Although an implacable adversary of the papacy, he applied in his states the bull which distanced the Jews from any public employment, and he applied the decisions of the Lateran Council more severely than the king of Spain. He permitted the Jews of Africa to flee before the Almohads and establish themselves in Sicily, but, while he exempted the other immigrants from any taxes for ten years, he made the Jews pay very heavy taxes.

47

**Nicholas Donin and the Talmud**

Under the reign of Louis VIII, son and successor of Philip Augustus, complaints from borrowers and trials brought by usurers caused new problems. By an ordinance passed in 1223, the new king suddenly annulled all interest obligations contracted with the Jews starting from All Souls Day of that year. He declared expired all titles dating back more than five years, and granted debtors a period of three years in which to pay their debts, in nine equal payments. This act had no other purpose than to free the government of incessant complaints, but the Jews continued nonetheless to practise usury.[148] “Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it” (Deuteronomy 23:19–20).

Queen Blanche of Castile – Saint Louis’ mother – who governed the kingdom of France during her son’s minority, also attempted to put an end to the scourge of Jewish usury. In December 1230, the Melun ordinance established that the sums due to the Jews should be paid within three years, and that the term of each payment should expire on All Saints Day. The Jews should present their letters or their bonds to their lords before All Saints Day. In 1234, a new ordinance assisted the Christians in the payment of their debts to Jewish usurers.

The poet Gautier de Coincy (1178–1236), monk and troubador born in Picardy, who was one of the great French poets of the Middle Ages, expressed the disgust of ordinary people for the members of this sect:[149]

“More bestial than naked beasts,  
Are the Jews, there is no doubt [...]  
Many hate them, and I hate them,  
And God hates them, and I do, too.  
And all the world must hate them.”

During the year 1236, the Crusaders, departing for Palestine, gave violent expression to the Christian resentment against the Jews. In Anjou and Poitou, at Bordeaux, and Angoulême, massacres occurred:

“The Crusaders treated them with ferocious cruelty, pitilessly

crushing them under the hoofs of their horses, women and children, tore up the holy rolls, and nearly five hundred of them embraced Christianity. The Jews filed complaints with Pope Gregory IX, who wrote to the bishops of Bordeaux, Saintes, Angoulême and Poitiers in September of that year, to persuade them to save the rest of the Jews."

The region was able to defend itself against the Jews, since we see that in 1249, the count of Poitou, Alphonse, Saint-Louis' brother and lord of La Rochelle, ordered the Jews expelled from his states. In 1291, public aversion towards the Jews exploded with such force at La Rochelle that the council of the commune shared the popular animosity and chased all the Jews from the city.

The popular revolt of 1236 had been aroused by a certain Nicholas Donin. He ceaselessly excited the mob against the Jews, travelling all over the region, from city to city, from village to village. Nicholas Donin was a former Jew who had left Judaism and had turned against the sect. With a good knowledge of the Hebrew language, he had been excommunicated by the Jews after expressing doubt as to the value of the Talmud and the authenticity of oral law. He then left Judaism completely and had himself baptised under the name of Nicholas. In 1238, he went to Rome to denounce the horrors contained in the Talmud to Pope Gregory IX.

Let us recall that the Talmud, the secret book of the Jews, contains teachings of the rabbis from the first few centuries. It retranscribes or summarises the stormy discussions which took place in the various academies of Palestine and Babylonia. A master would announce a problem and his disciple would propose a solution, the students would engage in copious disputation, and the next generation would arrive at a conclusion. Although the debate continued for generations, occupying masters and pupils alike, the Talmud only rendered an account in a brief passage or a single paragraph.[150]

The simplest things were the object of hair-splitting. The rabbis thus sought mysteries in the clearest or most insignificant phrases of the Torah, engaged in the most extravagant conjectures. They went so far as to claim that each passage of the Bible was subject to seventy and even six hundred thousand different explanations.

Thus, one can "prove" through the Talmud that the rabbis both preached and condemned intolerance, approved and rejected usury, honoured and degraded women, etc. It is nevertheless true that the work contains many passages offensive to non-Jews.

"It is beyond doubt", writes Graetz, "that the Talmud, composed without any spirit of scientific or historical criticism, contains all sorts of remarks". The Jewish historian openly acknowledged that certain

remarks made by the rabbis are of a nature likely to offend Christians: "To harm the Jews", it says, "they have pretended to attribute the same value to the entire content of the Talmud and to place the simplest babble on the same rank as major prescriptions". And Graetz continues cheerfully, without fear of ridicule: "As for Nicholas Donin's assertions that the Talmud permits the Jews to deceive Christians and to wriggle out of their oaths, these are impudent lies".

The accusations which Nicholas Donin was the first to direct against the Talmud had the most painful consequences for the "Chosen People". Later, erudite Hebraising Christians continued the study of the Talmud and confirmed what everybody suspected. The following are just a few of the precepts taken from this Holy book:

Christians are idolators; do not associate with them (*Hilkhoth Maakhaloth*); the Christians are impure because they eat impure food (*Schabbath*, 145b); Jewish women are contaminated merely by meeting Christians (*Iore Dea*, 198, 48); Jews are human beings, but not Christians, who are animals (*Kerithuth*, 6b); Christians and animals are associated in a comparison (*Orach Chaiim*, 225, 10); Christians were created to serve the Jews (*Midrash Talpioth*, 225); one must have no more compassion for Christians than for pigs, when they are sick with the intestines (*Orach Chaiim* 57, 6a); for the interpretation of a Psalm, one rabbi says: "the Psalmist compares Christians to impure beasts" (*Kethuboth*, 110b); the seed of the goyim is like that of animals (*Sanhedrin*, 74b); the soul of the non-Jews comes from death and the shadow of death (*Emek Haschanach*, 17a); one must replace dead (Christian) servants, like cows or lost asses (*Iore Dea*, 377); the Jews have the right to be called men, but not the Christians (*Iebhammoth*, 61a); striking a Jew is like slapping the face of God himself (*Sanhedrin*, 58b); a Jew should always be considered to be good, despite the sins which he may commit. It is only his outer shell which is soiled, not his inner self (*Chagigah*, 15b); a Jew must not enter the house of a Christian on a feast day (*Gittin*, 62a); do not eat with the Christians, for that leads to familiarity (*Iore Dea*, 112, 1); do not drink milk drawn by a Christian (*Abhodah Zarah*, 35b); one must throw wine away if it has been touched by a Christian (*Abhodah Zarah*, 72b); dishware purchased from Christians must be thrown away (*Iore Dea*, 120, 1); one must stop all contact with Christians three days before the beginning of one of their feast days (*Abhodah Zarah*, 2a); a child must not be fed by a Christian wet-nurse, since Christian milk will give him a malevolent disposition (*Iore Dea*, 81); Christian wet-nurses lead children to heresy (*Iore Dea*, 153); one may pretend to rejoice with Christians during their feasts, if this helps conceal our hatred (*Iore Dea*,

148); the property of a Christian belongs to the first Jew who claims it (*Babha Bathra*, 54b); if by mistake a Christian returns too much money, you must keep it (*Choschen Ham*, 183, 7); the Jews may with a clear conscience keep all property lost by a Christian (*Choschen Ham*, 226, 1); it is permitted to deceive Christians (*Babha Kama*, 113b); Jews who deceive a Christian must share the profit equitably (*Choschen Ham*, 183, 7); usury may be practised against Christians or apostates (*Abhodah Zarah*, 54a); the Jews may lie and perjure themselves, if it's to cause a Christian to be condemned (*Babha Kama*, 113a); the Jews may swear falsely using words with a double meaning, or any other subterfuge (*Schabbouth Hag.*, 6d); one must never cure a Christian, unless failing to do makes an enemy for Israel (*Iore Dea*, 158); it is prohibited to deliver a child for a Christian woman on Saturday (*Orach Chaiim*, 330, 2); it is permitted to kill a Christian indirectly, for example, if someone who does not believe in the Torah falls into a pit in which there is a ladder, one must quickly pull the ladder out (*Choschen Ham*, 425, 5); as regards Christians who are not enemies, a Jew may nonetheless refrain from intervening to warn them of a deadly danger (*Iore Dea*, 158, 1); do not save Christians in danger of death (*Hilkoth Akum*, 10, 1); he who wishes to reveal the secrets of Israel to the Christians must be killed, even before he tells them anything at all (*Choschen Ham*, 386, 10); those who wish to change religions should be thrown into a pit and forgotten (*Abhodah Zarah*, 26b); one must kill those who would give Jewish money to the Christians (*Choschen Ham*, 388, 15); goyim who seek to discover the secrets of the Law of Israel commit a crime which calls for the penalty of death (*Sanhedrin*, 59a); baptised Jews must be put to death (*Hilkoth Akum*, X, 2); even the best of the goyim must be killed (*Abhodah Akum*, 26b); if a Jew kills a Christian, it is not a sin (*Sepher Or Israel*, 177b); spilling the blood of the impious is an agreeable sacrifice to God (*Ialkut Simoni*, 245c), etc.

Nicholas Donin collated extracts from the Talmud, which he did in a 35-count indictment. As a result of Nicholas Donin's work, Pope Gregory IX sent a letter to the bishops of France, England, Castile, Aragon and Portugal on 9 June 1239, ordering them to confiscate all copies of the Talmud and remit them to the Dominican and Franciscan monks. The sovereigns of these countries were to assist the bishops in enforcing the order, while the priors of the Dominicans and Franciscans were responsible for opening an inquiry on the Talmud and burning all copies.

When vigilance was relaxed, the Jews hastened to make many times more copies; thus, the orders of the Popes and the bishops had to be renewed frequently. After Gregory IX, Popes Innocent IV (1244),

Clement IV (1267) Honorius IV (1286), John XXII (1320), Benedict XIV (1415) Julius III, Paul IV, etc. also placed the Christians on guard against the horrors contained in the pages of the Talmud.

48

**1240: Expulsion of the Jews from Brittany**

The principal occupation of the Jews, in Brittany as elsewhere, was lending at interest. But Brittany was the province of France which showed the greatest strictness in combating Jewish usury. In 1239, the states (parliament) of the Duchy decreed that debtors would be declared acquitted towards the Jews, that the Jews should be banned from the country, and that all their goods, both movable and immovable, possessed by them as collateral should be returned to the borrowers. The assembly even forced the Duke of Brittany to promise, under oath, on behalf of himself and his descendants as well, under pain of excommunication in the event of violation of their oath, to refrain from ever permitting Jews to enter the duchy and prohibiting all barons of Brittany from permitting any Jews on their lands. Popular aversion for the Jews went so far as to approve the murders which had been committed a few years before during the Crusades, and it was prohibited to prosecute anyone whatsoever for the commission of these murders.[151]

In 1588, Bertrand d'Argentré thus presented the Latin text of the document, which he reproduced: "From this time henceforth the country found itself loaded with Jews, inhabitants of the country of Brittany, who, through the inclemency and cruelty of their usurers, were permitted to consume both nobles and merchants, and all the little people, thus arousing the pity of the country; the states, clergy, nobles, and Third Estate all gathered, and made a pressing request of the Duke to expel them, which was finally decided upon, and the Jews were banished according to the patents; the tenor of which follows, as extracted from the charters of Brittany and found in the letters of Saint Melaine etc. of the Abbot of Kemperle".[152]

In 1716, Dom Pierre Morice summarised the document as follows: "The usurers were so outrageous that the prelates and barons begged the duke to expel them entirely from the lands of his obedience. To satisfy the Duke, being at Ploërmel on the 20th day of April of the year 1240, issued an edict, in which he declared: 1. That he would expel the Jews from all parts of Brittany and that he would no longer suffer them on his lands nor on the lands of his subjects; 2. That he abolished all debts contracted with Jews, of any nature whatsoever; 3. That the property, both movable and immovable, of the Jews, pledged as

collateral on the said debts, should be returned to the debtors or their heirs, except for articles sold voluntarily by Christians; 4. That no one should be prosecuted for the death of the Jews killed until the present time; 5. That he would prevent all debts contracted with Jews on the lands of the debtor's father from being paid; and finally, that he would have the said edict confirmed by the King of France. The Duke undertook under oath to respect the present ordinance throughout his lifetime, and to submit, in the event of violation, to the censures of the Church. He subjected all his successors to the same oath, and prohibited the act of rendering them homage before they have fulfilled this duty. The prelates and barons for their part also swore that they would no longer suffer the Jews on their lands".[153]

The following is the edict of 20 April 1240, by means of which the Duke of Brittany, John I the Red, upon the proposals of the parliament of Brittany, expelled the Jews from his territories:

"To all those by whom the present letters may be read, John, Duke of Brittany, Count of Richemont, greetings.

"Know that we, at the request of the bishops, abbots, barons and vassals of Brittany, having carefully examined the interest of the country, hereby expel all Jews from Brittany. Neither ourselves nor our heirs will ever permit another Jew to set foot in our lands of Brittany, and we shall not permit any of our subjects to have any Jews on their lands.

"All debts contracted with Jews drawn up in Brittany, in any manner and for any reason whatsoever, are hereby entirely remitted, and we hereby issue a receipt for the same.

"All lands mortgaged to Jews, and all immovable or immovable pledges held by the Jews shall be returned to the debtors or their heirs, except for lands and other pledges which shall have been sold to Christians by judgement of our court.

"No one shall be accused nor prosecuted for having killed a Jew.

"We pray and entreat in good faith and with all our power Monseigneur the King of France to confirm by these letters the present assise or ordinance, and we hereby provide surety for our father and for ourselves, that the debts contracted in Brittany towards the Jews shall never be paid on the lands of our father.

"The present edict, as written, has been sworn to by ourselves in good faith, in obedience, to be maintained forever; if it ever happens that we should happen to violate it, we, the bishops of Brittany together or each one separately, shall be entitled to excommunicate us and place an interdict on our lands located in their dioceses, notwithstanding any privilege obtained, past or future, by ourselves.



“What is more, we wish, and command, that our heirs who in future may come to succeed us, when they shall have attained the lawful age, shall faithfully commit themselves by oath to observe the present edict as written here. The barons, vassals, and all others liable to swear fidelity to the count of Brittany shall not swear the same, nor shall they render homage to our heirs, as long as the latter, duly required by two bishops or two barons at least in the name of the others, shall not have sworn to keep the present edict faithfully. But this oath being sworn, the barons and all those who owe fidelity to the Count of Brittany shall henceforth swear fidelity and render homage immediately to our heirs.

“Executed at Ploërmel, Tuesday, before the Resurrection of Our Lord, the year MCCXXXIX”.[154]

The decree was strictly respected, and for centuries there were no longer any Jews in Brittany.

At this time, at the other end of Europe, the Mongols and Tatars of Genghis Khan were ravaging Russia and Poland, and extended their incursions as far as Germany. Once again, the Jews played the “invader card”. “The rumour spread”, writes Heinrich Graetz, “that the Jews of Germany had betrayed their country, and that instead of supplying the Mongols with poisoned foodstuffs, which they assured their ‘fellow Germans’ that they had done, they attempted to supply them with huge barrels filled with weapons. This accusation served as a pretext for atrocious cruelties”.

## 49 Saint Louis

Saint Louis reigned in France starting in 1226. This king, who has been popularised by history for his justice and good faith, quite naturally felt a horror of Judaism.

There is a famous anecdote told by Saint Louis, as reported by Joinville:

“He [Saint Louis] told me that there was once a great disputation between clergy and Jews at the monastery of Cluny. And there was at Cluny a poor knight to whom the abbot gave bread at that place for the love of God; and this knight asked the abbot to suffer him to speak the first words, and they suffered him, not without dubiousness. So he rose, and leant upon his crutch, and asked that they should bring to him the greatest cleric and most learned master among the Jews; and they did so. Then he asked the Jew a question, which was this: ‘Master,’ said the knight, ‘I ask you if you believe that the Virgin Mary, who bore God in her body and in her arms, was a virgin mother, and is the mother of God?’

“And the Jew replied that of all this he believed nothing. Then the knight answered that the Jew had acted like a fool when – neither believing in her, nor loving her – he had yet entered into her monastery and house. ‘And verily,’ said the knight, ‘you shall pay for it!’ Whereupon he lifted his crutch and smote the Jew near the ear, and beat him to the earth. Then the Jews turned to flight, and bore away their master, sore wounded. And so ended the disputation.

“The abbot came to the knight and told him he had committed a deed of very great folly. But the knight replied that the abbot committed a deed of greater folly in gathering people together for such a disputation; for there were a great many good Christians there who, before the disputation came to an end, would have gone away misbelievers through not fully understanding the Jews. ‘And I tell you,’ said the king, ‘that no one, unless he be a very learned cleric, should dispute with them; but a layman, when he hears the Christian law mis-said should not defend the Christian law, unless it be he with his sword, and with that he should pierce the mis-sayer in his guts, as far as the sword will go.’ ”[155]

This history of the knight of Cluny is told by King Louis himself, who wished it to be exemplary for Christians: that unless you are a

scholar, and a "very good one", at that, you should never dispute with a Jew, rather, you should stab him right through the guts, with your sword.

Saint Louis gave the order to organise a public debate between Nicholas Donin and four rabbis, so as to confound the Jews. The four defenders of the Talmud were Yehiel of Paris, Moïse of Coucy, Juda ben David of Melun, and Samuel ben Salomon of Château-Thierry. The debate was held on 25 June 1240, at the royal court, in the presence of several bishops and Dominicans, and the Queen Mother, Blanche of Castile.

The discussion revolved around these two points: does the Talmud contain the blasphemies against God and assertions contrary to morality? Does it contain blasphemies against Jesus? At this point, Graetz writes: "After refuting various arguments produced against the Talmud, Yehiel agreed that this compendium, in fact, contained attacks on Jesus, son of Pantheras, but he stated that this personage had nothing in common with the Jesus of Nazareth. Yehiel made his statement in good faith, as the passage easily lent itself to error".

The Talmud was obviously condemned, and, on 6 June 1242, twenty-four cartfuls of copies of this nauseating work were publicly burned in Paris.

"This painful event profoundly afflicted the Jews", writes Graetz. "Many of them celebrated this sad anniversary by fasting on that day for many years".

It was the first time since Justinian that laws had been passed against the Talmud. In 1244, when Pope Innocent was informed that the Jews might have saved a certain number of copies from the flames, he ordered the King of France to proceed with new house searches.

Considering that the Talmud and other clandestine Hebrew books incited the Jews to commit all sorts of crimes, the Pope, in the same bull, ordered these works publicly burned "to confound the perfidy of the Jews". This extremely important bull, dated 9 July 1244, *Impia judaeorum perfidia*, says, word for word: "The impious perfidy of the Jews [...] causes them to commit such enormities that they cause stupefaction among those who hear of them and horror in those who listen".[156]

The Jews, as we have seen, were then constrained to wear a distinctive sign. Saint Louis absolutely insisted that the Jews should be easily recognisable by Christians, and imposed a heavy fine of 10 livres tournois upon all Jews who failed to wear the *rouelle*. This mark did not however prevent them from practising usury and the ruin of Christians.

The King also ordered the Jews of Languedoc to dedicate themselves to the professions and honest trade, but they obviously preferred lending at interest. The debtors, unable to free themselves from debt, were obliged to sell their properties and ended up by becoming the prisoners of their pitiless creditors.

Most of the councils of France held during this period thundered against usury: the Council of Château-Gontier in 1231, the two Councils of Lyon in 1245 and 1247, those of Albi in 1254, Montpellier in 1258, Sens in 1269, Arles and Poitiers in 1273, Avignon in 1282, etc.

The Councils of Bézier, in 1246, and Albi, in 1254, prohibited Christians from employing Jewish physicians. The Council of Vienna of 1267 ordered that any Jew guilty of fornicating with a Christian woman should be sentenced to a fine of 10 silver marks, and that the woman involved be publicly whipped and banished in perpetuity from the city.

In 1254, in the general ordinance for the reformation of morals, Saint Louis ratified that which had previously been ordered by his mother. He added that the Talmud was to be burned in conformity with the prescriptions of Innocent IV. But Jewish usury resisted all the king's efforts. He eliminated one third of all debts contracted under usurious contracts, accorded two periods for the payment of the rest, and bailiffs were prohibited from arresting Christians in relation to debts to Jews, or from forcing them to sell their patrimony.

"We wish the ordinance of the Jews to be kept as it is; that is: that the Jews cease their usury, blasphemies, magic and sorcery, and that their Talemus [Talmud] and other books, found to contain blasphemies, should be burnt, and that Jews who do not wish to comply with these prescriptions be expelled and that transgressors be faithfully punished; and that all the Jews live by the work of the their hands or other needs without usury".[157]

This ordinance was enforced with extreme strictness. The authors report that the Jews complained that they had never suffered such persecution. In 1257 or 1258, Saint Louis once again decreed that the usurious interest demanded by the Jews should be returned to those who had paid it, or to their heirs.

These orders were insufficient, and recourse was had to yet another act of authority. We see, by an act of Thibaud, king of Navarre and count of Champagne, that King Louis and his son had secretly agreed to arrest all the Jews in their domains on the same day in 1268.[158]

50

Saint Thomas Aquinas

The Neapolitan theologian Thomas of Aquinas (1225–1274), in his *Summa Theologica* (II-II, q. 10, art. 8), formally established that “No compulsion may be exercised against the Jews to bring them to believe, because belief is a matter of the will. The will cannot be constrained.”

On the other hand, St. Thomas, aware of the danger represented by the Jews in Christian society, professed that the Jews should be subject to the authority of the Church “There is no other alternative except, either expelling them from the country, or allowing them to live here but subjecting them to hard servitude which binds their hands and prevents them from causing so much evil.”

But for Saint Thomas, the words *servi*, *servitus*, do not have the exclusive meaning attributed to these words today. They do not refer to slavery properly speaking, but rather, a state of inferiority depriving the Jews of several rights enjoyed by other citizens and subjecting them to various burdens from which other citizens are exempt, for the express purpose of preventing them from doing evil.[159]

“Do not associate with them except in cases of necessity, and even then, only if you are firm in your faith”, he said. “Avoid entering into relationships of familiarity if your religion is vacillating, and if nothing compels you to see them” (*Summa*, question 10, article 10).

One of these writings is called *De regime Iudaeorum*. It is not, as one might suppose, a general treatise on the subject, but a rather short response to the Duchess of Brabant, Alix of Burgundy, whom he had consulted on various points in 1261 and who had asked him for advice on government following her husband’s death. To put her conscience at ease, Alix consulted the great doctor of the Church.

Saint Thomas replied: “Lords are perfectly within their rights to demand of the Jews any fee, since in principle, the very goods of the Jews belong to them”.

He nevertheless recommended against irritating them by means of excessive reprisals. They must be allowed to retain the necessities: “Necessarium vitae subsidia eis nullatenus subtraantur”. He specified that the word “necessary” should be interpreted broadly.

A bit further along, Saint Thomas stated that the princes should constrain the Jews to earn their living by working, instead of enriching

themselves through usury: "Your perplexity in this regard, as much as I can conjecture, seems to me to increase the consequences of your first question. In effect, you inform me that the Jews in your states only possess what they have acquired through their detestable usurious practices; hence, it follows that you are unaware that it is permitted to demand something of them, while they should rather return what they have thus extorted. Here is my answer on this point:

"It is obvious that the Jews would never lawfully be allowed to keep the profits from their usurious dealings; therefore, if you confiscate their profit, you cannot lawfully keep it yourself, unless it proceeds from extortions of which you or your predecessors were the victims. If it proceeds, on the contrary, from extortions practised against other persons and you have seized it, you must return it to those to whom the Jews themselves owe restitution; therefore, if there are persons from whom the Jews have extorted sums by usury, these sums should be returned to the interested victims; if there are none, the sums should be applied to good works on the advice of the diocesan bishop and men of recognised probity, or to objects of public utility, as long as the need is pressing, and the general good so commands. And it would even be permissible to demand restitution from the Jews a second time, in conformity with the customs of your predecessors and with the intention of using it as indicated above".[160]

In conclusion, he recommended that the duchess apply the provisions of the councils relating to the *rouelle* in her estates: "In all Christian kingdoms and at all times, it must be possible to recognise the Jews of both sexes as distinguished from citizens of the nation by means of an exterior sign". This was a wise piece of advice, which permitted immediate identification of the fox in the henhouse.

## 51

### **Pablo Christiani and the Barcelona Dispute**

The king of Castile, Alphonse I, who reigned from 1252 to 1284, promulgated several edicts against the Jews, based on Visigothic legislation – “this poisonous source upon which the Spanish hatred of the Jews was ceaselessly fed”, writes Heinrich Graetz. The Visigothic code had been translated into Spanish on Alphonse’s order (1257–1266). A chapter on the Jews was added, in which we read that “no Jew may hold any public office or hold any public dignity in Spain”.

Alphonse X integrated into his code all the laws of exception which the Byzantines and Visigoths had passed against the Jews, even adding other restrictions. He ordered the Jews and Jewesses to wear a distinctive sign on their hair, on pain of fine or flagellation for failure to do so. Jews and Christians could not eat together, nor bathe together.

Alphonse X, known as Alphonse the Wise, also believed that the Jews crucified a Christian child every year and renewed against them a prohibition against appearing on the streets on Holy Friday. On the other hand, he also prohibited Christians from profaning synagogues, forcing Jews to undergo baptism, or to summon them into court on their feast days. Alphonse X did not strictly enforce these laws, but they were applied later and contributed to restraining the aggressiveness of the Jews in Spain.

According to a census from the time, Castile had nearly 850,000 Jews at the time, who formed over 80 major communities in the region at that time, the most important of which was at Toledo.

Aragon formed an independent kingdom, with Mallorca and Sicily. The Jews there were not as free as in Castile. The King of Aragon, Jayme (James) I, who possessed properties in the south of France and who had frequent interviews with Saint Louis or his councillors, enforced these laws more strictly.

His confessor, Raymond of Peñaforte, a general in the order of the Dominican friars, no doubt played a major role in all this decision making. In the hope of converting all these Jews, Peñaforte organised schools where preacher monks dedicated themselves to the study of Arabic and Hebrew and thus prepared themselves to fight the Jews with greater success. He thus created a line of apologists who did not content themselves with compiling passages from the Old Testament

prefiguring the Trinity or prophecying the coming of the Messiah, but who attempted to refute the rabbinical books and Talmudic assertions.

A Dominican, Pablo Christiani (Paul Christian) – a former Jew and native of Montpellier – provoked the Jews into public controversies, in the south of France and in other regions, to show them that their holy books already announced the divinity of Jesus.

His superior, Raymond of Peñaforte, determined to organize a controversy between Pablo and one of the most famous rabbis of the time, Nahman of Girona, at court. In 1623, King Jaime, conforming to the desire of the general of the Dominicans, invited Nahman (known under the name of Maître Astruc de Porta), and several other rabbis, to come take part in a public colloquium at Barcelona.

For four days, starting on 20 July, Nahman and Pablo Christiani confronted each other on the subject of the divinity of Jesus. The dispute (*disputatio*) was held in the palace of the sovereign, in the presence of the entire court, high dignitaries of the Church, the nobility and the people.[161]

The pro-Judaism advocate was finally banished, and Pablo Christiani was sent to preach to the Jews in the principal cities of the kingdom, with authorisation to gather the Jews together wherever he thought necessary, and the right to seize all their books. Assisted by several religious persons, Father Christiani undertook his mission with great zeal.

These books were used by the Dominican Raymond Martin (Martini) in composing the treatises *Capistrum Judeorum* (*Muzzle for the Jews*), and above all the *Pugio fidei* (*The Dagger of the Faith*). The latter work, published in 1278, was the most widely sold. It was studied, consulted, and plagiarised, too. The author, a man familiar with Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldean and Syrian, shows vast erudition. Martini knew Hebrew better than Saint Jerome, and was very well versed in Biblical and rabbinical literature. He had studied the Talmudic *haggodot*, the writings of Raschi, of Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, and Kimhi. He fought the Jews with their own weapons, that is, with the Mosaic law and the Talmud. His enormous in-folio is sprinkled with Hebrew quotations, and the diffuse hair-splitting which accompanied them show that the author had attended the schools of those same rabbis whose most violent antagonist he had since become. He criticised the rabbis for teaching – among other things – that Jews were authorised to kill goyim. It is true that the *Avodazara* treatise says the goyim should be left in any pits which they might happen to have fallen into, and that *minims* (Jewish heretics), traitors and apostates should be thrown in there, too.[162]



Another convert, Jerome de Saint-Fois, making the same criticism of the Jews, cited a passage from rabbi Simeon, son of Rabbi Joanhia, who claimed that it was better to kill the best of the Christians, the way one crushes the head of the best of the scorpions.[163]

If the situation of the Jews was merely “rather good” in Castile at this time, Graetz tells us, it was “highly satisfactory” in the young kingdom of Portugal, under the reign of Alphonse III (1248–1279) and Denis (1279–1325). The Jews there were not obliged to pay the tithes to the Catholic clergy or to wear the *rouelle*, and could even hold the highest dignities. King Denis even had a Jewish minister, named Judah, who was also the head of Portuguese Judaism. On several occasions, the Church attempted to subject the Jews of Portugal to canon law. King Denis finally agreed to allow the introduction into his kingdom of the restrictive legislation drawn up by the Papacy against the Jews, but he most often neglected to apply them.

## 52

### Central Europe

At the end of the 13th century, the Jews enjoyed sufficient liberties in Poland to exercise their domination over Christian Poles. The Boleslas Charter, signed at Kalisz in 1264 (and confirmed in 1343 at Cracow by King Casimir), granted them complete freedom of action. The Jews there were rich and powerful, masters of nearly all trade.[164]

In a few adjacent regions, there were similar provisions. In Silesia, the Duke of Breslau, Henry IV, who had been completely corrupted by Jewish financiers, also assured the Jews of governmental protection for their persons, their goods, their religion, their schools and their speculations. It was even prohibited to proffer the banal accusation of infanticide against them, unless the charge could be supported by the testimony of three Christians and three Jews. If the accuser could not prove it, he incurred the penalty which would otherwise have been suffered by the guilty Jew.

In Moravia, the Jews were protected by special laws, as in Silesia and Poland. Ottocar II, King of Bohemia and Margrave of Moravia, promulgated these special laws were in 1254. The Jews enriched themselves and, as everywhere else, all bourgeois money passed through their hands. Everything was in hock to them, even the mitre of the Abbot of Trebisch. The bourgeois, the people and the clergy of this city quickly became exasperated and the Jews were expelled.[165]

In 1267, after the council of Vienna, Ottocar finally took salutary measures, renewing all the old restrictions by the states of Lower Austria. He ordered them to wear a particular costume, with a high and broad piece of headwear, probably the pointed hat. They were prohibited from building new synagogues, or enlarging and embellishing the old ones; they were prohibited from employing Christian workers or domestic servants, from occupying public offices, from practising medicine and from selling foodstuffs and drinks. The Christians and Jews were never to intermingle, at meals, markets, baths, or weddings. Catholic parish priests were assigned responsibility for pronouncing upon complaints concerning excessive usury, and for receiving a tax payable by Jews to Christians, as in indemnity, wherever they lived. Finally, if a Jew had carnal knowledge of a Christian, he would be punished by imprisonment and a fine of at least

ten marks, while the Christian woman would be whipped and chased out of town.[166]

Jews occupied numerous public offices in Hungary. They controlled salt farming, taxes and often lands. Bela IV, King of Hungary (1235–1270) maintained against them in their offices and even introduced into his own country the regulations of Frederick the Quarrelsome of Austria and Styria, who protected the Jews against popular violence and accorded them special jurisdiction.

After intervention of the Papacy, this situation changed suddenly. Legions of Dominicans and Franciscans invaded the regions of the Carpathians, partly to preach a Crusade against the Mongols, and partly to bring the schismatics of the Greek Church back under Papal jurisdiction as well.

Under their leadership, the prelates of Hungary and southern Poland met at the synod of Ofen (Budapest, formerly called Ofen-Pesth), in September 1279), under the presidency of the papal legate, promulgating restrictive laws against the Jews of Hungary, Poland, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia and Galicia.

It was prohibited to rent anything of any nature whatever to the Jews or to entrust them with public offices. The synod of Ofen also obliged the Jews of Hungary to wear a piece of orange cloth in the form of a wheel, on the left side of the breast.

But the anti-Jewish measures of the Christians were not applied very strictly. It was only fifty years later, that the last king of the families of Arpad, Ladislas IV, gave these edicts the force of law.

## 53

### Pointed Hats and Ritual Murders

In Germany, after the death of Emperor Frederick II, in 1250, a struggle exploded between the Guelphs, partisans of the Pope, and the Ghibellines, partisans of the Emperor. During the power vacancy, until the election of Emperor Rudolph of Habsburg in 1273, the Jews no longer enjoyed the security guaranteed by the prince's authority. The common people revenged themselves for all the humiliations they had been forced to suffer at the hands of the Jews, who were murdered by the thousands.

Every year, there were new massacres in Wissembourg, Magdeburg, Arnstadt, Coblenz, Sinzig, Erfurth, and many other cities in Germany. The anti-Semites proudly called themselves *Judenbräuter*, Jew-roasters.

The Council of Vienna in 1267, presided over by a papal legate, decided that, instead of the *rouelle*, the Jews should wear a pointed hat or a hat shaped like a horn, a *Judenhut*. The Council, as we have seen, recalled all precedent measures and ordered the Christians to conform to them. He added the prohibition against attending Jewish games and that of buying meat from them.

Ritual murder accusations regularly triggered popular riots. One day in 1234, the body of a Christian was found in the vicinity of Baden, between Lauda and Bischofsheim. Trial proceedings were brought against eight members of the Jewish community, who were executed on 2 and 3 January 1235.

In 1283, around Easter, the body of a Christian infant was found on the banks of the Rhine, near Mayence. The archbishop of the city, Werner, Archchancellor of the Empire, attempted in vain to calm the crowd by proposing to open an inquiry and summon the defendants before a regular court. But the Christians, driven mad, fell upon the Jews on the second day of Easter Week, killed a dozen of them and pillaged numerous houses. The archbishop's intervention put an end to the disorders. The same day, in the neighbouring city of Bacharach, 26 Jews had their throats cut.

Two years later, in 1285, the body of a Christian child was found at Munich. The populace, once again, revenged themselves for this crime. The Jews who were able to escape the fury of the crowd sought refuge

in the synagogue. Their assailants piled flammable materials all around the building, which was then set alight. 180 Jews were burned alive.

Goyishe vengeance was again exacted in 1286 at Boppard and at Oberwesel, near Bacharach, where 42 Jews were killed after the discovery of the body of a man nicknamed "Good Werner" by the people.

The Jews offered to pay Rudolph of Habsburg 20,000 silver marks if he agreed to punish the rioters at Oberwesel and Boppard and to protect the Jews against the violence of the people. Rodolph agreed to the conditions but his protection was never sufficient, and, in the spring of 1286, the Jews from several German communities decided to emigrate. At Mayence, Worms, Spire, Oppenheim and other cities, numerous Jewish families abandoned all their goods and left for Palestine. The rumour was in fact going around that the Messiah had appeared in that country and was about to free the "children of Israel". Above all, they learned that the members of the sect lived happily in Syria, under the domination of a Mongol sovereign, who, writes Graetz, "even showed more respect for the Jews than the Moslems and had conferred high offices upon them".

The collusion of the Jews and Mongols was public knowledge, since in Germany, in the 17th century, William Prynne, a prolific author, contented himself with remarking how the Jews in Germany, in the year 1241, had rendered themselves guilty of intelligence with the enemy by attempting to arm the Tatars to destroy the Christians.[167]

In France, during the Jewish Passover of 1288, the body of a Christian was found at the home of one of the notables of the Jewish community of Troyes named Isaac Châtelain. The inquiry was carried out by the Franciscan and Dominican friars, and, on 24 April, 13 Jews, most of them from the Châtelain family, were burnt at the stake.

54

**Nicholas IV, *Turbato Corde*, 1288**

Confronted with this repression, certain Jews pretended to convert to Christianity, with a view to continuing their past work of slowly destroying Christianity. One of the Popes who struggled with the greatest energy against crypto-Judaism was Nicholas IV. In his bull of 5 September 1288, entitled *Turbato corde*, he commanded the Inquisitors, clerics and secular authorities to pursue the marranos relentlessly, as well as those who defended them:

“Against the heretics, as well as those who favour them, one should proceed relentlessly. As for the Jews who may have coaxed Christians of the two sexes into their execrable rites, they should receive an even stiffer penalty”.[168]

This bull was one of the firmest foundations of the Church’s struggle against the Jewish fifth column which was infiltrating Christianity and against the carriers of heresies and their protectors. It was in fact enough to come to the defence of a crypto-Jew or a heretic to fall into the scope of action of the pontifical Inquisition.

As long as the Popes firmly supported the provisions of this bull and the canons of the Lateran Councils, it was very difficult for the Jews to penetrate the Christian citadel. It was only when Martin V and Leo X despised what had been ordered that the synagogue could succeed in tearing Christianity in pieces.

## 55

### Edward I and the Expulsion from England, 1290

In England, King Henry III Plantagenet (1227–1272), the son of King John and Isabelle of Angoulême, favoured the immigration of Jews and protected them against the common people.

In 1225, a general clamour arose in the kingdom: at Lincoln, a 10-year-old child, who had disappeared a few days earlier, was found dead in a cesspool. According to the chronicler of the time, Matthew Paris, a number of Jews were massacred by the mob, and on 25 August 1255, the Jew found guilty for this crime by a court was tortured and hanged.[169] His Jewish neighbours were arrested on the same charge and conducted to London. Eighteen of them were hanged, and the others acquitted. The child whom they had killed is known as Hugh of Lincoln.[170]

In 1263 and 1264, a revolt of the barons took place against King Henry III of England, led by Simon VI de Montfort, Count of Leicester. The Jews were accused of serving as the tools of royal oppression, and the communities of London, Cambridge, Canterbury and Lincoln were convulsed by riots. At Worcester, Simon de Montfort expelled all the Jews from their lands after declaring all outstanding debts to them null and void. At London, in 1264, more than 500 Jews were massacred; their houses pillaged and their synagogues destroyed.[171]

The Jews had already been expelled from various cities by the time of the reign of Henry III: the citizens of Newcastle in 1234 and those of Derby in 1260–1261 even purchased the right to prohibit the Jews from residing among them.[172]

Starting with the first year of the reign of Edward (1272–1307), son of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence, the king prohibited them from building synagogues, from possessing fiefs and other freehold land. The *Statutum de judaismo* of 1275 prohibited them from lending at usury, but some Jews attempted to evade its prohibitions. Better luck next time: 293 of them were hanged at London for violating the royal interdict.

It was soon discovered that counterfeit money was circulating in England and that the country's silver pennies were often clipped. The reaction of King Edward I was exemplary. On Friday 17 November 1278, all the Jews of the country, men, women, and children, were

thrown into prison and inquiries were opened. Nearly 300 Jews found guilty of altering the coinage were hanged; others were condemned to life imprisonment, while others, finally, were expelled from the country and deprived of all their goods.

The ignominies committed by the Jews multiplied exponentially. After the murder of a Christian child at Northampton, the guilty parties were arrested at London, quartered on 2 April 1279, and their bodies hanged from a gibbet.

One of the most remarkable intellects of the time, the Scottish theologian Duns Scotus (1266–1308), at that time a professor at Oxford, stood out by reason of openly stating his opinion on the best way to annihilate Judaism. Duns Scotus was the pride of the Franciscan order, and had a profound influence upon William of Ockham. The “subtle doctor” (*doctor subtilis*) went even further than Saint Thomas, in proposing a solution to the Jewish problem based on the complete destruction of the sect.

In reply to the question, “Should one baptise infant Jews against the will of their parents?”, the canonists and theologians of the 13th century, headed by Saint Thomas, responded in the negative. For his part, Duns Scotus thought it the duty of the king to kidnap Jewish children from their parents and baptise them.[173]

With regards to the argument of the necessary preservation of the Jewish people, in the expectation of their conversion at the end of time, the Franciscan believed that “it was sufficient to preserve a small number, kept separate on an island”.

In November 1286, the new Pope, Honorius IV, in a letter addressed to his legate and the archbishop of York, ordered measures to be taken. On 16 April 1287, the ecclesiastics met in synod at Exeter and decided to reintroduce all the measures decreed against the Jews by the councils. Fifteen days afterwards, on King Edward’s orders, all the Jews in England were thrown in prison, but rather promptly released in return for a large sum of money, 12,000 pounds sterling.

The year 1290 should have been a reassuring, even happy, year for the Jews. Abulafia, an illuminated cabbalist who considered himself a prophet of Israel, conceived the strange project of converting the Pope to Judaism. Pope Nicholas III ordered him arrested and imprisoned. Only the Pope’s sudden death saved the cabbalist’s life. Abulafia then left for Sicily. There, he no longer contented himself with his role as a prophet, but now declared himself the Messiah in person: God had revealed certain secrets to Abulafia, announcing the commencement of messianic delivery. This happy period, according to him, was to open in the year 1290.



But the year 1290 was not the right year. At Prague, this same year, an anti-Jewish insurrection spread rapidly all across Bohemia, Moravia and Germany, and massacres were committed which the authorities were unable to contain. There was talk of 10,000 deaths. It was one of the bloodiest reactions ever experienced by the Jews since their infiltration of Europe.

In England, through the decree of 18 July 1290, Edward I expelled all the Jews from his kingdom, on his own authority, without consulting Parliament. The date, according to Heinrich Graetz, coincided with the 9th day of the month of Av, the date upon which the Jews commemorated the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. They were granted the right to convert their property into liquid cash by the month of November; after this time, those found on the territory would be hanged. But first, they were to return to their owners all pledges and collateral in hock to them from Christians.

King Edward nevertheless prohibited his officers from mistreating them upon their departure and from extorting money from them in the ports of embarkation. Finally, on 9 October, 16,511 Jews left England. Any goods which they had been unable to sell were confiscated by the King.

Graetz recounts that, despite the royal prohibition, a ship captain played them a nasty trick: "Although he had promised to transport several families down the Thames to the high seas, he disembarked them on a sand bank at low tide, and left them there, awaiting the high tides; and when these unfortunates, surrounded by the waves, begged him to save them, he told them to remember Moses, who had protected their ancestors from the waves of the Red Sea. All these families were drowned".

The Jews of Guyenne, at that time an English province in south-western France, were included in the general proscription. They went to France, where Philip the Fair first authorised them to settle. But Philip soon changed his mind, and, with the consent of Parliament, decreed that the Jewish exiles from England and Guyenne would have to leave France by the third Thursday in Lent.

## **56**

### **In Persia, March 1291**

Persia at that time was under the yoke of the Mongols, led by the Khan Agrun. His physician, a Jew named Saad-Addaula, had drawn his sovereign's attention to acts of embezzlement committed by certain officials, thus gaining the prince's trust. At the start of the year 1288, Saad-Addaula was sent to Baghdad to audit the city's accounts, and, on his return, at the summer palace, he was raised to the dignity of Ministry of Finances.

As the Khan didn't like the Moslems, Saad-Addaula entrusted the highest offices to Christians and Jews, "and naturally", writes Graetz, "he particularly favoured his friends and his relatives". Little by little, he inspired such confidence that no major affair of state was handled without his assistance. It was no doubt on his advice that Argun opened diplomatic relations with Europe, with a view to forcing the Moslems to withdraw somewhat, particularly from Palestine. The Christians even hoped that the Khan would convert to Christianity.

The Moslems, excluded from all public employment, conceived an implacable hatred for the Jewish minister. A sect of brigands, the assassins, founded especially to kill the enemies of Islam, resolved to put him to death with all his family, but the plot failed.

Saad-Addaula aroused a lot of hatred due to his arrogance, including among the Mongols. Thus, when Argun fell ill, in November 1290, all the malcontents allied themselves against the Minister. In March 1291, when they saw that the Khan was definitely going to die, they hastened to kill the Jewish minister with his favourites and sent messengers to the various provinces to arrest all of Saad-Addaula's relatives, to confiscate their property and reduce their women and children into slavery.

"The Moslems went even further", writes Graetz. "They assaulted all Jews without distinction, massacring them all. At Baghdad, the Jews defended themselves forcefully and killed a great many number of their attackers."

During the following generation, the theologian Qayyim Al-Jawziya (1292-1350), author of sixty books, wrote:

"As to the nation which excites divine anger, it is the Jews, the nation of lies and perfidy, of swindling, trickery and subterfuges."

57

**Rindfleisch of Röttingen, 1298**

At Bern, in 1294, a new case of ritual murder resulted in the expulsion of the Jews, after which, the municipality erected a monument with a significant name: *Kinderfresserbrunnen*, the well of the child-eaters.

The same year, the Jews fled Zurich after having to pay a fine of 1,500 florins. 38 Jews were thrown into burning pyres at Schaffhausen and Winterthur, and those who escaped the flames sought refuge outside Switzerland.[174]

During the civil war that broke out in Germany between Adolf of Nassau and Albert of Austria, a gentleman named Rindfleisch, a native of a small city in Franconia named Röttingen, resolved to ignore the restrictions of Church doctrine and undertook to exterminate the Jews. This episode was triggered by a story of desecrated hosts.

On 20 April 1298, Rindfleisch began by burning all the local Jews. Under his leadership, the exasperated Christians went from town to town, recruiting new adepts on the way, and killing all the Jews that fell into their hands.

On 24 July, the entire Jewish community of Würzburg was massacred. At Nuremberg, the Jews, having taken refuge in the city fortress, defended themselves courageously. But on 1 August, the fortress was taken and all the Jews were pitilessly massacred. In Bavaria, only two communities escaped Christian vengeance: that of Regensburg and that of Augsburg.

From Bavaria to Franconia, the Rindfleisch rebellion spread to Austria. In the space of six months, they destroyed over 146 communities and – at least according to Graetz – killed over 100,000 Jews. This was the first real genocide in Europe. The Jews were in a trance, waiting to be massacred, which would have happened without the death of Emperor Rudolf and the ascension to the throne of Albert, who put an end to the civil war. The new emperor took vigorous measures to restore order in the country, punished those who had mistreated Jews and imposed fines on cities having participated in the violence.

## 58

### Philip the Fair

The King of France, Philip the Fair – Philip IV (1268–1314) – distinguished himself in particular through the firmness of his policies with regards to the Jews. The following is one of his edicts from July 1291, concerning the situation in Poitou.

“Philip, King of the Franks by the grace of God, to all those reading these presents, greetings.

“Having learned through the relation of a great number of very trustworthy men that the territory of Poitevin is being inhumanely exploited and absolutely crushed by a considerable quantity of Jews practising criminal usury and all sorts of illicit commerce; desiring to oversee the happiness of the inhabitants of this territory and comply with the wish which they have come to me to express in many different ways: we hereby instruct all prelates, canons, abbots, priors, colleges, cities, municipalities, barons and other temporal lords of the seneschal of Poitiers, as well as all those who govern men and all those who are dependent upon them, that the Jews are hereby expelled in perpetuity and irrevocably from the said bailiwick. We shall not at any time permit them to take up lodgings here nor to stay here; we order that they be expelled and by our seneschal before the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary”.[175]

In 1299, he renewed the order of Saint Louis which provided for the restitution of usurious profits extorted by the Jews. In 1304, by means of a convention signed with the Duke of Burgundy, Philip again prohibited his officers from receiving complaints from Jewish usurers of the Duchy and from prosecuting Burgundians whom the Duke had dispensed from the reimbursement of loans contracted with the Jews.[176]

Philip soon decided to finish with the Jews and crushed all opposition capable of threatening royal authority. He began by attacking the Jews themselves, before concerning himself with the Knights Templar. During the summer of 1306, he secretly ordered all his officials, high and low, to arrest and imprison all the Jews in France on the same day. On the morning of 22 July, all the Jews were arrested by the king’s men and thrown in prison. The order was carried out on the day after the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple of

Jerusalem (9 Av, in the Jewish calendar); the Jews had not yet recovered from the trials of the fast which they had observed in commemoration of the event. They were informed that their goods were forfeit and that they were granted one month in which to prepare to quit the kingdom. After the cutoff date, those who had not left France were to run the risk of being killed.

Heinrich Graetz affirms that Philip the Fair took this course of action "to replenish the royal treasury". But a bit further along, we read in the same text: "Philip the Fair pretended that the Jews had attracted this punishment as a result of their crimes". Graetz, quite obviously, does not describe or specify the crimes involved; but nevertheless feels sorry for his fellow Jews: "None of these unfortunates, neither the poor nor the rich, were left with anything but the clothes on his back, and enough food for one day. The gold, silver and precious stones of the Jews were transported to the king by the cartload; the rest of their property was sold at risible prices".

The king showed so much contempt for the victims of banishment that he gave his coachman the synagogue which the Jews of Paris had owned in the Rue de la Tacherie. Several years before, he had already condemned the Jews of Paris to a fine of 300 livres for singing too loudly in their synagogue.[177]

Their debtors were at first granted a term of 20 years in which to pay their debts. The auditors had great difficulty in making sense of this labyrinth of debts, agreements and contracts, most of them illegal, signed between Jewish creditors and Christian debtors. Facilities were accorded to the debtors who would denounce themselves, but few of them were simple enough to reveal the debts which they had contracted in secret.

The Jews then offered to reveal the exact situation of their debts if they were authorised to return. A few of them were allowed to return, but, in drawing up a balance sheet of their assets, they bribed the royal auditors and started lending usuriously all over again.

The list of their debtors which they presented contained so many widows, orphans and poor people who denied their obligations, that the King, not daring to despoil these unfortunates, rejected the declarations of the Jews as false and libellous, and ordered them to leave the kingdom immediately. He dismissed the auditors for their conduct, and ordered them to come to Paris to render an accounting of their actions, simultaneously prohibiting the authorities from searching for any more debts owed to Jews or from pressing for payment, unless they were obvious and of little value.[178]

In the month of September, nearly 100,000 Jews left France. At

Troyes, Paris, Sens, Chinon, Orleans, and many other cities, royal auditors were responsible for auctioning off their houses, synagogues and schools, bringing in considerable revenue.

Most of them settled in the adjacent regions, such as Lorraine, Alsace, Savoy, Dauphine, Provence – a part of which had already been placed under the sovereignty of the Holy Roman Empire – as well as Roussillon.

Emperor Albert protected the Jews who came seeking refuge in Germanic lands; and when new popular uprisings occurred in Franconia, Swabia and Bavaria, the sovereign offered them asylum and punished the rioters.[179] It must be said that the Jews were, for the emperors, a profitable property, like real estate. They spoke of them in this sense in their public pronouncements and expressed themselves very imperiously of their alleged ownership rights to all the Jews in the Empire.

In Gascony, the king of England, Edward II, on the complaints received regarding the excesses of the usurers, commanded the Jews to leave his States in 1314. The order probably was not carried out to the letter but there were so many edicts of this kind, since he renewed it over 30 years later, declaring that his express will was that the Jews should be banished.[180]

A particular class remained in France: the converted Jews. For the most part, they were very dubious Christians, and it sufficed for them to come into close relations with their former fellow Jews to cause them to abandon their new faith and return to the faith and customs of their fathers. But the Inquisition was there to supervise the flock of the faithful. Apostasy was a crime equivalent to heresy, and those who intended to become Jews again were pitilessly persecuted.

## 59

### 1320: The Crusade of the Pastorals

The banishment of the Jews didn't last long. In 1315, in fact, Philip the Fair's successor, Louis X the Quarreller, who only reigned for two years, readmitted the Jews into the kingdom so as to finance the war in Flanders,[181] and this, for a term of 12 years, with the promise that if the king decided to expel them after this period of time, he would warn them a year in advance. Despite the protests which exploded all over France, their recall went ahead. Jewish auditors, appointed by the king, were charged with giving all those who desired to return letters containing an indication of the place where they wished to live.

When one year later, after the death of Louis X, his brother Philip V, known "the Tall", succeeded him, he confirmed and even extended the privileges of the Jews, protecting them quite especially against the attacks of the clergy and decreeing that only royal officials would have the right to confiscate their goods and their ledgers. A public act fixed their rights and obligations and assured them of a tolerable existence. Here are the two principal articles: they must live by the work of their hands or the sale of good merchandise; they may lend at interest, but without practising usury. Their old debts would be paid; they would receive a third, and the king would receive the other two thirds (perhaps this article was one of the principal reasons for their recall; they could not be prosecuted for whatever had happened prior to their return. No lord could tolerate any outside Jews on his lands, i.e., any Jews apart from his own Jewish subjects. Their old privileges would be restored, and they would be permitted to repurchase their synagogues and cemeteries at the market price. Those of their books which had not been sold would be returned, except for the Talmud, which remained condemned by the Church.[182]

Still common in the 13th century, "show" theological disputations disappeared in the 14th century. The Talmud was no longer disputed; rather, it was burnt. In Delamare's monumental work, *Traité de la police*, published four centuries later, in 1705, we read that the treaty of June 1315 states "that all the books of their law shall be returned, with the exception of the Talmud, since this book is abominable [...] A tissue of innumerable indignities, this work contains, in addition to a multitude of abominations, curses and horrible imprecations proffered

each day by the perfidious and ungrateful Jews against the Christians and their exercises of devotion. This impious book, worthy of all anathemata, shall be seized".[183]

The Jews could therefore have dedicated themselves to trade, and even legal lending, in compliance with the privileges which they had just received. The lessons they had received should have taught them extreme circumspection. But they persisted in their stubbornness, and complaints concerning their usury never ceased. The same year in which Philip the Tall confirmed their privileges, it became necessary to repress the usury of the Jews of Montpellier and oblige them to wear the "Jew mark". The king's parliament even imposed a contribution of 1,500,000 (one and a half million) livres – an enormous sum at the time – upon the entire Jewish nation of the kingdom, as a fine.[184]

Upon their return to France, the Jews had learned nothing. A case of ritual murder occurred at Chinon in 1317. Another case of ritual murder occurred at Saint-Quentin. The Jews of Lunel, in Languedoc, were condemned for parodying the Passion and desecrating a cross in 1319.

In 1319, on the instigation of the Inquisitor Bernard Gui, ecclesiastics burnt two cartloads of copies of the Talmud at Toulouse. The following year, Pope John XXII, son of a middle-class family from Cahors, who became Pope in 1316, promulgated a bull, *Cum sit absurdum*, once again condemning the Talmud. A riot broke out in Puy in 1320, after another ritual murder accusation.[185] That same year, the revolt of the Pastorals broke out.

After a pilgrimage to Mont St. Michel, groups of Michelets, essentially, young peasants from the north of France, organised themselves to depart on a Crusade. This popular movement was supported by inflammatory sermons by an apostate Benedictine and a priest. Travelling in large gangs, these Pastorals converged upon Paris, which they entered on 3 May 1320. Five days later, advised of this uncontrolled, subversive movement, Pope John XXII promulgated the excommunication of all those departing on Crusades without pontifical authorisation.

After a few pogroms, the Pastorals were convinced to leave Paris. A troop of 40,000 Pastorals marched from town to town, banners flying. A singular assemblage of shepherds and peasants, they spread like a torrent throughout France, ravaging everything in their passage. Far from diminished by the obstacles which they encountered en route, on the contrary, their multitudes were ceaselessly on the increase.

At the beginning of the month of June, they traversed Saintonge and Périgord, which they devastated and pillaged, recruiting new



followers as they passed. More and more numerous, they entered Guyenne.

Having arrived in the region of Agen, they divided into two groups. Nearly 500 of them entered Jaca and savagely killed the Jews of Montclus before directing themselves towards Pamplona, capital of Navarre. Jaime III of Aragon put an end to their exploits by sending his son, Alphonse, to annihilate them.

The second group travelled up the valley of the Garonne, massacring the Jews as they went. These settlements of account extended throughout the entire region, from Bordeaux to Albi, Foix and other cities in the south of France. More than 100 Jewish communities were thus destroyed in Gascony.

Pierre Reymond de Comminges, who had just been appointed archbishop of Toulouse, wrote to the Pope requesting assistance and advice. The Pope then accused the king of France of irresponsibility and expressed his astonishment to his legate, Gaucelme, "that Your Royal Highness should so gravely have neglected to repress the excesses and the pernicious example of the Pastorals, who should rather be called wolves, rapacious and homicidal, whose manner of procedure gravely offend His Divine Majesty, dishonouring the royal power and preparing, for the entire kingdom, inexpressible dangers if they are not stopped".

On 25 June, the Pastorals attacked the Jews of Albi and Toulouse. The governor of Toulouse ordered his knights to arrest them. Many of them were conveyed into this city and thrown in prison, but the common people freed them and then attacked and massacred the Jews.

The Pastorals, in fact, met with popular complicity everywhere they went.

Four days later, they were at the gates of Carcassonne, where the royal army was awaiting them. Placed under the command of Aimeric de Cros, the senechal of Languedoc, the royal forces were reinforced by troops loyal to young Gaston II of Foix-Bearn. It was there that the Pastorals were crushed.

The survivors fled towards the region of Narbonne. The consuls, warned by the senechal, prepared to defend the city. The Pope wrote to the archbishop Bernard de Fargues advising him to do the same. The roads and passes were barred, and all persons running away or remotely resembling a Pastoral were hanged. In the fall of 1320, there wasn't a single Pastoral left in the region.

The remaining Jews did not appear to have learned a thing. In 1321, the communities of the bailiwick of Carcassonne officially asked King Philip the Tall to expel the Jews, due to their usury and extortions.

They were also accused of pimping and blasphemy: "They debauch Christian women, abuse their insolvent debtors, and insult the Christian religion".[186]

This year, Edward II, king of England, and Duke of Aquitaine, hastened to write to the seneschal of Gascony to demand the goods of the massacred Jews. "These goods", wrote the sovereign coldly, "belong to us, and not to other persons".[187]

The Jews revenged themselves for their persecution by poisoning wells. In 1321, many of them were arrested, tortured and burnt for this crime. At Chinon, 163 Jews were burned in two days. The authorities dug a ditch, lit a great fire and threw the Jews into the flames, both men and women.

At Vitry-le-François, 40 Jews locked up in jail were killed. Graetz estimated that as a result of this accusation – poisoning the wells – nearly 5,000 Jews paid with their lives. For the historian Léon Poliakov, obviously, this was all simply a "new myth", which created the "legend of the Jewish well-poisoners".[188] The Jews of France were nonetheless sentenced to a fine of 150,000 livres for poisoning wells.

In the Brabant, anti-Semitic insurgents laid siege to Genappe, which was full of Jews. Duke John II vigorously repelled the assaults, supported by the pontifical court of Avignon, which approved the firmness of the Duke of Brabant. In the same region, at Mons, in 1326, a converted Jew was accused of striking an image of the Virgin, painted on a wall of the Abbot of Cambron. The Jew was seized and put to the torture. Nevertheless, since he persisted in proclaiming his innocence, despite his torment, the torture was stopped. It was at this moment that a blacksmith claimed to have had a dream in which he was assigned the mission of revenging the Virgin, and offered to fight the Jew. A closed field was designated at the gate of Mons and a crowd streamed out to watch the spectacle which was about to be held for their edification. The two champions entered the lists, each one equipped with a cudgel. The blacksmith got the better of the Jew, who died on the spot. The body was then hung by the feet, upside down, and a fire lit underneath, slowly consuming the remains.[189]

**60**

**1328: The Revolt of the Navarrais**

Navarre had been integrated into France in 1285, through the marriage of Jeanne de Navarre and Philip the Fair. "In Navarre, which had been part of France for half a century", writes Heinrich Graetz, "hatred of Jews raged with this bitter violence which had never yet been seen in Germany".

The death of Charles IV, in the month of February, and the power vacancy, encouraged disturbances. On 5 March 1328, a Sabbath, the signal of attack was given by the inhabitants of Estella. The inhabitants of the city, incited by the Franciscan Don Peter Olygoyen, as well as bands of "Jew killers" from elsewhere, took the Jewish quarter by storm and the inhabitants were massacred. All over Navarre, mobs assaulted the Jews and there was carnage.

More than 6,000 Jews were liquidated. Only the community of Pamplona, capital of Navarre, seems to have avoided being attacked by Christians.

With Philip VI began the reign of the dynasty of the Valois. Hardly having just ascended the throne, the new king imposed fines on all the villages and cities involved, ranging from 200 livres (Viana) to 10,000 livres (Estella). Peter de Oligoyen's brother was imprisoned under the bishop's guard.

## 61

### **Spain in the Hands of the Jews**

The centre of Jewish activity at the time was in Spain. The brilliant business deals pulled off by the Jews in administering the finances of the kingdom, the harshness and contempt with which they treated the Christians, as well as their haughtiness, soon aroused the hatred of grandees, prelates and populace, who allied themselves against the rich and powerful financiers. People were only waiting for a favourable opportunity to settle accounts. The alliance first saw the light of day in the Cortes (representative assembly) of Madrid in 1309. People were complaining of Hebrew treasurers and speaking of the need to deprive the Jews of control over financial affairs.

In 1315, the Cortes of Burgos resolved that the tax collectors would be chosen from bourgeois notables of the various localities, and that they could not be nobles, nor priests, nor Jews. At the council of Valladolid, in 1322, the clergy decreed that the ancient canons of the Church should be applied, excluding Jews from public office.[190]

But the decisions of the councils of the Church were hardly followed by results. Under the reign of Alphonse XI (1325–1350), “the situation of the Jews of Castile”, writes Graetz, “was so satisfactory, particularly compared to that of their fellow Jews in other countries, that this epoch was, for them, almost a Golden Age... Under the modest title of treasurers, intelligent Jews then directed the policies of Castile. The high nobility also employed Jewish advisors and officials.”

They were “dressed in silk and gold”, enjoyed “consideration and authority”. They protected their fellow Jews “against the cupidity of the lower nobility, the jealousy of the people and the malevolence of the clergy. The sole fact that there were Jewish dignitaries among the sovereign’s entourage, wearing the uniform of the court and knight’s swords, sufficed to inspire a salutary reserve among the enemies of the Jews. No one dared to outrage, vilify and sometimes kill them, as occurred in Germany, as long as they were known to enjoy the support of powerful defenders in the King’s entourage”.

When he attained his majority, Alphonse XI took the reins of government, and personally chose two Jews, Don Joseph d’Ecija and Samuel Ibn Wakar, from among his favourites.

Don Joseph d’Ecija’s full name was Joseph ben Ephraim Beneviste

Hellévi. On his uncle's recommendation, the king appointed him treasurer and even intimate advisor. Joseph d'Ecija never went out except in an official carriage, accompanied by knights, and the grandees of Spain ate at his table.

Don Samuel Ibn Wakar (Samuel Abenhuer), the other Jewish favourite, was the king's physician, astronomer and astrologist. Though exercising no political function, he enjoyed great credit at court. Don Joseph and Don Samuel were jealous of each other, and their rivalry was to have unfortunate consequences for their fellow Jews.

As the result of complaints filed by the people against Jewish usurers, who "strengthened by the support of Alphonse XI, hounded their debtors mercilessly", writes Graetz, the Cortes once again requested the king to put an end to these abuses, and the King agreed. In 1329, encouraged by this initial success, the Cortes went even further and requested the king to prohibit the Jews from acquiring immovable property, collecting taxes or acting as royal treasurers. This time, however, Alphonse XI refused. What is more, he granted new favours to Don Samuel Ibn Wakar, entrusting with the tax collections on merchandise imported from Granada, under Moslem domination, and authorising him to strike coins of the country bearing the legal title, by special privilege. Out of jealousy, Joseph d'Ecija offered to pay the King a higher sum than that offered by Ibn Wakar for the privilege of collecting the taxes paid on the goods from Granada. He thought he had pulled off a clever trick against his rival, when the latter succeeded in persuading the King that he would render service to the Castilian population by prohibiting any imports from Granada (1330-1331).

With the rapid growth of commerce, numerous Jews had been attracted to Aragon, where they prospered by usury. By royal ordinance, Jews were prohibited from lending at interest, from receiving more than 20% per year, and from cumulating the interest with the principal. But a simple prohibition was not sufficient to prevent the abuses of Jewish usury. A few years afterwards, it was necessary to draw up more detailed statutes "to counter the avidity of the Hebrews and the hardness of their usury" (from the statement of content of the statutes), since, in Aragon, as nearly everywhere else, their inventive minds were always finding new ways to evade the laws.

Numerous precautions were intended to prevent the various frauds of the usurers. The preamble declared that the Christians had almost entirely renounced usury, but that the insatiable avidity of the Israelite usurers knew no limits, particularly regarding the cumulation of interest with the principal. The government's intention was not to prevent the Jews from lending at interest, but to put an end to the abuses. It was

ordered that all Jews who wished to lend at interest in the cities or countryside should first swear before a notary that they would obey the laws.[191]

Throughout the country, the exasperation of the Christians was reaching the point of paroxysm. A newly converted Jew proved the bitterest enemy of his former fellow Jews. This apostate, named Abner, from Burgos, is better known under the name of Alfonso de Valladolid. This physician knew the Torah and Talmudic literature well, and also possessed profane knowledge. Having reached the age of almost 60, he converted to Christianity and had been attached to the sacristan of a major church in Valladolid. He was the author of various writings of religious controversy, particularly the vast *Libro mostrador de justicia*, an anti-Jewish summa denouncing the daily prayers of the Jews and their curses against the Christians. "He manifested a violent hatred of his former fellow Jews", writes Graetz. "Familiar with Jewish literature, he singled out the passages which lead to equivocation, and multiplied his accusations against Jews and Judaism".

He composed a great number of writings where he sometimes attacks the Jewish religion with great heat, and sometimes defends Christianity against the objections of the Jews. Since he was less comfortable in Spanish than Hebrew, he used Hebrew to denounce the writings of the Talmud containing injurious passages about Christ.

At Abner's request, the King of Castile invited the delegates of the Jewish community of Valladolid to come and debate this question publicly with their enemy. Called upon to justify themselves, the Jewish representatives of Valladolid affirmed that these imprecations were in no way directed at the founder of Christianity nor its adepts; but they fooled no one. On 25 February 1336, upon concluding the controversy, King Alphonse decreed that the Jews would henceforth be prohibited from reciting the passages in question.

Among the favourites of the King of Castile were Gonzalo Martínez d'Oviedo, formerly a poor knight, who owed his position to Don Joseph d'Ecija. But Gonzalo conceived a profound hatred for Don Joseph and all Jews. When he became the King's minister, and grand-master of the order of Alcántara (1337), he conceived a plan to exterminate the Jews of Castile. He began by insinuating to the king that Don Joseph and Don Samuel Ibn Wakar had amassed immense riches in the offices which they occupied, and obtained authorisation to take all measures which he considered necessary to make them disgorge their ill-gotten gains.

On his order, the two Jewish favourites, as well as two of Ibn Wakar's brothers and other relatives of the accused and their families

were thrown into prison and their property confiscated. Don Joseph d'Ecija died in prison and Don Samuel succumbed to the tortures inflicted upon him.

After this initial success, Gonzalo tackled two other Jews, Moïse Abudiel and Soleiman Ibn Yaisch, who also occupied high positions. Gonzalo then believed that the time had come to attack the Jews of Castile as a whole. During a campaign against Granada, in which he took part as a general, he engaged the king to imitate Philip the Fair of France, but his advice was contradicted by the king's ministers and even by the prelates.

Gonzalo also beat the Moslems who had attempted to invade Castile. Their chief perished on the battlefield. After this brilliant victory, he had no doubt that his sovereign would allow him complete freedom to deal with the Jews as he saw fit. A woman's intervention saved the Jews and prepared for Gonzalo's fall.

The beautiful Eleanor de Guzmán had in fact bewitched the king and made him suspect in the eyes of Alphonse XI, who decided to have him arrested. Gonzalo was ordered to return to Madrid, but Gonzalo refused to obey and raised the knights of the order of Alcántara, as well as the inhabitants of the cities placed under his authority, against the king. He even attempted to ally himself with the king of Portugal and the king of Granada, who was an enemy of the Christians.

In 1339, Alphonse XI then convened all his knights and marched against the rebels. Frightened by the prospect of a civil war, several knights from Alcántara abandoned the cause of their grand-master and surrendered to the king the towers which they were responsible for defending. Seeing himself powerless to continue the struggle, Gonzalo implored the king's grace, but he was condemned as a traitor and burned alive. As a result, the Jewish communities of Castile celebrated the day of his death as a day of deliverance. King Alphonse again treated the Jews with benevolence, and entrusted a high post at court to Moïse Abudiel.

62

**The German Judenschläger, 1336–1338**

A new revolt against the oppressor broke out in Germany. Emperor Louis IV of Bavaria was more favourable to them, while his rival, the Austrian Frederick the Fair (c. 1289 – 13 January 1330), was quite hostile to the Jews, causing all copies of the Talmud in his states to be searched for and burnt, and insisting with other princes before the Pope for him to put the Jews back in their place.

In view of the imminence of the danger, the Jews of Rome sent a delegate to plead their cause at the papal court of Avignon and before King Robert of Naples, suzerain of Rome, who protected the Jews. The Jewish delegate succeeded in pacifying the anger of the schismatic Avignon Pope, Clement V, “thanks to a gift of 20,000 ducats”, writes Graetz. The danger was thus allayed.

Starting in 1236, the Jews of the Empire were no longer free men, but “serfs of the imperial chamber”. Louis of Bavaria imposed a new tax upon them: the “golden penny”: any Jew or Jewess in the Germanic empire, aged over 12, and who disposed of the sum of 20 florins, should pay an annual tax of one florin. In his eyes, this tax was justified on the grounds that, since Vespasian and Titus, the Jews paid an annual tax to the Roman emperors whose direct heirs the Germanic Caesars claimed to be.

Under the reign of Emperor Louis, the Jews suffered the setback of disorders and civil war which then raged in Germany. For two consecutive years (1336–1338), bands of peasants and beggars, calling themselves the “Jew Killers”, ravaged the Jewish communities of Southern Germany.

At the head of these Judenschläger were two members of the nobility, including an Alsatian inn-keeper named Cimberlin, the “king of the poor”. They were known as “Armenleder”, “leather arms”, due to the strip of leather which they wore wrapped around one arm. For more than two years, they criss-crossed the countryside between Alsace and Austria, killing Jews and destroying their property. Armed with pitchforks, hatchets, poles and flails, 5,000 peasants revenged themselves for their humiliation.

In Alsace, the first localities they entered – Roufiach and Ensiheim – felt the effects of the rage of the common people, too long despised.



Nearly 1,500 Jews were massacred. The survivors took refuge in the fortified city of Colmar. The troop of Jew Killers were not long in arriving under the walls and demanding their victims. At the magistrates' refusal, the insurgents spread throughout the region and committed all sorts of disorders.

The Emperor's protection remained ineffective or came too late. The Jew Killers were dispersed, or at least contained, by the arrival of Emperor Louis, but after his departure, they regrouped and renewed their activities. The bishop then formed a league of lords and municipal magistrates to break their resistance. In the end, the armed force succeeded in capturing one of the Armenleder, and the Emperor ordered him decapitated.

Similar massacres occurred at this time in Bavaria when a new case of host profanation occurred. The municipal advisers of the city of Deckendorf had themselves fixed the date of the insurrection. On 30 September 1337, when the church bell gave the signal, the knight Hartmann von Degenburg, accompanied by numerous knights, entered Deckendorf and fell upon the Jews by surprise, who were pillaged, killed and burnt. A church dedicated to the Holy Sepulchre was erected on the spot and became an object of pilgrimage. From Deckendorf, the disorders spread through Bavaria, Bohemia, Moravia and Austria, killing thousands of Jews.

The Emperor, who was then embroiled in struggles with the Pope and the King of France, had more or less ignored all these events. His relative, Henry, Duke of Bavaria and the Palatinate, even congratulated the inhabitants of Deckendorf for having liquidated the Jews, and authorised the public use of everything they had stolen.

The Jews, protected by the Popes, had the possibility at that time of taking refuge in the papal states. While they were never persecuted there, at Rome as at Avignon, it is because they were never allowed to oppress the people, dedicating themselves to illegal commerce, ridiculing religion and fomenting heresies.

The same year, a council convened at Avignon passed the following resolution, among others: "All Christians must reject and despise the fetid services of the Jews. The Jews, for their part, rise too far above the servile condition which is proper to them."

## 63

### 1348: The Black Plague

The Black Plague, which came from the Orient, arrived at Marseille on Jewish international merchant ships.[192] From 1348 to 1352, the plague spread for over four years with unprecedented violence, killing off one quarter of the population of Europe, or approximately 25 million individuals. The plague did not completely spare the Jews, but the fact is, as Graetz writes, that they died "in smaller numbers", giving rise to the justifiable suspicion, among the Christian population, especially since certain Jews had already poisoned the wells 20 years before to revenge themselves on the Pastors.

The people, convinced that the Jews had caused the plague out of hatred for the Christians, committed massacres which the authorities had great difficulty in repressing.

In mid-May, a few Jews were killed. From there, the movement spread to Catalunya and Aragon. At Barcelona, the population had already killed 20 Jews and pillaged numerous houses. A few days later, the same scenes were repeated at Cervera, in Spain, where the Jewish communities barricaded themselves in their districts.

At the beginning of the month of July, Pope Clement VI promulgated a bull by means of which he prohibited the killing of Jews without legal condemnation under pain of excommunication, as well as their forced baptism and/or looting their property. Perhaps this bull had some effectiveness in the south of France, where he lived, at Avignon, but it had no effect on the rest of Christendom.

The environs of Lake Geneva also became the theatre of bloody disturbances. On the order of the Duke of Amadeus of Savoy several Jews, accused of poisoning, were incarcerated at Chillon, Thonon and Chatel. At Chillon, the defendants were put to the question. One of these Jews, named Aquet, declared that he had poisoned wells at Venice, Apulia, Calabria and Toulouse. These declarations were recorded by the secretaries in their transcripts and countersigned by the judges. As a result of these declarations, not only were the defendants burned, but all the Jews living around Lake Geneva as well. In September, the consuls of Bern sent to Geneva for the records of the hearings and burned all the Jews in the city. Pope Clement VI published a new bull, but it was not obeyed.

The massacres took on quite a particular nature of savagery in the Holy Roman Empire. In vain did the new Emperor, Charles IV, seek to interpose himself.

Graetz writes here: "The Germans not only persecuted the Jews to gain control of their property. It was quite in all the innocence of their stupidity, and with firm conviction, that they believed that it would have been quite easy for the Jews to poison the Rhine, the Danube, the rivers, springs, the fountains and water tanks of Germany".[193]

In many cities, they went so far as to surround their wells and fountains with walls to prevent the inhabitants from approaching, forcing them to drink rain water or melted snow. Towards the end of 1348, the Jews were expelled from all the cities on the upper Rhine. They were considered outlaws. They were expelled or burnt at will. Chased out of the cities, they were beaten to death in the countryside by the peasants.

In Basel, they were tortured. Marooned on an island in the Rhine, they were locked up in a house built especially for this purpose, which was then set on fire. After this summary execution, the council decided that no Jew would be allowed to settle in the city, a prohibition which remained in effect for 200 years. A few days later, it was the turn of the Jews at Fribourg.

The verses of Guillaume de Machaut (1310–1377), the most famous French poet of his century, were no doubt an accurate reflection of the feelings of the people of his time. The following is an extract from his *Judgement of the King of Navarre* (1349):[194]

"Afterwards there came a piece of shit  
False and traitorous, a renegade,  
This was Judea the shameful,  
The bad, the disloyal,  
Whoever hates the good and loves all evil  
Who gave so much gold and money  
And promised Christian people,  
That poisoned wells, rivers and fountains  
Which were clear and clean  
In several locations."

In the Dauphine, the sovereign was also the accomplice of the anti-Jewish insurgents: while the people swooped down on the Israelites and massacred them, the Dauphin had others arrested, sentenced by judges, and their goods confiscated.[195] The archives of the Dauphine contains the accounts of the sums corresponding to the executions of the guilty. The trial of the Jews of Vizille lasted ten days and cost 27 francs, 17 sous and a penny. The question is raised in these accounts of

a master Girard, who was cut in two and attached to the gibbet for stealing a Christian child and delivering him to the Jews. 13 members of the sect were murdered at Veynes, in the region of Gap. Those of Saint-Saturnin underwent the same fate a few days afterwards.[196]

At Rouffach, a great many Jews were burned on a plain which still bears the name Plain of the Wells. At Strasbourg, pots of poison were found in the wells. The magistrates of the city persisted in their sentiments of benevolence with regards to the Jews, but the mayor, a certain Wintertur, soon had to yield to the demands of the common people. The workingmen's guilds met on Cathedral Square after obliging Wintertur and his colleagues to resign from office, an act which was followed by multiple acts of anti-Jewish violence. On 14 February 1349, 2,000 Jews were thrown into prison, then dragged to the Jewish cemetery, where hundreds of them were burned alive in a wooden shack.[197] The prefecture headquarters was later built on the site of this cemetery. Their synagogue was demolished and replaced by a chapel. The new council prohibited the Jews from residing in Strasbourg, a prohibition which remained in effect for a century, and their immense riches were confiscated. The only Jews spared were those who converted to Christianity.

In several places, the magistrates used the treasures and precious stones taken from Jewish houses to embellish the city.[198]

At Mulhouse, where the Emperor had already acquitted the residents guilty of anti-Jewish violence and cancelled a debt of 200 silver marks owed to the Jews, an imperial charter again acquitted the bourgeoisie after the massacres of 1348 and granted them the houses and other property of the victims.[199]

Such massacres occurred in the great majority of German cities. In the Rhineland provinces, the residents of Spire opened the series of massacres. A very small number of Jews accepted baptism. The Jews of Frankfurt suffered the same fate, but the pillaging of Jewish houses caused a fire that destroyed a quarter of the city.

The flagellants, mendicant penitents, went in groups from town to town, inspiring new terror.[200] At Mayence, a troop of flagellants incited the people against the Jews. The Jews were not in a mood to perish without resistance. Three hundred of them equipped themselves with weapons and stubbornly defended themselves, killing 200 Christians. Faced by overwhelming numbers, they set fire to their houses and threw themselves into the flames after burying all their treasures. On 23 August 1349, the largest Jewish community in Germany – approximately 6,000 people – was thus destroyed. The bodies were placed in barrels which were rolled down into the Rhine.

The Palatine Count Rupert, despising the clamour of the people, welcomed and protected the Jews who had escaped from Spire and Worms.

Persecutions resulting from the Black Plague reached Cologne, where the Jews were so much more numerous that the Jews from the surrounding regions sought refuge there. There, they were attacked by the Christians on the same day as their fellow Jews from Mayence, and all were massacred.

These killings spread from locality to locality, throughout Germany, from the Alps to the North Sea. The contagion reached Bavaria and Swabia. The inhabitants of Memmingen, in Swabia, obtained letters from the Emperor acquitting them from any prosecution relating to the massacres which they had committed against the Jews.[201] A few years before, in 1344, the Jews of Memmingen had been powerful enough to have the bishop place an interdict on the bourgeoisie which had committed these acts, probably because of their debts. The Jews paid dearly for this impudent procedure when the general rioting broke out.[202]

Jews were killed *en masse* at Augsburg, Würzburg and Munich. "At Nuremberg", writes Graetz, "the Jews of this mercantile city were particularly detested because they had considerable wealth and beautiful homes, paid for by numerous debtors". Emperor Charles IV declared to the council of the city that he would hold it responsible for any mistreatment inflicted on the Jews. But no one paid any attention to his orders. On a square later renamed Judenbühle ("Jew mound") the Christians erected an enormous pyre and burnt all the Jews who had not succeeded in fleeing.

At Regensburg as well, where there was the oldest Jewish community in southern Germany, the common people demanded the death or at least the expulsion of all Jews. The Jews owed their health to the intervention of the council and the high bourgeoisie, who solemnly swore before Mayor Berthold Egoltspecht to defend them against any aggression.

At Brussels, every Jew in the city, approximately 500 in number, was massacred by the crowds. In Brabant, the massacres were not just a momentary paroxysm, that is, the executions of Jews and lepers continued for nearly two years, which was for as long as the Plague lasted.[203] Then, just as the popular frenzy was dying down, the flagellants arrived to stir it up again.

Nevertheless, there were several countries where the Jews didn't suffer too much. Louis, King of Hungary, had expelled them from his states, but as miscreants, not as poisoners.

In Poland, as well, where the Black Plague was raging, they were not too badly mistreated, thanks to the protection of King Casimir the Great, who showed benevolence towards the Jews. It should be noted that King Casimir had fallen under the influence of a Jewess named Esterka, who became his mistress. In 1354, at the request of a few influential Jews, Casimir confirmed the Charter of Kalisz, which had been drawn up in the last century, granting the Jews exorbitant privileges. The Jews took refuge *en masse* in the Kingdom of Poland, which then began a long decline, ending in its dismemberment by its neighbours at the end of the 18th century.

In November 1355, a sort of Constitution of the Germanic Empire was promulgated under the name of the Golden Bull, at the diet of Nuremberg. The monarch conferred a few Kingly rights upon the seven electors of the Empire, such as the right to possess sources of additional income. This illustrates the manner in which the Jews were simultaneously rejected and sought after, disdained and courted by the princes and nobility.

"They knew well that they were only appreciated for the resources which could be derived through them", writes Graetz. Hardly astonishing that, faced with this obvious proof that they could only defend their miserable existence through money, they were so avid in obtaining it.

64

**The Late Awakening of John the Good**

King John II, known as John the Good, was King of France from 1350 to 1364. In 1356, he had been taken prisoner by the English at the battle of Poitiers. During his captivity, the Jews negotiated their readmission into the Kingdom with the Dauphin, the future Charles V, and obtained privileges which were confirmed upon King John's return.

Through an edict of March 1360, the Jews could return to France paying an annual fee, for a limited duration of 20 years. They then obtained considerable commercial privileges. "They could lend at rates of up to 80 or 100 percent and demand collateral", writes Graetz.

The Jewish banker Manassès de Vesoul, who had directed these negotiations with zeal and ability, was responsible for collecting the annual taxes imposed on his fellow Jews. To defend them against arbitrary action by the judges and officials, a Jewish court was authorised to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction over them, without appeal. These privileges attracted many Jews to France.

The following are the articles of the treaty concluded between the Jewish banker and the royal government.[204] The King agreed to permit the Jews to enter the Kingdom of France; to remain there for 20 years; to acquire dwellings there; to engage in trade and brokering; to practise all liberal and mechanical arts; to lend money at interest, all without impediment on the part of the authorities and lords of the Kingdom. They were to enjoy royal protection, having no judge other than the Royal Commissioner, the Count d'Estampes. Each Jew, upon entering the Kingdom, was to pay 14 florins for himself and his wife, and one florin two large livres tournois for each of his children and their people. In return for this contribution, they were to be quit of all other taxes of any nature whatever, and would not be subject to any servitude or lordly fee. They were to have a protector or guardian, a function to which the King was to appoint the Count d'Estampes, prince of the blood; they were not to be subject to prosecution except by the said Count or the King, and no other justice of the Kingdom should ever be entitled to prosecute them for any offense; in addition to which, the King's prosecutors were to be barred from bringing charges without duly informing them of all the facts and circumstances. For common crimes, they were to be discharged by virtue of a deposit paid

by the Jews or Christians. No Jew was ever to be prosecuted in court, for any crime whatsoever, committed prior to his entry into the Kingdom of France.

In the event that any of them should prove unworthy of remaining in the community, two rabbis, assisted by four other Jews appointed for this purpose, would be entitled to banish them from the Kingdom, but in this case the King should enjoy the confiscation of his goods and was to receive the sum of 100 florins from the two rabbis. Those who lent money to the Christians against collateral were to take four pennies interest per livre per week. Whatever they may have received in addition was to be returned to the debtors. The public authorities were to assist them in recovering their loans; they were to be permitted to lend upon all sorts of obligations and pledges, except ecclesiastical vessels and agricultural tools. It was to be prohibited to compel them to attend Christian sermons, or to engage in combat in a closed field; it was to be prohibited to seize their books. All ordinances contrary to the present franchises were to be abolished; all ancient privileges were to be confirmed as often as the Jews wished.

It is obvious that the draft of the above treaty was drawn up by the Jews themselves, since the King's government would not have so carefully compiled all the guarantees proper to prevent violence.

The privileges granted to them were exorbitant, and simply the precursor to more violence. Philip Augustus had established an interest rate of two pennies per week, which was already excessive. The rate now granted them was twice as high, that is, nearly 80% per annum. Whatever the rarity of cash, the legal rate established by the ordinance of 1361 was intolerable, and the King was quite short-sighted in allowing himself thus to be surprised by the cupidity of the Jewish usurers, who were very certain to recover their costs in a very short period of time against the King's subjects, regardless of the head tax which they undertook to pay to the Treasury. What they brought into the Kingdom in terms of capital earned them a return of 80%, starting in the first year. They could thus anticipate an abundant harvest during the 20 years in which they were allowed to live in France.

This is why they insisted so persistently on being allowed to remain among the Christians, despite the reverses which they had had to endure at regular intervals.

All the cash of the French would be swallowed up in the money chests and strong boxes of the Jews, and their stay was to cost the Kingdom far more dearly than the King's captivity for ransom at Poitiers.[205]

The Jews also stipulated the right to possess dwellings without



mentioning lands. The essential point from their point of view was the right to lend money. Jewish historians, or assimilated Jews, who claim that the Jews of the Middle Ages practised usury because they were forced to do so are either ignorant or dishonest.

The readers of our previous books know the score on this subject.

The inevitable happened. Complaints were raised against Jewish usury in all parts of the Kingdom. The King, having taken the advice of notables from several good cities, declared by ordinance announced at Reims, in October 1363, that “major abuses” committed by the Jews had forced him to intervene.

He first required them to wear a *rouelle* the size of the red and white royal seal on their clothing, and he made them subject to prosecution by ordinary courts despite all the prerogatives granted in the past. He also declared the nullity of all obligations by means of which Christians pledged their liberty as collateral in loans from Jews.[206]

Which proves that, after plundering their debtors of all their property, the usurers then reduced their borrowers to slavery, or, least, servitude. The obligation to wear a distinctive mark on their clothing was renewed shortly afterwards in the Assembly of the Estates General held in Amiens.[207] Twelve councils and nine royal ordinances ordered all the Jews in France to wear the *rouelle* between 1215 to 1370. Which is to say that many Jews attempted to evade doing so.

**65**

**The Death of Blanche of Bourbon**

Alphonse XI of Castile was married to Marie-Constance of Portugal, who gave him a son, Peter. But the King had left his lawful wife and son for his mistress, Eleanor de Guzmán. This situation aroused profound bitterness in Peter I and his mother, who, after the death of the King in 1350, wished to revenge themselves upon the bastards of the deceased King, which Peter did so thoroughly that he quickly acquired the nickname of Peter the Cruel.

Don Peter, son and successor of Alphonse XI, ascended the throne at the age of 15. Under his reign, the Jews enjoyed considerable influence in Castile. Don Peter had appointed Don Samuel ben Meir Allavi (or Ha-Levi), from the distinguished Abulafia Hallevi family of Toledo, as treasurer. Little by little, Samuel gained the King's trust, became his intimate counsellor and was consulted in all important matters. The King's physician and astronomer was also a Jew, Abraham Ibn Carçal. There were so many Jews at Peter's court that, to show their contempt, the Spaniards referred to it as the "Jewish court".

In 1352, in order to seal an alliance, Peter I decided to marry Blanche of Bourbon, sister to Juana of Bourbon, Queen of France, wife to Charles V.

There was very keen dissension among the courtiers, some declaring for the Princess of Bourbon, and others for the King's mistress, Maria de Padilla. Samuel, and with him, all the Jews in Spain, favoured Maria de Padilla, because they knew that Blanche of Bourbon viewed the Jews with displeasure since they occupied all the highest positions at court, and she had already publicly expressed her intention to get rid of them.

In July 1353, Peter the Cruel married Blanche of Bourbon, but, on the pretext of delayed payment of the dowry, he abandoned her shortly afterwards to join his mistress, who had already given him a son. The failure of this marriage obviously caused the failure of the alliance with the King of France. Don Peter then freed himself from all maternal restraint and had his mother exiled to Évora, in her native Portugal, before having her poisoned. Then, in 1358–1359, he got rid of all his enemies, starting with three of his half-brothers. He then murdered his aunt, Eleanor of Castile, and his sister-in-law, Juana Núñez de Lara

(wife of another half-brother). Castile was then plunged into a bloody civil war. Henry of Trastámara (also spelled *Trastámare* or, incorrectly, *Transatamare*), another of Don Peter's half-brothers, headed the revolt.

At Don Peter's court, Samuel Ha-Levi now enjoyed considerable influence. His riches were immense, writes Graetz, who adds: "Numerous Jews, unshakeable in their hopes, saw in the elevated situation of Samuel and other Jewish favourites, certain proof that the messianic times were approaching".

Don Peter took umbrage and one day confiscated the entire fortune of Samuel and his family. The Kingdom recovered 230,900 doubloons, 4,000 silver marks, 125 chests of precious fabrics and 180 slaves. "It seems that considerable quantities of gold and silver were found concealed in Samuel's house." Samuel himself was thrown into prison and tortured. It was hoped to make him confess that he possessed even more riches, but he made no confession and died under torture. "It is true", writes Graetz, "that, even after Samuel's death, the King continued to entrust high positions to Jews".[208] It was not without reason, therefore, that Henry of Trastámara continually referred to Peter as "the King of the Jews".

In 1361, Don Peter had his first wife Blanche of Bourbon imprisoned and then assassinated. "It was said", writes Graetz, that, "a Jew had poisoned Queen Blanche on the King's orders, because she had expressed the desire to expel the Jews from the Kingdom. A French romance has perpetuated this legend".

This "legend" is nevertheless a proven fact, which also caused the King of France to send the constable Bertrand de Guesclin and his "great companies" into Spain to lend Henry a helping hand in 1365. A detailed account of it may be found in the *Collection complète des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*. [209] Volume IV, published by Jean Petitot in 1819, is dedicated to the memory of the Constable of France, Bertrand du Guesclin. This is the republication of a text by Jacques Le Febvre, "provost and theologian of Arras, hereinafter chaplain and preacher of the Queen", published in Douai in 1692, entitled *Anciens Mémoires du quatorzième siècle, depuis peu découverts, où l'on apprendra les aventures les plus surprenantes et les circonstances les plus curieuses de la vie du fameux Bertrand du Guesclin, connétable de France* (*Ancient Memories of the Fourteenth Century, Recently Rediscovered, in Which One Can Learn of the Most Surprising Adventures and the Most Curious Circumstances of the Life of the Famous Bertrand du Guesclin, Constable of France*).

Jean Petitot provides a plethora of historic details relating to Bertrand du Guesclin, and explains his preference for Le Febvre's

work, written in imitation of the ancient chronicles. Le Febvre retains the archaic language of du Guesclin's time. "I believed", he writes, "that the patois of the fourteenth century, which I used in a few places in my book but with much reserve and discretion, will serve to relax the reader's mind and even be of some pleasure to him, while revealing the lively and naive features which are conveyed with such forcefulness".

Jean Petitot adds: "We therefore decided to reproduce Le Febvre's original text, whose occasional lapses even better recall the tone and manner of the authors of the fourteenth century".

The following is a summary of chapters 14 to 22. Chapter 14 is entitled "Of the Origins of the War in Spain between King Peter, Known as the Cruel, and His Natural Brother Henry, Count of Trastámara".

"Bertrand, always seeking new occasions to display his valour and courage, found material with which to satisfy his warlike inclinations in Spain, where the people were taking sides, some with King Peter and others with Henry, Count of Trastámara, Bertrand sided with the latter, as we shall see later. The source of this dispute was the bad conduct and cruelty of the said Peter, criticised for his enormous injustices. The first was the mistreatment of the Queen, Blanche of Bourbon, his wife, sister to the King of France. The indignities which he committed against this princess scandalised all his subjects, which could not view all his cruelties against her without great indignation, being a woman of great sweetness, whose birth and beauty should be the three links most capable of attaching him closely to her. But the ardent love which he felt for Maria de Padilla, who had enchanted him by a potion which she induced him to take, suffocated in his heart all the emotions of tenderness which he should naturally have felt for such an accomplished Queen. This concubine had acquired such a great ascendancy over his mind that she governed absolutely and caused him to commit a thousand outrages against his own wife, whom she regarded as her rival.

"The other injustice for which the King was criticised is that he carried on no business with Christians, whose customs and religion displeased him greatly. The Jews were the only confidants of all his secrets; he gave them his full attention and revealed to them all his innermost thoughts. With regards to all others, he maintained a profound dissimulation, rendering himself impenetrable to all the lords of his Court, to whom he could not refuse access, but remained inaccessible on matters in which he could not prohibit himself from communicating with them due to the eminence of his character and the royal authority which he held in his hands. Even his closest relatives

could not find the key to his heart, since he made such a mystery out of everything. This surprising conduct alienated all minds and attracted the aversion of all his subjects, which hoped only for revolution, in the hope of seeing a change in this horrible situation.

"So far did this prince, who was correctly called Peter the Cruel, take the inhumanity with which he treated her, whom he was not even content with depriving her of her liberty by imprisoning her, but whose life he wished to take, upon whom he undertook, by means of a poison which he had administered to her, but against which she was able to protect herself through emetics, because she knew the evil depths of this prince and the jealousy of his concubine, and always kept her guard up. All these outrages never destroyed the respect and regard which she owed him, promising herself that God would touch his heart and open his eyes, to cause him to overcome his blindness.

"The more Peter caused himself to be hated, the more Henry, his alleged natural brother, caused himself to be loved. It seemed that he was worthier of the Crown than this barbarous King; since he had found the secret of conciliating all the hearts through quite engaging airs, and no one ever left his presence unsatisfied with the reception which he had received, so much did he possess the gift of pleasing everyone. All hearts were turned in his direction. The pride of the first caused the sweetness of the second to be admired, and the Catholic religion, of which he made a high and sincere profession, rendered odious this penchant manifested by Peter for the superstition of the Jews. It was therefore desired to see him on the throne instead of the former, whose conduct could no longer be tolerated.

"Henry spoke to King Peter about his conduct in the hope of amending it, which only increased Peter's bitterness [...] The prince's remarks were very inappropriately supported by a Jew named Jacob, who found himself there; since, wishing to flatter Peter and woo him at Henry's expense, he had the nerve to tell Henry that it was indeed bold to undertake to teach lessons to Peter, the wisest King on earth, and that the best thing Henry could do in the future would be to never more appear before him; but Henry soon made him eat his words at the expense of his own life; since after reproaching him for the pernicious advice he had given Peter, and the infamy of the nation, he pierced him to the heart with his dagger, and left him dead on the floor. The King, all surprised and quite indignant at this assassination committed in his presence, wished to avenge the Jew's death upon his brother on the spot, pulling a knife from his scabbard to kill him, but he was restrained by a knight who grabbed his arm as he was about to strike a blow.

"Henry escaped in the same instant, and had hardly gotten down the

stairway before he told his retainers to saddle his horses to enable him to flee instantly to save his life. Peter was being held down by four men, uttering a thousand curses against those who were restraining him, and accusing them of being accomplices of this bastard, whom he would never pardon for the blood which he had just shed. It was in vain that people told him it was only the blood of a Jew, a race having attracted the curse of God upon itself, a nation which had rendered itself the horror and execration of men, through the deicide which it had committed on the person of the Saviour; but all this oil thrown on the fire lit it so strongly that Peter had this poor knight hanged for preventing him from killing Henry”.

Chapter 15 of Jacques Le Febvre is entitled “Of the Tragic Death of Queen Blanche of Bourbon, Commanded by Peter the Cruel, Her Own Husband”:

“This barbarous King had conceived such a mortal aversion for Blanche of Bourbon, his wife, that he took all steps to make attempts on her life. The poison which he employed to dispatch her had no effect upon her, because knowing the design to cause her death, she took all the precautions necessary to guard against poisoning. Maria de Padilla, Peter’s mistress, induced this prince to send Blanche far away from the court entirely, and give her an establishment in some distant province, so that nobody ever saw her, and this absence, without hope of return, would have the same effect as her death. Peter, madly in love with his concubine, followed her advice. He confined the princess in the most distant province of the court, giving her a small retinue to back her up in her quality as Queen, not daring the anger the people against himself as he would have done if he had reduced her to a private condition. This domain, which Blanche had had by division, would earn her the admiration of all vassals dependent upon her seignury.

“A rich Jew held some lands as an enclave in the Queen’s department. He visited the court, like the others, to pay his respects as her subject, and as it was the custom in those times to show respect by kissing the cheek of one’s sovereign to show the zeal and affection which one would have all one’s life for her service, this Jew approached the Queen to salute her as his lady and his mistress; she could not refuse to accept this mark of servitude, since he was her subject; but after he had left her chamber, she expressed the horror she had felt for this ridiculous ceremony, criticising her servants for their carelessness, which they had shown in failing to prevent the villain from approaching her, and immediately called for hot water to wash her mouth and face, to clean off the stains, so to speak, which the Jew’s kiss had left there. Her indignation did not stop there; since, as she was

his sovereign, she wished to punish the Jew with the most drastically cruel torments for the temerity which he had shown in taking liberties in this manner; and in the first outburst of her anger she wished to have him hanged. When the Jew was warned that he had been condemned by the Queen, and that he was under pursuit for the purposes of hanging him, the Jew took flight and ran straight to King Peter to complain of Blanche's design on his life, turning a ceremonial duty, which he had hastened to fulfil, into a capital crime. The King received him under his protection, commanding him to fear nothing, and saying that he well perceived that this princess, having a hatred and an aversion for all persons whom he, the King, respected, would not scruple to make attempts on his life as well, as soon as she got the chance; that it was therefore necessary to prevent this; but that it would be much better to get rid of her secretly to save appearances, and without having any power over him.

"The Jew, burning with desire for revenge, assured him that nothing would be easier than to send him to the other world without leaving a mark on her body, no blows or wounds. Peter liked this expedient, and declared that whosoever pulled this thorn from his foot would render him a great service. He therefore permitted the Jew to execute the affair as he had conceived it, without any scandal. The vengeful Jew, who was anxious to satisfy his resentment against the Queen, was thrilled to have received this barbarous order from Peter. He gathered together a troop of his fellow Jews to assist him in the murder and, marching all night, visited the Queen's apartment. He entered, right up to her door and, knocking on the door at such an unheard of time of night, one of the Queen's servant girls refused to open, and, astonished at all the noise, told him through the keyhole that it was not the proper time to visit the Queen, and demanded what was the object of his visit so late and at such an hour. The Jew, to cause himself to be admitted, claimed that he had very happy news to deliver to the Queen, since her husband, in testimony to the fact that he wished to be entirely reconciled with her, was coming at that instant to come to be with Her Majesty. The chamber maid ran joyfully to the Queen to announce this unexpected adventure which was bound to be very pleasing to her, congratulating her in advance that the King had regained his own heart and wished to treat her more justly in the future than he had done. The Queen, who saw the impending danger, immediately began to cry, knowing that she had a very short time to live, because she foresaw quite rightly that the Jews, who hated her mortally, would not have appeared at her chamber in such great numbers without having received some bloody order, which they were

about to carry out. The chamber maid, becoming aware of the pains and misfortunes of her mistress, cried out in alarm, and crying torrents of tears, said that she would not open the door unless His Majesty absolutely commanded it. The Queen signalled to her no longer to dispute with the Jews over entry to the chamber and at the same moment raised her eyes to the heavens, for the health of her soul, protesting that she was not sorry to die innocently, following the example of the Saviour, praying God to spread His blessings on the Duke of Bourbon her brother, on the Queen of France her sister, on Charles the Wise, and on the entire royal family. She had hardly finished these words, when the Jews entered her chamber in a huge mob. They found the holy princess lying on her bed, holding a psalter in one hand, and a lighted candle to read her prayers in the other; and turning her eyes towards those who had just entered, demanded what they wanted of her, and who had sent them to talk to her so late at night. They answered that they were in desperation, seeing themselves constrained to announce to her the harsh order which they had received from the King to cause her death, and that she was to prepare herself for her last hour.

"This discourse was interrupted by the cries of her servant girls, who tore their hair and filled the chamber with their sobs, sighs, telling each other that the best princess in the world was about to die unjustly, conjuring Heaven to avenge this inhumanity upon those who were the authors. The poor Queen ordered them to contain their cries, adding that they need not cry so grievously, since she was about to die innocent, and it was rather Peter's conduct, her husband's conduct, which was to be pitied, committing this barbarous act through the evil councils of his concubine, who had long desired her blood.

"The Jews, fearing that the crying and wailing of the Queen's chamber maids would prevent the execution of their mistress and reveal the murder which they wished to conceal, took them all by the hand, dragged them out of the chamber, pulled them into a basement, and strangled them in order to kill the Queen Blanche in greater quiet and secrecy afterwards. These rabid killers did not hesitate in dispatching her, crushing her abdomen by dropping a heavy beam on her, so as to crush her to death, without leaving any bloodstains on her face or her body; and after they had done the detestable deed, they immediately withdrew to a castle located on a high rock, which the King had instructed them to do for asylum.

"This inhuman prince, not wishing to attract criticism for the murder which he had ordered, kept up the exterior pretence by all the means he could devise, publishing a manifesto in which he excused



himself for this villainous act as best he could; but his later conduct proved only too well that he was the author of it; since, instead of besieging the castle, in which the rascals had taken refuge, so that justice might be done, they came filing out six months later with an impunity which horrified everyone, and it was obvious that they had only been the ministers of Peter's cruelty. All persons cursed this evil prince who had never blushed in committing such a horrible assassination, of a princess whom he should have adored for the innocence of her morals and the nobility of her extraction. Most of the Jews, even those who had hitherto been Peter's most outspoken partisans, could no longer keep silent on this matter. Peter, for his part, took precautions against all of Henry's undertakings in his states.

"He levied numerous troops, gained the principal lords of Castile through gifts and favours, and performed so many acts of generosity to gain the commitment of the people of his party that poor Henry saw himself abandoned by all, and constrained to seek asylum in foreign countries. This unfortunate prince was reduced to throwing himself into the arms of the King of Aragon, who received him in his court with great probity".[210]

66

**Bertrand du Guesclin and the White Company**

Peter the Cruel ordered the King of Aragon to cease protecting his enemy, under pain of declaration of war. So as to avoid armed conflict, the King of Aragon was forced to distance himself from his friend.

Chapter XVI entitled "Of Bertrand's Resourcefulness in Using an Army Corps Composed of All the Vagabonds of France and Taking Them to Spain against Peter the Cruel to Avenge the Death of Queen Blanche and Cause Henry to Ascend the Throne".

"All of France learned with great pain of Peter's cruelty committed against Queen Blanche, his own wife, in causing her to die unjustly and abandoning her to the discretion of the Jews, who crushed her to death on her own bed after entering her chamber at night and finding her at her prayers, a candle in her hand. All the circumstances aggravated Peter's crime, and rendered the fate of this princess even more pitiable. The Queen of France, her sister, and the Duke of Bourbon, her brother, strongly condemned such a wicked deed, which deserved exemplary vengeance. King Charles V of France, known as 'the Wise' (1338–1380), shared their feelings very forcefully, and sought only an opportunity to watch it explode. This opportunity presented itself as favourably as it could. The Kingdom of France was bursting with rascals and vagabonds who were desolating the country with their brigandage and pillaging. It was impossible to suppress this disorder, because these crowds of thieves were growing more numerous by the day, recruited from the one million foreigners who had entered the Kingdom to plunge the country into anarchy and chaos. The countryside was infested by large numbers of German, English, Navarrese and Flemish brigands, sacking and burning the châteaux and holding the nobility to ransom. The prince's edicts were despised. Force and violence became the sovereign law of France, so much so that it seemed that France had become the prey of rabid dogs.

"King Charles, wishing to arrest the course of so much evil, assembled the wisest men of the Kingdom to take council as to best means of providing a remedy to so many evils without entering into open war against the brigands. Bertrand relieved his anxiety by suggesting the special pretext of avenging the cruel fate of Queen Blanche, his sister-in-law, and assuring himself that he could get rid of

this troop of vagabonds once and for all, he cajoled them so successfully that they came to share his sentiments, and he inspired them with the desire to turn their weapons against the King of Spain, in the hopes of enriching themselves with pillage all over Spain, an opportunity which would be offered by the war about to be declared by the prince. He even offered to place himself at their head and command them, to ensure the success of the expedition, representing to the King that through this artifice he would purge France of these foreigners, and that he would moreover employ them usefully against the enemies of the Crown. Charles gave a hand to Bertrand's judicious proposal, and immediately dispatched a herald to the leaders and generals of all these people to obtain a safe conduct, so that he might send them someone later who could contact them in complete freedom."

Bertrand du Guesclin then visited Chalon-sur-Saône, principal encampment of the "Great Companies", groups of undisciplined soldiers desolating the Kingdom after the end of the war against the English.

"Bertrand told them his plans, telling them that the King of France, furious with Peter, intended to make him repent for the cruel death which he had inflicted upon Queen Blanche, his sister-in-law, and that, to punish this cruel prince for such a black assassination, he had resolved to carry the war into the heart of his states; that the King his master had charged him with telling them for his part that if they wished to share such a just sentiment, and lend their troops and their assistance, he would not only pay them the sum of 200,000 livres cash, but would arrange with Saint Peter for the absolution of all their sins which they had committed until then; that he advised to join up, so much the more so because they would be going to a fat, rich country, the pillaging of which would greatly enrich them."

Hugues de Caurelay won over all the leaders – "Gascons, English, Bretons, Navarrese, who would give their word to march under Bertrand's ensigns [...]; Guesclin returned as happy as could be, and hastened to Paris to assure the King that he would deliver the kingdom from all the bandits and rascals who had been desolating the country for twenty years, through their pillaging."

These leaders were then summoned to the Temple, in Paris, where King Charles had established his dwelling. "This prince offered them a thousand favours, gave them the richest gifts he could and made them very rich presents to commit them further in his interests. The principal lords of the court did not content themselves with getting to know these men, they also wished to form a very close friendship with their generals, with whom they hoped to live more than a day. The Count of

the Marche, the Besque de Vilaines, the Marshall d'Andreghem, Olivier de Mauny, Guillaume Boitel and Guillaume de Launoy approached them, and declared that they would be quite glad to share with them the perils of the war which they were about to undertake. These leaders were enchanted to learn of this resolution, assuring them that such a noble and generous company would give even more heat to fighting well. Bertrand gathered them together at Chalons-sur-Saône, and made them march towards Avignon”.

In the fall of the year 1365, Bertrand du Guesclin set out en route for Spain. At Avignon, in the city of the Pope, he made a cardinal understand it was in the Pope's interest to pay, “...if he wished to contain the license of all these vagabonds, whose hands were so accustomed to brigandage, and who cared less about the absolution which they were promised than the money they were demanding, being entirely prepared, in the event of refusal, to conduct horrible depredations against the Papal states”.

The cardinal figured a deal was a deal, and departed immediately to render an account to the Pope of all that had occurred. The pope, understanding the situation, gathered the bourgeois of the city and demanded contributions. Soldiers, vagabonds and brigands then left with their pockets full, together with the papal absolution. They then headed straight for Toulouse, then Aragon, to assist King Henry against Peter the Cruel, “...who had no good feelings for the Christian religion, but rather his entire secret inclination was for Judaism, of which he made a secret profession, and who, moreover, had become the horror and execration of all of Europe”.

Henry came to meet Bertrand. “Guesclin embraced him tenderly, and made a very sincere protestation that he would never set foot in France without having first placed Henry on the throne of Spain”.

“It should be noted”, writes Le Febvre, “that the troops led by Guesclin were called the White Company because they all bore a white cross on the shoulder, as if they wished to testify that they had only taken up arms to abolish Judaism and combat the unfortunate prince who protected it to the great contempt of the cross.”

The army left Aragon “to penetrate deeper into Spain, so as to reach Peter, and give him no rest, or truce”.

The first city in their path was taken by storm and pillaged, “after which the victorious soldiers put many a Spaniard and Jew to sleep in mother earth if they dared to resist. The loot was great; since the Jews who surrendered at discretion, to save their lives, sacrificed all their riches to ransom their lives. Never did an army reap such pleasant booty as that which Bertrand had promised them: it was also necessary

to satisfy the lust for gain of so many Bretons, Frenchmen, Normans, Liégeois, Walloons, Flemish, Brabançons and Gascons, of whom the troops were made up, and who had only joined this expedition to enrich themselves from the ruin of Spain. The Marshall of Andreghem, Hugues de Caurelay, Gautier Huet and his brother, Guillaume Boitel, the Sire of Beaujeu, seconded Bertrand with admirable bravura, placing each one of themselves at the head of the men they commanded, and leading the assaults by giving them the first example of how to do it".

"Du Guesclin", writes Heinrich Graetz, "proved himself harder on the Jews, whom he treated, not as soldiers who fight for their King, but as slaves in revolt against their master."

The capture of the city spread terror all over Spain. Bertrand left a garrison in the city and continued to advance, arriving before Burgos. Archers and crossbowmen shot at all those besieged who appeared on the ramparts to defend the city, while pioneers and sappers filled in the ditches. The walls were undermined with picks and levers while rope ladders permitted the bravest to penetrate the fortress, "...although the Jews and Saracens, of whom the city was filled, threw boiling water down on them". The soldiers of the White Company were soon masters of the city.

"There was a Norman who was brave enough to plant the first of Bertrand's standards on the wall, and cry to the others that the city was taken, and they should climb up bravely. He soon found himself followed by a crowd of determined men who clung to the ladders and joined him in great numbers. From there, a crowd spread into the city and went to seize the gates and open them to their companions, who, frenziedly throwing themselves inside, made the bourgeoisie cry for mercy, who, kneeling down with their wives and children, begged for quarter, declaring that they were surrendering to Prince Henry, whom they wished to recognise in future as their master and sovereign."

Henry, "who wished to earn the honour of showing clemency to attract others into his party, allowed himself to be moved by their prayers, and not only promised them their lives would be saved, but also their property, which his followers were forbidden to disturb. He only wished to show such indulgence to Christians; for Jews and Saracens, who were entirely loyal to Peter, he gave no quarter [...]"

"After the White Company had stayed in the country for a while, to rest and recover from the fatigue of two sieges and bandage their wounded, the victorious troops threw themselves against Bervesca, a fortress which Peter had manned with a large garrison of Spaniards, who were entirely devoted to him."

Du Guesclin immediately invested the city and placed himself at

the head of the bravest men to commence the attack. "The besieged appeared on the walls, determined to defend themselves, while Bertrand's men shot at them with darts and arrows; Hugues de Caurelay chose a few of his hardiest troops with whom he approached the Jewish district, where he undermined the walls with great blows of iron battering rams, opening large holes in the walls: the Jews, understanding that they would all be massacred if they persisted in offering resistance, assisted the besiegers in entering their Jewish quarter in order to save their own lives. There was a Breton among the Caurelay troops who immediately climbed up on top of the walls and raised Bertrand's standard while crying Guesclin's name. This signal encouraged the others to exert themselves to the utmost, climbing up by means of rope ladders with which they had richly provisioned themselves. This assault was very bloody on both sides; since while the French were climbing the walls, and assisting each other in reaching the top of the rampart, the Spanish threw barrels of boiling water down on them from the top, causing them to fall into the ditch. This misfortune in no wise cooled the ardour of the besiegers, who relieved each other with ever greater rage and returned to the assault with renewed stubbornness. The besieged threw barrels full of stones down on top of them, and great beams to crush them, so much so that this vigorous resistance caused the French to doubt the success of the siege. It was believed that they would waste a great deal of time, and consideration was given to the idea of lifting the siege and departing, without making any further attempts. Henry feared that the siege would be abandoned, and made his last efforts in person before his troops, when Bertrand, who was never afraid, whom the presence of danger only made him more intrepid, appeared on the barriers of the gate with a woodman's hatchet and struck the gate so many furious blows that he broke it open. All the bravest men, encouraged by his example, entered pell-mell to attack the enemy inside the city, where they wreaked terrible carnage. Those who could avoid the soldiers' fury through flight concealed themselves in their houses, hoping to be safe from danger, but they were no safer than if they had been outside. The women kneeled in supplication before the victors to save the lives of their husbands and the children prostrated themselves at the soldiers' feet, begging them not to kill their fathers; but all these supplications were incapable of arresting the course of violence and killing. There remained an old tower in which a few Jews had taken refuge; Bertrand attacked the gates and rapidly destroyed them. No quarter was offered to the most obstinate of those inside but some indulgence was offered to others who surrendered on discretion in good faith."

Peter the Cruel, who was at Burgos, where he held court, was informed of the fall of Bervesca by two bourgeois who had escaped:

"They told him that the enemies had climbed the walls like monkeys with rope ladders, and that they had opened the way despite all the efforts made to dispute their passage; that, after all, the city was inundated with the blood of Jews, Saracens, and Spaniards which they had shed in rendering themselves masters of the town. This prince had difficulty believing the tale of the astonishing capture at first, and imagining that these two bourgeois had sold the city for money, he threatened to kill them all. One of them, to excuse himself, represented to him that those who had captured the city were not men, but devils before whom it was impossible to hold out; that these were men who feared neither arrows, nor darts, nor death, nor wounds; that the day dawned through all the dangers, always advancing without ever falling back; and that he believed that there was no fortress in all his states which could resist such determined troops for fifteen full days, and that the troops seemed to have come straight from Hell [...]

"Peter, not recovering from the alarm which disturbed him, called upon all the Jews in whom he had a quite singular trust. The first Jew was named Jacob; the second, Judas; and the third, Abraham. He implored them to inform him of their opinions and advice, in the deplorable state in which his misfortune had reduced his condition. These three men were themselves rather at a loss, not knowing which way the prince should turn to get out of such a dangerous predicament. He called a fourth advisor from the Jewish nation named Manassès, who took the liberty of testifying that he no longer believed the King to be safe in Burgos, and that he would do better to establish himself in Toledo, the walls of which were safe from capture and the citadel well fortified [...] Peter, thinking that he had placed his affairs in order, and counting on the loyalty of those left at Burgos, dreamed only of setting out for Toledo, accompanied by the Count of Castres and these four Jews, his particular confidants. He was received in this great city with extraordinary acclamations [...] Peter had just left Burgos when a spy from this city came to inform Henry, telling him that Peter had taken the road to Toledo, and that it was believed that Peter intended to hole up there. Bertrand, who was present at the presentation of this spy's report, was of the opinion that they should march away to capture Burgos, promising Henry to have him crowned King of Spain there [...]

"The march of the army commenced after the break of day. They put the baggage train in the middle; the avant-garde was led by the Marshall d'Endreghem, seconded by Olivier de Mauny, Hugues de Caurelay, Nicholas Strambourc, Jean d'Evreux, Gautier Huet, and

many English knights, all of whom made a very good impression. The rear guard was commanded by Bertrand, whose name was so redoubtable that everyone believed that his name alone was worth an entire army. The count of Marche, the Sire de Beau Jeu, Guillaume Boitel, Guillaume de Launoy, Henry de Saint Omer, wishing to earn the honour of accompanying such a great captain, and of sharing with him the perils and glory which he was about to seek on this expedition; but above all, Prince Henry promised that it would be advantageous to him to fight under the ensigns of a general whose arms had always been victorious, hoping, moreover, that God, knowing the justice of the cause which was motivating them all to act, would spread his blessing over their undertaking, then, that the enemy whom they were about to fight was a reprobate prince, who was neither content publicly to renounce the Christian religion, through the infamous commerce which he carried on with the Jews, a great scandal to all his subjects, but had what's more stained his hands with the innocent blood of the holiest and most accomplished princess of the entire world, that he should all the more so arranged that she should be his own wife, and that besides, she was descended from Saint Louis."

Here is chapter 18, entitled "Of the Voluntary Surrender Which Those of Burgos Made of Their Cities As Soon as They Learned That Bertrand and the White Company Were on the March to Besiege Them". We learn that these "three sects", Christians, Saracens and Jews, "all had but one desire, to recognise Henry as their King [...] as long as he promised them not to molest their customs and privileges". The coronation of King Henry and his Queen took place at Burgos, on Easter Sunday, April 1366.

"Bertrand and all his White Company, having gloriously executed that which they had undertaken in Henry's favour, took council together, in the thought of turning their arms towards Granada, against the Saracens who had taken control of the city. But Henry, seeing that the plan would gravely injure his interests, which remained unfulfilled, and could fall apart if he neglected them, ordered them to follow up their initial triumphs by advancing on Peter's territories, as they had so well begun, representing to them that it was a motive of religion which made them bear their thoughts against the Kingdom of Granada, because it was full of Jews and Saracens, that were no fewer in the lands of Peter's obedience, which impelled them to serve as the object in the accomplishment of their pious designs; that moreover he would abandon to them the pillage of all the conquests which they would make, of which they could enrich themselves greatly".

At this piece of news, Peter the Cruel left Toledo to take refuge in



Cardona, and hid in a forest, "so frightened was he of the peril which threatened him". The bourgeoisie of Toledo, terrified, did not fight. Henry approached the city with his army, and received the keys to the city from the hands of the bishop. Fleeing the enemy, Peter travelled to Seville, the only city of any importance remaining open to him. From there, he learned that Cardona had surrendered.

He took it out on his two Jewish advisors, Daniot and Turquant, "...who through their pernicious councils had embarked him in all the unfortunate affairs which he had to endure. He accused them of being the cause of all his misfortunes, since they had maliciously advised him to murder Queen Blanche, having they themselves rendered the ministers and instruments of this cruelty to satisfy their private vengeance; that since that detestable murder, they had aroused the indignation of all his subjects and the revolt of his own brother, who followed him, fighting everywhere; that they deserved punishment with the utmost torment, but that he would content himself with banishing them forever from his court, prohibiting them from approaching on pain of death. These two Jews obeyed without replying or attempting to justify themselves before this prince whose anger they feared. They set out for Lisbon to take shelter from the menacing storm; but by misfortune they were met with one morning by Mathieu de Gournay, an English knight, who surprised them exiting a little valley, as he was foraging. He had barely noticed them before he confronted them sword in hand, ordering them to surrender, or it would cost them their lives. These two miserable creatures, trembling with fear, cried for mercy: he asked whether they were Jews or Saracens; Turquant replied that they were in truth Jews, but that if he would be so good as to spare their lives, they would promise to deliver the city of Seville to him tomorrow. The knight assured them that not only would he spare their lives, but that they would be rewarded in proportion to such as essential service, if they were lucky and adroit enough to carry out their promise. Turquant resumed speaking, revealing to him the means he would employ to achieve his aim. He informed him that the Jews, having a separate district in Seville, could open and close the gates whenever he liked, and it would be very easy to enter the place they occupied and win over the officials with whom he had secret intelligence; that he would turn their minds so well that they would condescend to do whatever he wished, as long as he promised that in facilitating the capture of the city for Henry, neither their property nor their lives would be affected."

Turquant actually succeeded in convincing the elders of the Jewish community of Seville. Peter, being informed of this treason thanks to a

female Jewish spy, left Seville precipitously. "Henry, Bertrand and the entire White Company, took advantage of such a favourable occasion to present themselves before the walls of the city. The information which they had already obtained about the place from the Jews greatly facilitated the surrender", and Henry made his entry into Seville at the head of his army.

Peter went to meet the King of Portugal at Lisbon to request his assistance, but the latter made him understand that he did not have the means to combat the French. On the other hand, the Prince of Wales, eldest son of the King of England, who held Guyennes, an ancient province in western France, under English control, would no doubt be inclined to support him. "These arguments encouraged Peter to take the road to Bordeaux to speak with the Prince of Wales, who held court there. He therefore had a vessel prepared which he loaded with everything he had that was most precious, not forgetting his gold table, in which he embarked, followed by 25 knights, 50 Spanish shield-bearers and a great number of Jews, who made a very strong company."

In February 1367, the Prince of Wales, or Black Prince, who owed his nickname to the colour of his armour, crossed the Pyrenees. His avant-garde suffered a defeat at the hands of the French, but in April, impelled by the impetuosity of a few young Spanish lords, Henry fought the disastrous battle of Nájera, in northern Spain, against du Guesclin's advice. As a result of the defeat, du Guesclin was taken prisoner, while Henry of Trastámara took refuge on the other side of the Pyrenees, where he immediately regrouped his army.

Peter the Cruel, who no longer needed the Prince of Wales, perfidiously invited him to withdraw his troops towards Navarre, making him believe that there was an abundance of foodstuffs there and that he would go there personally, to bring him all the sums of money which he had promised. But having withdrawn to Navarre with his troops, the Black Prince found nothing to eat there, "all the crops having been consumed [...] and Peter, who was supposed to bring him so much money, so much riches and treasure, left him to rage helplessly together with all his troops".

Du Guesclin personally fixed his own ransom at 100,000 florins. The Princess of Wales, Joan of Kent, made him a present of 30,000 florins, while 4,000 French knights or shield-bearers who had served him in Spain paid the rest. The Black Prince quite willingly liberated him, all the more so since a rumour was current that he was only holding du Guesclin prisoner because he feared him. Du Guesclin regained Castile, where Henry had returned, and rapidly reconquered

the country. The siege of Toledo lasted nine months. The city was valiantly defended by partisans of Don Peter, "and most particularly by the Jews", writes Graetz. "The siege was horrible, and the community of Toledo disappeared almost entirely after the capture of the city".

Peter the Cruel had arrived to assist Toledo, with an army composed essentially of Moors and Jews. On 14 March 1369, he suffered a heavy defeat at the battle of Montiel and was taken prisoner. When du Guesclin went to visit him with Henry, the two half-brothers fought, and Peter was killed. Peter's death pacified Spain, and du Guesclin was able to return to France with the sensation of having accomplished his mission. On hearing the news of Peter's death, Pope Urban V cried joyously, "I hear with satisfaction of the death of this tyrant, rebel against the church and protector of the Jews and Saracens. All just people rejoice at the punishment inflicted upon the wicked tyrant".

**67**

**May 1370: The Hosts of Enghien**

According to a rumour in the Brabant, the Jews of the city of Enghien had purloined 6 consecrated hosts from a church of Brussels to pierce them with daggers and knives in their synagogues. An old Jewess denounced the guilty parties, and there was a general cry of indignation. The elders of the synagogue of Enghien were put to the question. On 22 May 1370, three of them were torn with pincers and burned alive near the Porte de Namur, Brussels. One of the condemned men, Jonathas, had acquired great riches through speculation.

All the other Jews were banished from Brabant, and their property confiscated. A resolution was taken to perpetuate the memory of this event: eighteen paintings depicting all the details of the event were painted for the Church of St. Gudula of Brussels. So as to commemorate the event, a secular holiday was instituted, the return of which was fixed at fifty years.

In July 1820, the story of the hosts of Enghien was still being celebrated, with eight days of festivals. In streets piled high with flowers, the faithful carried images of the saint, sacredly ornamented with precious stones, ornamented with eight pierced hosts. There were banquets, concerts, archery contests, fireworks and illuminations.[211]

68

**The Obsequies of Charles V**

When Charles V ascended the throne of France in 1364, in a country ravaged and partially occupied by the English, he hastened to abolish the restrictions added to Jewish privileges by his father, and authorised them to prolong their stay in France. The privileges of the Jews were thus established for six additional years. The Jews obtained everything they wanted at court through bribery, and the banker Manassès de Vesoul, who represented them, made very skilful use of his credit in their favour.

Despite the express prohibition against taking more than four pennies in interest per livre per week, the Jews, utterly incorrigible, greatly exceeded this rate, which was already too high. As usual, the complaints reached the King. The provost of Paris initiated legal proceedings and sentenced the usurers to heavy fines. There was even a question, at the King's council, of re-expelling from the Kingdom, but Manassès de Vesoul, in return for a bribe of 1,500 gold francs, was able to obtain a royal order shoving the matter under a rug and imposing silence upon the King's prosecutor. Then, after another payment, of 3,000 gold francs this time, they obtained an extension of the time they were allowed to remain in France, now amounting to 26 years in total.[212]

While the Jews visited the fairs of Champagne and Brie, it was not so much to exhibit merchandise as to speculate in the other traders' need for money, forcing other traders into bankruptcy and ending up with their collateral on top of the interest.

Charles Evrart de Tremagnon, a Breton jurist and author of the *Songe du Verger*, finished in 1376, one of the widely read books of the 14th century. The book was also an indictment of Judaism. The book's dialogue between a cleric and a knight contains remarks such as the following:

"And in fact", said the one, "I knew someone who borrowed 10 francs from a Jew, but when the principal and usurious interest rates were added together, he found he had paid 1,300 francs, and even then he wasn't in the clear. Anyone who honestly wished to investigate the matter would find 50,000 people in France who have been disinherited and reduced to poverty by the Jews in this Kingdom of France."

And the other responds, "The Christians, in their misery and poverty, live like dogs in the hope of getting their collateral back." And they both agree the fact that "These are the evils and horrors that occur every day as a result of doing business with or associating with Jews".[213]

The Jews were always supposed to pay a tax at certain tolls. At Saint-Symphorien d'Oson, a Jew on foot paid four pennies, a Jew on horseback and a pregnant Jewess paid double.

An even more insulting outrage was practised at Puy. Whenever a Jew dared show his face in the city, he was liable to trial by the choir boys in the cathedral. Under the terms of a sentence handed down in 1373, these same choirboys sentenced a Jew to a fine of 300 livres for being surprised inside the city.[214]

In the country of Lesmont, in Champagne, any Jew who passed by was compelled to kneel before the door of the lord or the lord's tenant farmer to receive a slap from him.[215] Georges-Bernard Depping, who reports these facts from the 19th century, remarks indignantly: "Such were the insults to which people were inhumane enough to subject the people of Moses and Solomon!"[216]

Charles V died in September 1380. The little people of Paris took advantage of the occasion and rebelled against the Jews. The Jews of the capital were pillaged and a few Jews were killed. The powerful provost of Paris, Hughes Aubriot, known as the defender and protector of the Jews, was unable to quell the revolt.[217]

Aubriot was on very poor terms with both the Church and the University of Paris, which was dominated by the Clergy. During the course of disturbances, in Paris, after the death of Charles V in 1380, he arrested some Parisian citizens who had harassed some local Jews. For this, he was placed on trial, and a variety of trumped up charges were brought up against him, including heresy, sodomy, and extortion. Luckily, he was a strong supporter of Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, who was able to prevent his execution. Instead, he was sentenced to life imprisonment on bread and water. He was later released during disturbances in Paris, and sought refuge in flight.

In the *Chronique des Quatre premiers Valois*, we read that Aubriot was accused of being "addicted to heresy, buggery, sodomy, and being a false Christian", and "having committed several horrible and abominable acts, such as living bestially with women against nature, having carnal traffic with Jewesses, such as handing over to the Jews the children of Jews who had been converted to Christianity, as well as corrupting women and then having had their husbands hanged for sodomy and not keeping Christian laws".[218]

In the adjacent duchy of Burgundy, by contrast, the Jews didn't have to suffer much. Philip the Bold (1363–1404) maintained the obligation imposed upon the Jews prohibiting them from leaving their houses without a “horn” hairstyle. He also prohibited them from wearing coloured clothing, bathing in the same places as Christians, and touching food exposed for sale, and having more than one cemetery and synagogue per diocese. He also ordered them to abstain from meat during Lent, like the Christians. But there were no bloody persecutions during his reign.

Strasbourg, city of empire, re-admitted the Jews in 1383 by a public act which limited their stay to a just a few years. But once they gained a foothold, they never had any difficulty in perpetuating themselves there and worming their way to respectability.

An Alsatian noble from Mulhouse named Neuenstein was being prosecuted for debt, the amount of which exceeded his capital. As he wished to get rid of his Jewish creditor, he invited him to dine with him. When the creditor arrived, he had him placed in a trunk by four tough valets who transported him to Burgundy. The prisoner only returned after four weeks, after paying a ransom of 400 florins. But the case ended up before a magistrate. Neuenstein was banished for perpetuity, and his estate was confiscated in favour of the city, who turned it into a tile factory.[219]

69

The General Uprising of 1391 in Spain

Henry of Trastámara, who ascended the throne of Spain in 1369, bore no ill-will towards the Jews of his kingdom. His struggle with Peter had absorbed considerable sums, and he owed large sums to his allies. He therefore needed skilful financiers to find the money required and collect taxes regularly. He called upon two Jews from Seville, Don Joseph Pichón (or Picho) whom he appointed Minister of Finance, and Don Samuel Abrabanel.

But anti-Jewish resentment was first expressed at the first meeting of the Cortes, at Toro, in 1371. "It was complained that this race occupied high positions at court and before the grandees of Spain, that they controlled the tax farming and thus made the Christians dependent upon themselves", writes Heinrich Graetz.

Henry was obliged to take these recriminations seriously and promulgated two anti-Jewish edicts. He prescribed the wearing of the *rouelle*, like their fellow Jews in the rest of Europe, and required them to change their Castilian names to Jewish names.

There were approximately 200,000 Jews in Castile around 1370, or between 3 and 5% of the total population. In the kingdom of Aragon, with 600,000 Jews, the proportion rose to 6 or 7%. [220]

The richest and most influential Jews had infiltrated all mechanisms of the State, enriching themselves through usury, parading around in public like peacocks, covered with gold and silk garments.

They were also active as pimps: a Jewish pimp was punished by fine at Barcelona in 1387. [221] "Some Jews", writes Graetz, "complained of the egoism and immorality of their rich fellow Jews, who dreamt only of increasing their fortunes and gaining more dignities... 'Most of our grandees', said the preacher Salomon Alami in his *Moral Mirror*, who frequented the royal courts and are officials at the Treasury, 'are proud of their situation and their riches, but forget the poor'. They live in palaces, go out in sumptuous carriages, and, with a princely prodigality, cover their wives and daughters with gold, pearls and precious stones... They are even jealous of each other and mutually calumniate each other before kings and princes".

Denunciations of Jews by fellow Jews were becoming quite common. "They even denounce the rabbis", says Graetz. "The Jewish



minister Joseph Pichón was thus accused of embezzlement by several of Jewish favourites, thrown into prison and sentenced to a fine of 40,000 doubloons. After paying this sum, he was released. To revenge himself or perhaps simply to justify himself, he implicated his informers in a 'very serious accusation', writes Graetz, who does not inform us of what it was.

King Henry II of Castile died at this point, in 1379. During the festivities of the coronation of his son Don John I, at Burgos, a court composed of rabbis sentenced Joseph Pichón for being an informant, without even hearing his defence. A few court Jews asked the young king to authorise them to execute one of their fellow Jews, said to be a very dangerous man, whose name they failed to reveal. Equipped with a royal charter and the text of the decree, Pichón's enemies visited the chief of police (*alguacil*) and demanded his assistance in executing the sentence of the rabbis.

On 21 August 1379, early in the morning, a few Jews, accompanied by the *alguacil*, entered Pichón's home, woke him up and got him to come outside on some pretext. The moment he got to the door, he was immediately killed.

The execution produced profound emotion, and, on the orders of King John I, the Jewish executioners, a member of the rabbinical tribunal of Burgos, as well as the *alguacil*, Fernán Martín, were put to death. What is more, the king eliminated the criminal jurisdiction of the Jewish tribunals; henceforth, the Jews were to elect Christians as judges in their criminal trials. Don John I also ordered them, under pain of the severest penalties, to abstain from all proselytism and to delete all insulting passages contained in their prayers.

From that time onwards, the situation of the Jews of Spain deteriorated. On the instances of the Cortes of Valladolid, in 1385, King John elevated into state law the canonical provisions prohibiting the Jews from living in the same house as Christians or from hiring Christian wet nurses. He also decided that neither Jews nor Moslems would be allowed to occupy the posts of treasurer to the King, Queen or *infante* [royal child not in line for the throne].

Ferrán Martínez, Archdeacon of Seville, was actively inciting the people of Spain against their Jewish oppressors. Martínez, former confessor to the Queen Mother, had thundered against Jewish acts of malfeasance, denouncing their "riches and indomitable pride" in his sermons since 1378. On 15 March 1391, in a town square, he finally and openly exhorted the Christians to free themselves, an exhortation followed by acts of popular violence. The authorities, directed by the chief of police of Seville, caused two of the ringleaders to be punished,

but this intervention only aggravated the popular anger. The Jews pulled all their usual strings and Henry III's regency council crushed the popular resistance movement.

Martínez nevertheless continued to preach the same sort of sermons. Three months later, on 6 June 1391, the people of Seville attacked the Jewish quarter and set it on fire. The crowd massacred the population so completely that the Jewish community of Seville, which consisted of 7,000 families, entirely disappeared. "4,000 Jews were killed by rioters, after which the survivors accepted baptism", writes Graetz. The women and children were sold to the Moslems as slaves, and two synagogues were transformed into churches. From Seville, the rebellion spread all over Spain.

After Seville, the revolt spread to Córdoba, the cradle of Spanish Judaism. Many members of the Jewish community were killed, and the others accepted baptism. At Toledo, as well, some of the community accepted Christianity. Nearly 70 Jewish communities of Castile experienced the same outbreaks of Christian violence, exasperated by Jewish domination.

At Saragossa, the principal agitator was the Archdeacon's nephew. The people attacked the *aljamas* (Jewish quarters) *en masse*, just before departing on a holy war in the Holy Land.

Although always in disagreement with Castile, Christians took up arms in the kingdom of Aragon as well. Three weeks after the massacre at Toledo, the same scenes recurred in the province of Valencia: "Not a single Jew of a community of more than 5,000 persons remained. More than 200 Jews perished, while the others sought safety in abjuration". At Valencia, 7,000 Jews were said to have converted to escape death.

At Palma, capital of the island of Mallorca, a group of vagabonds and sailors, preceded by a cross, crossed "Jew Street" in Montesión shouting, "Death to the Jews!" 300 Jews were killed, and many Jews renounced their faith. La Sicil, a region in Aragon, was the scene of more violence.

Three days later, carnage broke out at Barcelona, capital of Catalunya. The Jews of the city experienced four days of terror. On Saturday, 5 August 1391, towards 1:30 in the afternoon, a small group of harbour troops, including some sailors from Castile, burned the gate of the Jewish quarter and killed a number of Jews. The mob joined in the pillaging, which started that evening and lasted all night, while the surviving Jews took refuge in the royal castle.

Calm returned on Sunday, 6 August 1391. A counter-attack was even attempted, and a few of the guilty parties were arrested and thrown into prison. Royal officials, councillors and most of the

administrators mounted guard around the Jewish quarter and the castle to protect the Jews.

On Monday, 7 August, dozens of armed men gathered on the instructions of the advisors, and 10 sailors from Castile were sentenced to be hanged. When Guillermo de San Clemente, the King's deputy, was on the point of executing the sentence, at about 1 o'clock in the afternoon, he was interrupted by rioters, who freed the condemned prisoners after attacking the prison.

On Tuesday 8 August, dying of hunger and thirst, the Jews in the castle surrendered. A procession left the cathedral and came to meet them, whereupon most of the Jews immediately accepted baptism in the cathedral and churches. The others were put to death. Shortly afterwards, Lleida, Girona and other cities were the scene of similar events.

On 14 December 1391, 11 ringleaders of the riots at Barcelona were hanged. On 22 December, 10 others suffered the same fate and two were quartered, including a tailor named Armentora. The total number of death sentences amounted to 25.

These riots, which lasted a little over two months, from 6 June to 13 August 1391, caused hundreds of deaths. Highest estimates appear dubious: 4,000 deaths at Seville, over 2,000 at Córdoba. Others are more modest: between 100 and 250 at Valencia, 250 to 400 at Barcelona, 78 at Lleida.[222]

Heinrich Graetz writes: "The impression was generally so terrifying that, for several months after the end of these excesses, the Jews no longer dared leave the places of refuge in which they had sought comfort... They continued to live in a sort of continual trance, in a sombre mood, with a troubled mind, trembling at meeting a Christian and fleeing before a child".

These acts of violence no doubt indicated the coming of the Messiah, announcing the forthcoming hour of deliverance.

Some Spanish Jews crossed the straits to establish themselves in Algiers or Fez. Others went to Portugal, which had become an asylum for abjured Jews. King Don John I of Portugal energetically maintained order and punished all rioters with an implacable severity.

Pope Boniface IX once again prohibited Christians from using violence to baptise Jews. His bull was published in all the cities of Portugal and elevated into a law of the state. On 17 July 1392, King Don John I again promulgated an edict prohibiting Christians from punishing relapsed Jews (those who had returned to their religion of origin).

At the other end of Europe, in the Holy Roman Empire, more than

## *69. The General Uprising of 1391 in Spain*

---

3,000 Jews were massacred at Prague in a popular riot, and their synagogues were burned (Easter, 1389). The next year, Emperor Wenceslas published an edict declaring “all counts, barons, lords, knights, valets, bourgeois and other subjects residing in the country of the Franks discharged from all debts to Jews in both principal and interest”.

## 70

### 1394: Expulsion from France

In 1380, upon the advent of Charles VI, hardly out of childhood, the government was the plaything of courtly intrigue. The dukes of Berry, Burgundy, Orleans, each had their partisans, and the faction with the most credit obtained whatever royal orders they desired or disrupted parliamentary procedures. In this party struggle, the Jews never lacked for friends and protectors. No doubt they also had more debtors.

It was at this point, as always, that anti-Jewish riots broke out in Paris and a few provincial cities. The common people, enraged by the usury of the Jews, practised with impunity, pillaged Jewish property and wounded or killed several inhabitants; but the Jewish community always managed to arrange compensation. For example, they argued that precious objects left with them as collateral – gold, silver, precious stones, jewellery, etc. – had been stolen in the riots, and that as a result they could no longer return these objects to their owners. They were thus dispensed from returning them without even having to compel the government to reimburse them.

We see, through the public documents of the time, that they never ceased supplying the King with bribe money, for wars and other expenses.

In 1388, they extorted the right to demand four pennies per livre in interest, an exorbitant rate. But the kings always prohibited the cumulation of rents with capital, and charging interest on interest, which was called, in the language of the time, *faire des montes montes* [making mountains of mountains]. The Jews had never before been allowed to push usury to this point.

The king's prosecutors and other judicial officers then filed charges against the guilty usurers. In fear that the authorities might discover transactions capable of bringing down a new tempest upon their heads, the Jews hastened to advance the king a large sum of money.

They then complained that the officers of the law were molesting them, and begged the King to protect them from these "persecutions". The monarch in this case was weak enough to impose perpetual silence upon his own prosecutor, and to protect the Jews from any prosecution for 10 years.[223]

The unfortunate borrowers, for their part, probably paid 10 times

what it cost the Jews to obtain this concession. The King was weak enough to prohibit his own prosecutor from accusing them of any abuses whatever. He was also ordered to avoid disturbing them in any way and to allow them to enjoy their privileges to the fullest, so that the fortunes of private persons were placed at the discretion of the usurers for 10 years. Never since the reign of Louis the Pious had the Jews obtained so much power.

With an insane king and a government undermined by factions, the Jews speculated in public misery, enriching themselves rapidly, and, as usual, pushing their audacity to ever greater extremes. In this case, they asked the king to stop issuing creditors with the letters of respite which were obtained to prevent prosecution by the creditors of anyone who enjoyed credit at the royal court. It cost them 10,000 francs.[224]

Quite luckily, some honest judges reacted against these parasites. Despite formal orders from a "crazy" king, Jews guilty of exceeding the legal rate of interest or charging interest on interest were arrested and locked up in a caretaker's lodge, and consideration was given to confiscating all their property. The Jews, with money in hand, immediately went to complain at court, claiming that the prisoners were innocent, that they had only been exercising their privileges, and that, despite the persecution, the community was prepared to pay whatever sum of money the King wished to see raised. Through the payment of 6,000 francs cash, the representatives of the Jews obtained the liberation of the guilty parties. The prosecutor was reduced to silence.[225]

In 1388, in yet another case, at Montpellier, a Jew was convicted of placing counterfeit money into circulation. The curator of the privileges of the Jews of the city demanded custody of the prisoner, claiming that he alone had the right to judge them. But when the affair was laid before the King's Council, it was decided that the judgement belonged to the general masters of the mint. The outcome of the case is unknown.

The Jews finally lost their credit in France at the court of the Denis Machaut affair. Machaut was an extremely rich Jew from Paris who had converted to Catholicism. One day, he disappeared without a trace. There was a great commotion and the affair was laid before the provost of Paris. Seven Jews were arrested, who admitted having exhorted Denis Machaut to return to Judaism. Apostasy was a crime which was so rarely pardoned that a Christian was burned alive at Paris for having had children with a Jewess, who brought the children up in the Jewish faith.[226]

Assisted by lawyers and theologians, the provost condemned the Jews to be burned alive. But Parliament, having been apprised of the

affair, commuted the sentence to banishment and confiscation, moreover stipulating that the guilty should be whipped in three public squares, that they pay 10,000 livres in fines for the construction of the little bridge of the Hotel-Dieu, and that they remain in prison pending the return of Denis Machault.

The poet Eustache Deschamps, in his *Complainte de L'Église* (1393), then called for the expulsion of the Jews in his *vœux*.

The adversaries of the Jews took advantage of the Denis Machault affair to obtain the revocation of all the privileges granted to the Jews and their banishment from the kingdom. We are unaware of the intrigues which were put in play at court to arrive at this result.

The 28 years which King Jean had permitted them to remain in the kingdom of France in 1360, and the 16-year extension which Charles VI had granted them, should only have expired in 1396. But the crimes and other abominations which they committed every day obliged King Charles VI to cut this period short. The exasperation of the people was too great and could no longer be contained.

"The Jews collected great sums in interest and had their borrowers imprisoned when they didn't wish to pay", thus arousing popular enmity. "The people hated the Jews", writes Graetz. Their incessant raillery against the Catholic religion, the receiving of stolen goods, their usury, pederasty, pimping, ritual murders, racketeering and swindling of all kinds, had aroused the disgust and hatred of the Christians against the members of this sect. On 17 September 1394, the day of the Great Pardon, the King finally took the decision to expel the Jews from the kingdom.

"We have long been informed, on repeated occasions, by trustworthy persons, our prosecutors and officials, of serious complaints and grievances received every day of the excesses and crimes of the Jews against Christians and, for this reason, our prosecutors have conducted several investigations through which it appears that the Jews have committed various kinds of crimes, especially, crimes against our faith and the contents of our letters... After mature deliberation with our council, we hereby declare, as an irrevocable provision, that henceforth no Jews whatsoever shall be permitted to reside in or enter our kingdom".[227]

Loans owed to Jews were cancelled and their debtors discharged from repayment. This memorable edict put an end to the legal existence of the Jews in France.

The following text is by Michel Pintoin, a monk at Saint-Denis and historiographer to the King: "Jewish usury, which was getting more odious with each passing day, and which was practised throughout the

kingdom, have reduced more than one family to the most horrible misery. The enemies of Jesus Christ have aroused the hatred of all French people. The King, informed of these disorders and heeding the wise counsel of the Queen, his well-beloved spouse, has, despite the large sums extorted from the Jews every year – sums which filled his treasury – resolved to separate the wheat from the chaff and to distance all believers from contact with infidels. An ordinance, published in all the cities of the kingdom, commanded the Jews to leave France before Christmas and to seek refuge abroad, under pain of conviction of *lèse-majesté* and the confiscation of their property”.[228]

Graetz stresses that the decree had been promulgated, perhaps intentionally, on the Day of Expiation, while the Jews were in the temple. The Jewish historian gives vague and succinct explanations: “They were accused of outraging Christianity and violating the terms of their privileges”.

Charles VI nevertheless treated them less harshly than his ancestor Philip the Fair. He granted them a grace period in which they were permitted to collect their debts, ordered the provost of Paris and the governors of the provinces to protect them, and charged officers to accompany them to the border to protect them against robbery and assault. The Jews only left France in late 1394 and early 1395. They left for Provence, which was not yet part of France, Italy or the Holy Roman Empire. Jews only remained in the papal territories: in the Comtat-Venaissin, Avignon and Carpentras.

Some Jews had entrusted large sums to the famous Nicholas Flamel, a sworn scribe of the University of Paris, who passed for a sorcerer and alchemist, capable of transforming mercury into gold, and who was in cahoots with the cabbalists. Flamel, they say, never returned the money to the Jews, and is said to have used these sums to build the church of Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie, the tower of which is still in existence, next to the Hotel de Ville.

When their departure was decreed, the great theologian Jean Gerson praised Charles IV for having expelled the Jews.[229]

In 1398, the Provençal prior Honoré Bonet, who resided in Paris, published a text entitled *L'Apparicion de maistre Jehan de Meun*, author of *Roman de la Rose*. The great writer, who appeared to him in a dream, was said to have bitterly upbraided the prior for failing to put an end to the evils raging in France, against which de Meun now ordered him to rebel. Another great writer, Honoré de Balzac, also spoke through de Meun, setting forth the popular complaints against the Jews in these words:

“You have been thrown out of the royal kingdom due to your great



iniquities, your usury, your sins. One will find in you so many things to criticise that you really should have been burnt alive, since you practise no honest profession and wherever you reside no benefit or utility results from your presence. You do not till the earth nor do you toil on the sea. You shall have no portion of Paradise.”

A few Jews lingered in the kingdom, probably involuntarily, or because they were subject to prosecution by Christian creditors. In 1395, seven of these Jews appealed to the provost of Paris against the King’s prosecutor; who had put them to the question and “tortured” them. They remained in prison until at least 1397.

Two of them died, and eight others came to join them. It cost them 4,000 gold écus in bribes to the Queen to be freed, but they were immediately conducted to the bridge of Lyon or Macon, on the banks of the Rhine, for expulsion from the kingdom, along with all the other Jews.

On 30 January 1398, an ordinance of Charles VI prescribed that all the obligations signed by Christians to the benefit of the Jews would be “withdrawn, torn to pieces and burnt”. [230]

France was now *Judenrein*, purified of Jews. As a result, France experienced a magnificent flourishing in the arts and all other fields for the next four centuries, until 1789 at least.

After their departure, there remained such an evil memory of them and their presence that, many years later, people continued to express their hatred and disgust at the “rapacious usurers”. In his *Mystère de la Passion* (1452), Anoul Gréban caused one of his theatrical characters to describe them as the “cruellest of wolves”, “deadlier than scorpions”, “prouder than an old lion”, “more rabid than false dogs”. He also called them “wicked and felonious”, “bawds”, “whores and perverse progeny”, and “devils from hell”. [231]

This “anti-Semitism without Jews”, a phenomenon leading to a great deal of feigned puzzlement among Jewish intellectuals, cannot otherwise be explained.

71

1397: Expulsion from Venice

Since Italy was divided into a large number of small states, no government was never able to control the activities of the Jews. If one such state restricted their activities, another prince was always found who could be induced to consider it to his advantage to protect them.

Compliance with the order to wear the *rouelle* was as difficult to enforce in Italy as it had been in France, and had to be renewed on numerous occasions. The synod of Ravenna, in 1311, once again subjected the Jews to the wearing of a mark on their clothing, further stipulating that no Jew could reside more than a month in any location where there were any synagogues.[232] At Malta, the bishop exercised the functions of guardian of the *rouelle rouge*, that is, that he made sure that the Jews wore a red mark the size of the royal seal below their beards.[233] Pope Paul II required them to wear red *tabares* (a sort of short jacket). Later, at Rome, they were required to wear yellow clasps or *barrettes*, but the barrettes were as difficult to introduce as the *tabares*.[234]

At Venice, in the year 1298, the Great Council deemed it necessary to appoint five honest men to supervise the Jews and fine those who gave themselves over to usurious practices. They were then granted permission to reside and open banks for 10 years only, and were compelled to renew a licence called the *condotte*. They were then granted *condottes* for 10 years, in return for a yearly payment of 4,000 ducats into the treasury. The legal rate on loans was not to exceed 10% in the absence of a written contract. If there was a contract, the interest could increase to 12%. The senate wished to force the Jews to write written contracts at all times, so as to put an end to the endless disputes between Jews and Christians as to the rate of interest on loans.

In 1385, an ordinance of the Grand Council established that Jewish usurers were committing serious abuses by demanding usurious rates of interest and that they were continually enriching themselves in an outrageous manner at the expense of the poor. As a result, the Council ordered them never to refuse a loan when the borrower presented collateral equal to the value of the loan. They were also prohibited from having any intimate relations with Christian women, even prostitutes, under pain of a fine and six months to one year in prison.[235]

These regulations did not however put an end to the disorders. In 1388, the Senate began to complain that the Jews were refusing to loan small sums of less than 30 ducats to the poor of Venice at 8%. The Senate ordered them to grant these loans under pain of fine, while prohibiting the acceptance of holy objects as collateral.

On 27 August 1394, two and half years before the expiration of the 10-year contract, the Senate, by quasi-unanimous decision, ordered that all the Jews were to be expelled from the city upon expiration. In fact, in the Senate's report, we may read that "all the moveable wealth of the Venetians was in danger of ending up in the hands of the Jews." The *Judeorum expulsio* was effective starting on 21 February 1397. Henceforth, the Jews would only be authorised to enter the city with 15-year permits and they would be compelled to wear a yellow *rouelle* on their lapel. Lending at usury in Venice, "publicly or secretly", would henceforth be punishable by a fine of 1,000 ducats. It was necessary to await the beginning of the 16th century for the Jews of the nearby port city of Mestre to be authorised to come and engage in their dealings in Venice, on condition.

## 72

**Pablo de Santa Maria**

While a few Jews fled Spain after the riots of 1391, most of them remained in the country, where they were supposed to convert. These new Christians were called *marranos*, or *conversos*. But, writes Graetz, "while they professed Catholicism for appearances' sake, they continued to practise Jewish rites in secret. The authorities saw nothing or pretended they saw nothing". The Inquisition was not yet in operation, but the people were not deceived as to the innermost sentiments of these false Christians. The Spanish people "hated them even more than the Jews".

Nevertheless, some Jews were sincerely converted. Conversos were even the first people to demand the founding of the Inquisition. Wherever they established themselves, the Jews suffered persecution, "very often provoked by renegade Jews", writes Graetz. Because, as always, the sincerity of any "new Christian" can only be judged by the force of his or her anti-Judaism.

Don Peter Ferrus, a baptised Jew, published innumerable treatises against the rabbis and Jewish community. Diego, a monk, from Valencia, was also a secret Jew who mixed Hebrew words in his satires against the sect. The poet Alphonso Álvarez of Villasandino larded his poetry with Jewish words. The apostate physician Astruc Raimuch de Fraga, until that time one of the primary defenders of Judaism, also carried on very active Christian propaganda under the name of Francisco Diós Carne.

But none of these converted Jews did as much harm to his former fellow Jews as Salamon Levi, of Burgos, known, as a Christian, under the name of Paul (Pablo) de Santa Maria. Before his baptism, he practised the functions of rabbi. He engaged in noisy activity and lived like a lord, travelling about in luxurious carriages, accompanied by a numerous escort. In 1391, he received baptism with his brother and four brothers. Paul de Santa Maria then visited the University of Paris to study Christian theology and a few years later, the rabbi was ordained a priest. He went to Avignon, where the cardinal Peter de Luna had just been elected anti-Pope under the name of Benedict XIII. Thanks to his skill, zeal and his facility with words, Paul gained the good graces of the Pope. He was appointed archbishop and chaplain,

then bishop of Cartagena, and, on the Pope's recommendation, the King of Castile, Henry III, showered him with favours. He also published the *Scrutinorum scripturarum*, in which he accused the Jews of homicides, adultery, thefts and mendacity, and expressed joy at the massacres of 1391. Pablo de Santa Maria began to provoke new persecutions of the Jews, advising Don Henry III to prohibit access to public office not only by Jews, but by new Christians as well. "He expressed his malevolence towards Judaism and the Jews even when explaining the Bible", writes Graetz. "These actions showed the Jews that this particular apostate was indeed their most implacable enemy."

Nevertheless, King Henry kept two Jewish physicians around him, in whom he reposed absolute trust. For the Jews, the reign of Henry III was like a calm between two storms.

The situation deteriorated after this sovereign's death in 1406. The heir to the throne, John II, was then only two years old, and the queen mother, Catalina (Catherine of Lancaster), occupied the regency. As co-regent she had the infante Don Ferdinand, who later became king of Aragon. Finally, among the King's advisors was Pablo de Santa Maria, preceptor to the young king, who exerted a great influence in the council to the regency.

In 1408, an edict reinstating the paragraphs of the compendium of laws of Alphonse, who was hostile to the Jews, was published in the name of the young King. Public employment was now closed to them. Any Jew who accepted a function on the part of a nobleman or city was liable to a fine amounting to double the wages earned on the job. If his fortune was insufficient to pay the fine, first of all, all his property was confiscated, and, in addition, he was sentenced to fifty lashes.

On 2 January 1412, Regent Doña Catalina (Catherine of Lancaster), in accordance with the infante Don Ferdinand and Pablo de Santa Maria, promulgated an edict of twenty four articles, in the name of John II, intended to protect the Christian population from the Jews. The Jews were now obliged to reside in special districts (*juderías*) which could only have one gate to come in and go out of. They were prohibited from practising medicine, having business relations with Christians, taking Christians into their service, even on the Sabbath, and from occupying any public office whatsoever.

Their private jurisdiction was abolished. A few articles of the edict regulated the manner in which they were to dress. They were no longer permitted to wear the same garments as ordinary citizens of the country, nor to wear rich fabrics, under pain of a considerable fine; in the case of recidivism, they risked physical chastisement and even the confiscation of all their goods. They were prohibited from carrying

weapons. On the other hand, the wearing of the *rouelle*, of red cloth, was very strictly required. If a Jew shaved his beard or cut his hair short, he was punished by 100 lashes. Finally, they were prohibited from bearing the title *Don* ("Sir"), either in writing or orally, and from leaving one city to go and live in another. The Jews did not even have the freedom to leave the territory. Those surprised in the act of emigration lost all their goods and became serfs of the King. The nobility and bourgeoisie were threatened with severe punishments for offering protection to any Jew.

This edict, which shows the influence and probable partial authorship of Pablo de Santa Maria, was enforced in the strictest manner. A contemporary Jew, Salomon Alami, cited by Graetz, describes the results: "The wealthy residents of palatial dwellings", he writes, "are confined in dark corners, in miserable huts. We are forced to replace our sumptuous and elegant garments with rags, to make us objects of contempt and mockery. Considerable personages engaged in tax farming are reduced to poverty, because they know no trade permitting them to earn a living".

73

**Vincent Ferrer**

Such was the situation when Vincent Ferrer arrived at the court of Castile. Vincent Ferrer (or Ferrier) was a Dominican monk, originally from Valencia, who had refused a high position at the papal court at Avignon to travel Europe barefooted, as a simple flagellant monk. For twenty years, from 1399 until his death, he criss-crossed Spain, Italy, Switzerland, and even went to Scotland. He was known for the austerity of his morals, his contempt for riches, and his humility. He was often accompanied by an impressive retinue of followers, to the point that he had to preach outdoors, in large spaces, to enable him to be heard by the entire crowd. Burning with enthusiasm, eloquent, with a warm and vibrant voice, he knew how to move the masses. Whether tearfully describing the Passion of Christ or announcing the forthcoming destruction of the universe, he drew tears from all his listeners and exercised an absolute domination over them.

Wherever he appeared, he was welcomed as a saint, accompanied by a crowd of disciples. Upon his arrival in a village, the entire population left their work and ran to meet him. When he commanded the multitude to uncover their shoulders and mortify the flesh as Jesus had been flagellated by the Jews, thousands of listeners shed tears with him. The rich left their goods and lived in austerity, women from great families withdrew into the cloisters. There were never enough confessors to hear all the confessions that people had to make to them: criminals, rogues and courtiers denounced themselves for the scandal of their past lives. The notaries who accompanied the Dominican drew up records of the restitution of goods unjustly acquired. There were reconciliations between families, parties and cities.

This missionary, venerated as a saint by Christians, was feared by the Jews. Vincent Ferrer enjoyed a very great influence before the kings of Spain, because on more than one occasion, he succeeded in calming popular riots solely through the authority which he exercised over crowds. It was therefore easy to obtain authorisation from the royal family to preach in the synagogues and mosques, and to constrain the Jews and Moslems to come and listen to his sermons.

Vincent Ferrer was hostile to any physical violence against Jews and any forced baptism. But with support from the civil authorities, he

obliged the Jews to come and listen to his sermons. With the cross in his hand and the role of the Law under his arm, in the midst of an escort of flagellants and swordsmen, he invited Jews to accept baptism.

Using the pen and the spoken word, he undertook an implacable crusade, which he continued for many years. He first directed his attacks against the new Christians, whom he accused of being insufficiently fervent. In the fear of finding themselves subject to the fearful punishment applicable to relapsed converts, perhaps in part due to the inflammatory eloquence of the Dominican, many marranos did public penance.

In 1412, with Pablo de Santa Maria, he determined the government to issue the statute of Valladolid, which prohibited the Jews from selling or offering food to Christians, hiring Christians to till the land, and from shaving off their beards. The Jews naturally had to wear a distinctive sign.

Many Jews converted, the moment they started trembling at the sight of their synagogues being torn down. Vincent Ferrer could have had the Jewish districts completely destroyed by mobs with a single word. Wherever he preached, many Jews were baptised and many synagogues were transformed into churches and blessed by the Dominican. "During the four months that Vincent Ferrer lived in Castile (December 1412 – March 1413), he did the Jews so much harm that they never recovered from it", writes Graetz.

Called to Aragon, where several pretenders were disputing the crown, he succeeded, in June 1414, in having the Castilian infante, Don Ferdinand named king of the country. Ferdinand rewarded his services by hastening to have him appointed confessor and director of conscience.

Like their fellow Jews in Castile, the Jews were obliged to listen to the sermons of the Dominican monk, and in many communities, at Saragossa, Tortosa, Valencia and Mallorca, there were numerous abjurations. It is estimated that 20,000 Jews from Castile and Aragon accepted baptism as a result of his preaching. Vincent Ferrer, who died in 1419, was canonised in 1455. His saint's day is 5 April.



74

**Jerome de Santa Maria  
and the Tortosa Controversy**

The great schism of the Orient, which had pitted two Popes against each other for forty years, one in Rome and one in Avignon, ended in 1417, after the council of Constance.

A council meeting in Pisa had attempted to find a solution a few years before, in 1409. The 500 representatives had decided to depose the two Popes and elect a new one. In the month of June, the condemnation of the two rival pontiffs was pronounced and the cardinals elected Alexander V. These cardinals were excommunicated by the two rival Popes and the situation deteriorated, since there were now three Popes, two of them anti-Popes.

In May 1410, Alexander V died and was replaced by Jean XXII. In his *Chroniques*, Enguerrand de Monstrelet described the coronation of Pope (anti-Pope) Jean XXIII at Bologna. On this occasion, he recalls how the Jews saluted the cortege when he arrived at their street and presented the Pope with a roll of the Torah, as was the custom. The Pope threw it to the ground and said, "Your law is good, but ours is better". The Jews followed the cortege and attempted to approach the Pope, so much so that they threw coins. But the 200 armed men at the head and tail of the cortege each had "a leather mallet with which they struck the Jews, so great was the joy to see it".[236]

The anti-Pope of Avignon, Benedict XIII, then attempted to rally partisans to himself by provoking mass conversions of the Jews of Spain. To this end, in concert with King Ferdinand, he had convened the wisest rabbis at the end of 1412 to a religious dialogue at Tortosa. At this meeting, Jerome of Santa-Fe was to show them that the Messiah had already arrived, based on the Talmud, and had taken human form in Jesus. The papal court wished above all to convert the eminent Jews of Aragon to Christianity, persuaded that once the community leaders were converted the masses would follow.

Jerome de Santa-Fe was then one of the most implacable enemies of Israel. Like Pablo de Santa Maria, he was also a former Jew. Before his conversion, his name was Joshua Lorki d'Alcániz, physician to the Pope of Avignon. The list of the persons to be convened was drawn up by Jerome de Santa-Fe.

The Jews knew from experience how these conferences, which were nothing but traps, always ended up for them, but were not in a position to reject the proposal of the Christians. They had no alternative but to have themselves defended as best they could by their ablest scholars. Twenty-two of the most important Jews in Aragon appeared at this dialogue, with the poet and physician Don Vidal Benveniste Ibn Labi of Saragossa at their head, who was the progeny of a grand Jewish family. The representatives of Judaism in Aragon all possessed a high level of culture, but, writes Graetz, "the repeated persecutions and humiliations had defeated the courage of the most valiant. At the time of the events, this elite of the Judaism of Aragon was not yet capable of rising to the level of its mission".

This controversy prolonged itself, with many interruptions, for 21 months (from February 1413 to 12 November 1414) and took up 68 sessions, sometimes in front of 2,000 spectators. On the 63rd day, Jerome de Santa-Fe introduced the Talmud into the prosecution evidence, and Nicholas Donin later denounced the horrors of all sorts which it contained while demanding that the book be condemned. To attain this objective more easily, he made a compendium of all its abominations. Heinrich Graetz speaks here of "... all the fantasies and singularities" which one could discover "in the immense ocean of the Talmud".

Jerome also repeated the accusations of his predecessor Alphonse de Valladolid. The Jews were now divided into two groups. In accordance with the majority of his colleagues, Astruc Levi declared in writing that the *haggadot* incriminated in the Talmud had no authority and imposed no religious obligation. But Joseph Albo and Don Vidal protested and affirmed that they would submit to the authority of the *haggadot*, with the reserve that the passages cited by Jerome should not be taken literally.

The papal court also summoned to Tortosa, in groups, these thousands of Jews who had listened to Vincent Ferrer and who had accepted baptism. They introduced themselves all together in the meeting room and publicly made their profession of faith in the creed of the Christians. Three thousand neophytes also paraded in the baptistries of Tortosa, and the year 1414 became known as the "Year of the Apostasy". In the last session of the dialogue, the Pope coldly dismissed the notable Jews and announced that new restrictive measures would be taken against their fellow Jews. All the rabbis, with the exception of two, in the name of a crowd of Jews who had been present during the debates, declared that they would recognise and abjure their errors and demanded baptism.[237]

The measures announced by Benedict XIII were promulgated six months later, on 11 May 1415. The bull of Valencia consisted of 13 articles. Jews were prohibited, for example, from teaching the Talmud. All copies were to be searched out and destroyed.

All those who read the writings of anti-Christian polemics, in particular, a treatise entitled *Mar Mar Yeshu*, would be condemned as blasphemers. No community, small or large, would be permitted more than one synagogue. The Jews were forbidden from residing with Christians, bathing, eating, having commercial relations with them, from occupying public office, having Christian domestic servants or wet nurses, from practising medicine. Henceforth, for the first time, the Jews were obliged to live in separate quarters. Jewish relatives could not disinherit their converted children under any pretext.[238] Once again, they were required to wear distinctive emblems of red or yellow cloth. Finally, they were ordered to attend Christian sermons three times a year, and, after the sermon, to listen to the reading of the bull.

A son of the apostate Paul, Gonzalo de Santa Maria, baptised at the same time as his father, was charged with supervising the strict enforcement of this edict. No doubt, this bull, in most paragraphs, simply renewed the provisions recently taken by Queen Catalina. But, while the latter had only promulgated her edict against the Jews of Castile, the bull of Benedict XIII applied to the Jews of all Christian countries.

The bull of Benedict XIII, if it had been strictly enforced, would have put an end to the political existence of the Jews. It annihilated in effect all the sect's civil rights, and placed them outside Christian society. But anti-Pope Peter de Luna or Benedict XIII, recognised only in Aragon, did not enjoy such great authority over Christianity. Even Castile failed to obey him.

Benedict XIII, replaced by the council of Constance and abandoned by his friends, soon only retained his magnificence in the small fortress of Peñíscola. We do not know what happened to Jerome de Santa-Fe after the fall of his protector. In Jewish circles, this convert had received the nickname of *Megaddef* ("the Blasphemer"). King Ferdinand, the regent Catalina and Vincent Ferrer left the scene almost all at the same time, between 1417 and 1419.

In Castile, Catalina's restrictive laws continued to apply, and the bull of Benedict XIII remained in force in Aragon. "Vincent Ferrer, in particular", writes Graetz, "had hurt the Jews a great deal, not only in Spain, but in other countries as well."

There were many countries in Europe where Ferrer, either through his preaching, or through the reputation of his exploits, which preceded him wherever he went, caused "considerable harm to the Jews".

## 75 Martin V

With the termination of the Great Schism of the West, a synod was organised by the Jewish communities of Italy, held at Bologna and at Forlì (1416 and 1418), raised the necessary funds to purchase the protection of the Pope and the college of cardinals. Pope Martin V allowed himself to be bribed, and, on 31 January 1419, he promulgated a bull which began as follows: "Since the Jews are made in the image of God and that the debris of their nation will one day find health, we decree, like our predecessors, that it is prohibited to bother them in their synagogues, to attack their laws, usages and customs, to baptise them by force, to force them to celebrate Christian feast days, to impose upon them the wearing of distinctive signs or to place any obstacle in the way of their commercial relations with Christians".

"It is permitted to suppose", confirms Graetz, "that the rich gifts offered by the various Jewish delegations to Martin V were not at all without influence upon the sentiments of benevolence manifested by the pontiff with regards to the Jews".

Later, Martin V was able to take energetic measures against the crimes committed by the Jews. We know that the merchants of the sect have never scrupled to traffic in human flesh. On the edges of the Black Sea, certain Jews have never hesitated to sell young Christians to the Moslems.

The city of Caffa, in Crimea, was a flourishing colony, the great warehouse of Genoese trade in the Black Sea. Many foreigners moved there to profit from the activity of this Italian colony, and there were numerous Jews. We have no information on the trade they conducted, but we know that several of them, practising no religion in public and not making their religion known by any exterior sign, dedicated themselves to the slave trade. They purchased young girls and boys from the Tatars, the Russians and in the Caucasus, and sold them to the Saracens at a great profit. The young Christian slaves, young men and girls, finished up in the harems. The Dominicans of Caffa warned the Pope of this abominable traffic, and Martin V, indignantly ordered another bull, that the Jews should always wear a distinctive emblem on their clothing; he then authorised the bishop of Caffa and other Genoese trading posts to seize the goods of Jews suspected of dealing

in slaves and to use the money from these seizures to redeem the young people sold. Recalcitrant Jews were to be expelled from the colony.[239]

An Italian author of the 15th century, Giovanni Fiorentino, obviously had a good understanding of the nature of the Jews. In one of his writings, he shows a Jew from Mestre who wishes to cut a pound of flesh from the body of a debtor from Venice, simply to have the satisfaction of causing the death of a Christian.

A text from an anonymous author entitled *Gernutus, le Juif de Venise*, had been published at the end of the 14th century. Sung to the air of *Black and Yellow*, the ballad was compiled by an English folklorist, Thomas Percy, canon of Dromore, County Down, Ireland, in 1765: "In the city of Venice/ Not long ago/ There lived a cruel Jew/ Who lived solely off usury/ According to Italian authors..."[240] Between 1553 and 1640, the English theatre had a repertory of no less than sixty plays including Jewish usurers among the characters. William Shakespeare took up this theme in 1600 in his famous play, *The Merchant of Venice*, and the horrible usurer Shylock still personifies the implacable hatred of the Jew towards Christians, even today.[241]

## 76

### The Hussites and the Council of Basel

At the other end of Europe, Jews were distrusted just as much as they were in Spain. The *rouelle*, imposed by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, was useful in revealing the fact that one was dealing with a Jew. Canon 33 of the Council of Salzburg of 1418 contains a provision proper to place the goyim, always too trusting, even further on their guard against the Jews: at the same time as it enjoined the Jews to wear the yellow bonnet, Jewish women had to attach a little bell to their robes.[242]

The disorders began in Austria in 1420, for the usual reasons. On 23 May, Archduke Albert (Albrecht) ordered the arrest and incarceration of all the Jews in the kingdom. In the prisons, the men were separated from the women, and the children from their parents. More than 100 victims died this way in Vienna, on 12 March 1421, burnt in a meadow, on the banks of the Danube. The synagogue of Vienna was destroyed that same day. What is more, an edict from the Archduke prohibited all Jews from residing in Austria in the future.

The new converts left Austria to take refuge either in Poland, or in Italy or Bohemia. But the latter country became increasingly uncertain for them. After the death of John Huss, in July 1415, the religious struggle between Catholics and Hussites had become an international struggle between Czechs and Germans. The Jews, who systematically favoured everything that could contribute to the weakening of the Catholic Church, naturally supported the Hussite movement, supplying them with money and weapons. Thus the Hussites showed no hatred for the Jews. There was only a single case in which Jewish houses were looted along with Catholic ones.

“It should be remarked”, writes Graetz, “that every time a party has been formed within Christendom to fight the reigning church, it has taken a Biblical, that is, Jewish, character. For the Hussites, the Catholics were pagans, while they considered themselves the people of Israel, commanded by God to fight the Philistines, the Moabites and the Ammonites, and they destroyed the churches and convents as places soiled by the worship of idols.”

Emperor Sigismund united considerable forces, hiring German landsknechts and mercenaries from Brabant and the Netherlands. Armed bands came running from all parts and marched on Prague,

where the chief Hussite, Ziska, organised the defence of his country. Wherever they passed, the German soldiers attacked Jews. In the provinces of the Rhineland, in Thuringia, in Bavaria, they killed all the Jews they could find. Sigismund did not permit their mistreatment, but he did not defend the Jews very zealously.

The Jewish community of Cologne was expelled in its entirety at this time (1426). The Jews, accused of a ritual murder, were burnt at Ravensburg, Überlingen and Lindau (1430).

The Council of Basel (June 1431 – May 1443), which deliberated on all great European affairs, attempted to get the Hussites to re-enter the bosom of the Church. The council also renewed all the ancient restrictive measures against the Jews. It thus reinstated the application of the canonical provisions which prohibited the Jews from having relations with Christians, employing them as domestic servants, of treating them as physicians, and occupying public office. The Jews were also required to wear distinct clothing and reside in special districts. To these ancient prohibitions, the council added a number of new prohibitions: the Jews could no longer obtain any university degree and were to be constrained, even by force, to go and listen to the speeches of Christian proselytisers. It was also resolved to teach in Hebrew, Chaldean (and Arabic) in upper schools to facilitate their conversion. This council also concerned itself with converted Jews. It prescribed benevolence in their regard, but also supervision.

It is probable that the apostates Gonzalo and Alfonso de Cartagena, whom King Don John II had delegated to this assembly, played an important role. We recognize the influence of the two brothers in several of the resolutions voted by the council, whose only purpose related to the Jews in Spain. When the Jews were prohibited from occupying a chair in a school, the measure was not intended for application in Germany, since at the time, the Jews did not dare teach in universities at that time.

Emperor Sigismund died in 1437. His successor, Albert of Austria, was an implacable enemy of Jews and heretics, and, writes Graetz, “and he would gladly have exterminated them all, if the Hussites had not had good weapons to defend themselves and if the Jews had not been an inexhaustible source of income”. When the Council of Augsburg decided to expel the Jewish community, in 1439, he hastened to ratify this resolution. They were granted a grace period of two years in which to sell their houses and property. They were then expelled to the last man, and the stones from their cemeteries were used as building materials. Albert II only reigned two years and left the crown to Frederic III (known as “the Peaceful” or “the Fat”). This weak and corruptible sovereign was, for his part, inclined to protect the Jews.

77

## 1449: The "Blood Purity" Statute in Spain

The Spanish reaction against the Jews continued with increasingly greater force. In 1434, at the age of 82, one year before his death, Paul de Santa Maria composed a new pamphlet against the Jews and Judaism, *Examen de l'Écriture sainte*, which is presented in the form of a dialogue between the miscreant Saul and the convert Paul.

An ex-rabbi, whom Vincent Ferrer's sermons had attracted to Catholicism in his old age, John de Espanya, otherwise known as Old John, of Toledo, also denounced the crimes of Judaism. He justified his abjuration and invited his colleagues to imitate him. The summing up drawn up against the Talmud by Jerome de Santa Fe for the colloquy of Tortosa was also widely publicised in the country. After the great Tortosa debate, one of the baptised Jews on this occasion, the jurist Peter de la Caballería, in 1450, drew up a treatise entitled *Zelus Christi contra Judaeos, Sarracenos et infideles*. Many Spanish Jews had left Judaism for good by this time.

At the beginning of his pontificate, Eugene IV demonstrated his benevolent dispositions towards the Jews, confirming the privileges which had been granted them by his predecessor, Martin V. He prohibited forced baptism and the mistreatment of Jews. But he rapidly changed his policies in their regard, certainly under the influence of Alfonso de Cartagena, bishop of Burgos, who, at the council of Basel, had heatedly pled the cause of Pope Eugene. This bishop, of Jewish origin, was nicknamed "*the joy of Spain and the honour of the clergy*" by the Pope. On 10 August 1442, Eugene IV addressed a brief to the bishops of Castile and Leon to tell them that the Jews were abusing the prerogatives granted by the preceding Popes. He restored the application of all the restrictive measures against the Jews by Pope Benedict XIII and which had never been taken into consideration under the reign of John II.

The "new Christians" had great influence in Spain at that time and were certainly not all sincerely converted. Graetz writes here: "Benumbed by their brilliant situation or their wealth, many of them showed the pride of parvenus, attracting the envy and hatred of the old Christians through their presumptuous arrogance."

In 1149, at Toledo, the constable of Castile, Álvaro de Luna,



ordered the issuance of a loan, and the measure aroused popular resistance against the tax collectors. The insurrection, led by the city's major, Peter Sarmiento, led to the withdrawal of the royal army. For the first time, trouble broke out, during which several of the most highly considered new Christians were killed and hung from a gibbet. This was the first anti-converso rebellion in Spain. Master of the district, Peter Sarmiento expelled all new converts from important posts in the city of Toledo (advisors, judges), by decree (*Sentencia estatutos*). Faced with the duplicity of the marranos, who pretended to be good Catholics, the concept of *limpieza de sangre* (blood purity) was quite logical.

On 2 May, a *Suplicación* was sent to King John II, and a tribunal met to debate the right of the conversos to occupy public offices. On 5 June, the tribunal rendered its decision, despite the opposition of the clergy; the conversos were declared unfit to occupy any office in Toledo or to testify against Christians.

Pope Nicholas V condemned the Sentence by means of a bull of 24 September 1449, recommending "the application of severe measures against the tormentors of the conversos" and ordering, by means of the bull *Humani generis inimicis*, that "all converts, present or future, who lead a good Christian life, be admitted to all ministries and dignities, to testify and exercise all offices just like old Christians".

This decision did not prevent Álvaro de Luna from taking the decision to dismiss all conversos who occupied posts in the administration. In 1451, the King of Spain, John II, wrote to the new Pope, Nicholas V, that many new Christians, laymen and ecclesiastics, monks and nuns, practised Jewish rites in secret and mocked the Church. Nicholas V, by means of a letter to the bishop of Osma and the Dominicans of the University of Salamanca, ordered all marranos suspected of Judaizing to appear before a special tribunal. The defendants, even if they were bishops, had to appear before this tribunal, justify themselves, and, if they were found guilty, to be despoiled of their property and all dignities and handed over to the secular arm to be put to death. This tribunal was a precursor of the Inquisition.

78

**John of Capistrano, the Scourge of the Hebrews**

In the 15th century, the Jews began to be frequently expelled from the most important cities in Germany: they were first expelled from Strasbourg in 1388; from the Palatinate in 1394; from Austria in 1420; from Freiburg and Zurich, in 1424; from Cologne in 1426; from Augsburg in 1439; from Bavaria in 1442; from Nuremberg in 1448; from Würzburg in 1453; Erfurt in 1458. The list then snowballed, getting constantly longer: Ulm (1499); Ravensberg (1519), etc. The Jews of Mayence were expelled four times in the space of 50 years, between 1420 and 1471. Many sought refuge in Poland. Others went to camp at the gates of the city. Those from Nuremberg, for example, went to Furth (which enjoyed the rare privilege of not being bombed during the Second World War).

In 1450, to deliver numerous debtors caught in the nets of the usurers, the Bavarian duke of Bavaria-Landshut, Louis IX, or Louis the Rich, arrested all the Jews in his kingdom in a single day. The men were locked up in prison and the women in synagogues. The Christian debtors were only authorised to pay their Jewish creditors the same capital which they had lent, minus the interest already paid. After one month's detention, the Jews were made to purchase their lives at the price of 30,000 florins, after which they were required to go into exile. Duke Louis would have gladly inflicted the same punishment on the rich and important community of Ravensburg, placed under his domination, but as he had only limited authority over the Jews of this city, who, as bourgeois, had a right to the protection of the city council, he had to content himself with imposing a contribution upon them.

At the provincial council of Bamberg, in May 1451, a cardinal, Nicholas of Cusa (a native of Kues, on the Mosel), who was also a papal legate, succeeded in decreeing that the Jews would be compelled to attach a piece of red cloth to their breast and Jewish women, a blue ribbon to their hair.

In Italy, the leading lights of anti-Judaism were then two Franciscans, John of Capistrano and Bernardine of Feltre. At Rome, Pope Nicholas V "hated the Jews with a profound hatred", writes Graetz. He began by eliminating all the ancient privileges of the Jews, then, by means of a new bull, he subjected them to all the restrictive

laws which his predecessor had issued against the Jews of Castile. John of Capistrano, "an implacable enemy of the Jews", was responsible for supervising their strict enforcement, "and he acquitted himself of his task with an unheard of ferocity".

Capistrano was a monk with an emaciated countenance. He slept little and ate little, was charitable towards others, and his austere life brought him the people's admiration and respect. John was born on 24 June 1386 in the city of Capistrano, in the region of the Abruzzi, near Naples. According to Maurice Pinay, the author of *The Plots Against the Church* (1962), he was descended from a noble lord, no doubt from Anjou, or perhaps Savoy, who had followed Louis I of Anjou in the conquest of the kingdom of Naples. Orphaned of his father at a very early age, he was sent to Perugia, where he studied civil and canonical law for ten years. He was so brilliant that this masters had recourse to his judgement in thorny questions.

Appointed governor of Perugia by King Ladislas (1412), John of Capistrano was an incorruptible judge of great integrity. One day a lord attempted to bribe him to obtain a sentence of death against an enemy, but John, who had conscientiously studied the case, acknowledged the defendant's innocence and freed him despite the accuser's threats. Capistrano was also authorised to punish any Jews who transgressed the canonical prescriptions or failed to wear the distinctive sign which was required of them.

In 1415, he sold his property, distributed the rest of his property to the poor, and, in October 1416, he was admitted to the Franciscans of Perugia, where he showed zeal and charity with regards to his brothers when sick. He studied theology, his first teacher being Bernardine of Siena, who did not hesitate to confirm his student's surprising progress. One day, he said, in speaking of him, "John learns while sleeping what the others cannot learn studying day and night"

A profound theologian and scholarly canonist, Capistrano was also the first great missionary of his time. Towards 1420, he was deacon when Saint Bernard had him preach at Sienna and Tuscany. Ordained a priest, towards 1425, he no longer allowed himself any rest, criss-crossing Italy to combat all errors, attacking all sects. He had a persuasive voice and energetic determination which moved the masses. Throughout the peninsula, the inhabitants came by the thousands to listen to him. He denounced the usury of the Jews and their incessant manoeuvres to dissolve Christian society. Thousands of listeners gathered around him and trembled with enthusiasm in listening to him.

He became a legate of Eugene IV in Milan (1432) and Burgundy. After the Council of Florence, he was appointed apostolic nonce in

Sicily, then legate in France. He was then sent to Germany where Emperor Frederic III and his brother Albert, Duke of Austria, asked him to fight the Hussites and reestablish concord among the German princes. John of Capistrano, apostolic nonce and inquisitor, chose twelve companions and reached Germany on foot. A triumph was prepared for him in Lombardy. Wherever he went, John was received as God's envoy.

Pius II described him as follows: "He was small in size, advanced in age (65 years old), dessicated, emaciated, exhausted, having only his skin and bone, and nevertheless cheerful and indefatigable at work. He preached every day, dealing with the most profound questions, and was pleasing to both the simple and the wise; he preached to 20,000–30,000 listeners every day; he preached in Latin and an interpreter translated his speech".

Teaching in public squares, where numerous persons came to hear him, he very soon acquired the nickname "Holy Preacher". He was also called the Scourge of the Jews, since he supported the poor against the usury of the Jews. For Maurice Pinay, "John of Capistrano was the most energetic anti-Jewish Christian leader and the most effective who had arisen since Christ Our Lord and the Apostles". Heinrich Graetz confirms this: "Wherever Capistrano went in Germany, he inspired the utmost terror in the Jews. His name alone made them tremble".

John preached in Carinthia, Styria, Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Transylvania, Moldavia, Wallachia and other provinces, performing prodigies, cures, and, it is said, a few resurrections. He sent several of his monks to Prussia and other provinces. His presence was in demand everywhere, his advice was called upon everywhere.

Bishop Godfrey, of Würzburg, who was also the Duke of Franconia, had first granted a certain number of privileges to the Jews on his territory. But a few years later, after hearing Capistrano's sermons, there was a complete change in tone. In 1453, he ordered the Jews to sell all their landed property before the month of February of the coming year and to emigrate within fifteen days afterwards, so that there was not a single Jew in his bishopric. At the same time, an order was given to the cities, the counties, to the lords and judges to make the Jews leave.

Capistrano proved himself particularly worthy of the title "Scourge of the Hebrews" in Silesia. Invited by the bishop Pierre Nowak, of Breslau, John visited the city, gathered the ecclesiastics together in the city, and there, behind closed doors, spoke out with his usual verve against the Hussites and the Jews. His speech was all the more forceful since numerous nobles and bourgeois were indebted and threatened

with ruin by usurers, and, in particular, by a certain Meyer, the richest of them all.

What is more, a converted Jewess declared that the Jews of Breslau had burnt a host; and that, on another occasion, they had stolen a Christian boy, fed him, locked him in a barrel full of sharp spikes, until he died. After which, the murderers gathered his blood to send to the other Jews of Silesia.

318 Jews were then arrested in various communities, taken to Breslau and judged by Capistrano. On 2 June 1453, 41 of these defendants were burned on the Salzring, today called the Blücherplatz, after which the entire Jewish population was expelled from Breslau. The children aged less than seven were separated from their parents, baptised and entrusted to Christians to be raised in the Catholic religion. The goods of the Jews were consecrated to the construction of the Church of the Bernardines. In the other cities of Silesia, the Jews suffered the same fate as in Breslau: some were delivered to the flames, the others expelled.

The young King Ladislas, solicited by the council of the bourgeoisie of the city, did not content himself with prohibiting the return of the Jews. As a worthy son of Albert II, who had expelled the Jews from Austria, he also approved of the torture inflicted upon the Jews of Silesia, considering that "they had been treated as they deserved". At the instigation, no doubt, of Capistrano, who stayed some time at Olmutz, Ladislas also expelled the Jews from the city as well as from Brunn.

The Jews of Poland enjoyed a much more satisfactory situation than their fellow Jews in the other countries of Europe. For a long time, they enjoyed an equality of rights which assured them of their domination over the Christians. Poland thus became a paradise for the "persecuted" Jews from Germany, Austria, and Hungary. Expelled from the Adriatic coastline, the first Jewish families arrived in the country around 1264, but it was only seventy years afterwards, with King Casimir, that the great wave of immigration began. The charter of Kalisz in effect granted them liberties and broad privileges which were the basis of their religious, national and economic existence, which was only disturbed three centuries later.[243] So as to intensify trade and industry, Casimir "the Great" (1333–1370) promulgated laws favourable to the Jews while they were being persecuted in Germany for their crimes and their usury. It was under his reign that masses of Jewish immigrants flooded the country. This king, who unified the Polish state, was therefore largely responsible for the decadence which followed, up until the partition of the country in the 18th century and its complete disappearance.

The Kings of Poland were considerably indebted to Jewish financiers. Casimir had borrowed the enormous sum of 15,000 marks from Jewish bankers. King Louis of Hungary owed the usurer Levko, of Cracow, more than 30,000 gulden. King Ladislas Jagiello and Queen Jadwiga also owed him large sums. The acts of the Lithuanian chancellery indicate that the Jews controlled almost all the customs offices of the Duchy of Lithuania between 1463 and 1494.[244]

Major Jewish communities were established in the capital of the kingdom, at Cracow, Lemberg and other large cities.[245] Casimir's benevolence is explained by the fact, it is said, that he was in love with a Jewess named Esther, a tailor's daughter. The common people, for their part, regarded the presence of Jews with hostility. At Posnan, in 1399, the rabbi and 13 Jewish notables were arrested and burnt. At Cracow, a massacre of the Jews took place in 1406. Poland's misfortune was that its princes permitted themselves to be bought off by financiers. Casimir IV, king of Poland and prince of Lithuania (1447–1492), also protected the Jews as much as he could.

The powerful bishop of Cracow, Cardinal Zbigniew Olesnizki, who was at the head of the Polish clergy, then invited Capistrano to come preach. At Cracow, the Franciscan monk received a triumphal reception and, throughout his entire stay in the city (1453–1454), he never ceased, with the bishop's assistance, to exhort the King to combat the Hussites and the Jews, publicly reprimanding Casimir and finally predicting that he would be defeated in his war against the order of the knights of Prussia, unless he resolved to abolish the privileges of the Jews and abandon the Hussites. In September 1454, the Teutonic knights defeated the Polish army and obliged Casimir to take shameful flight from the battlefield. The King then took measures against the Jews. All over the country, public criers announced that all the privileges of the Jews had been abolished.[246]

Now came an event which caused all of humanity to tremble and which had favourable consequences for the Jews: on 29 May 1453, Constantinople was taken by the conquering Turk Mahomet II, completing the destruction of the Byzantine Empire. The conqueror inflicted all sorts of humiliations and torments upon the vanquished. At this point, the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz could not help gloating: "If one thinks that since Constantine, founder of the Byzantine empire, up to the last monarch, Constantine Dragossès Paléologue, all the sovereigns of Byzantine, with the exception of Julian the Apostate, had manifested a disproportionate pride, feelings of dissimulation and hypocrisy, and an excessive ardour of persecution: that the peoples and dignitaries of the Church and State had shown themselves worthy of

their masters: whether in Byzantine legislation or the Germanic, Roman and Slavic peoples, and the representatives of the Church had drawn this odious principle that it was necessary to debase and even exterminate the Jews; and if we think of all the iniquities practised in this empire throughout its ten-century existence, the sufferings that it had to undergo after the defeat may be considered a well-deserved punishment”.

Mahomet II authorised the Jews to establish themselves freely at Constantinople and in the other cities of the Ottoman Empire. He permitted them to erect synagogues and schools, assuring them of complete commercial freedom. Each Jew could dispose of his goods in any manner he pleased, dress as he wished, cover himself with garments of silk and gold. “If our brothers in Germany only knew one-tenth part of the prosperity of this country”, said two Jewish young people, Kalmann and David, emigrés in Turkey, “they would do anything they could to come here *en masse*”. This is exactly what they did a few years later, after the mass expulsion of the Jews from Spain, in 1492.

After the capture of Constantinople, the Turks now threatened Hungary. Mehmed II (Mahomet II) prepared the invasion and arrived with an army of 100,000 men. The Christians, for their part, prepared to meet the assault. At the Diet of Neustadt, on 2 February 1455, John of Capistrano proclaimed a new Crusade. He entered Hungary in triumph, and, at the diet of Buda, dissipated all hesitations, and filled all hearts with enthusiasm. Then he preached all over the country for a Crusade, with John Hunyadi as generalissimo.

John Hunyadi provisioned and armed the fortress of Belgrade at his expense. He then left the city to form an army of support and a fleet of 200 corvettes. The Hungarian lords, fearing his growing power, allowed him, once again, to finance the entire operation. Hunyadi recruited an army of 15,000 mercenaries, and Capistrano brought an army of 35,000 peasants, artisans and students behind him, some of them armed only with slings and sickles. Both men marched at the head of their men in the direction of Belgrade, besieged by the Turks. On 14 July 1456, John Hunyadi arrived in the vicinity of Belgrade and succeeded in breaking the Turkish naval blockade, sinking three galleys and capturing 24 ships. During the 11 days which followed the naval victory, Capistrano remained in the midst of his crusaders, day and night, exhorting them to resistance, giving himself only the time to eat and sleep.

On 21 July, Mehmed II, desiring to take advantage of the damage caused to the fortress, ordered an assault, which lasted all night. The

besiegers entered the lower town and began to attack the fort. Hunyadi ordered the defenders of Belgrade to launch burning materials on the Ottomans. The flames caused the Janissaries to become separated from the rest of their army, and they were surrounded. The tide of battle turned to the advantage of the Christians, who drove the attackers back outside the walls. On 22 July 1456, the peasant-Crusaders went into action spontaneously. Despite Hunyadi's orders, they left the walls of Belgrade half-destroyed and attacked the Ottoman soldiers. Other Christians immediately joined them and what had been an isolated incident transformed itself into a veritable battle.

John of Capistrano then took the decision to place himself at the head of 2,000 crusaders, whom he launched against the Ottoman lines. At the same time, Hunyadi launched a charge from the fortress, to capture Turkish cannons. The Janissaries, 5,000 in number, attempted in vain to stem the panic. The Sultan himself participated in the battle but was wounded in the thigh by an arrow and fell unconscious. Taking advantage of the darkness, the Turks retreated, taking their wounded with them.

After the victory, there was an outbreak of plague in the Hungarian army. John Hunyadi, affected by the disease, died on 11 August 1456, in the arms of John of Capistrano. The latter, broken by age and fatigue, devoured by continual fever, saw that the hour of his death was approaching. On 23 October 1456, he received the last sacraments in the convent of Vilak, then, stretched out on the bare ground, went to sleep peaceably, at the age of 71. John of Capistrano's body was buried in the church of the convent of Vilak. He was canonised in October 1690, and his holiday is still celebrated, on 23 October.

The Christian victory of Belgrade put a stop to the Ottoman penetration of Central Europe for several decades. But in 1521, the Turks captured the city, took the fortress of Vilak and ruined the Franciscan convent. In 1527, they were at the gates of Vienna.



## 79

## Alfonso de Espina

The situation of the Jews in Spain still seemed satisfactory under the reigns of Don Henry IV (1457–1474), King of Castile, and Don John II (1450–1479), King of Aragon. Henry IV, perhaps even more indolent than his father, was not much worried about whether the canonical laws concerning the Jews were really applied. But the anger of the common people was growing everywhere.

Alfonso de Espina, a Franciscan monk, who was rector of the University of Salamanca, thundered against the Jews from the pulpit, attacked the Jews and their protectors in speech and through his writings. Towards 1460, he wrote a pamphlet against the heretics, Jews and Moslems, in Latin, the *Fortalitium fidei*, in which he expressed the usual complaints: “spirit of treason, ritual murders, poisoner-physicians, destruction of the Christians through the outrageous practice of usury, Jewish counterfeiting and sodomy, etc.”

The cupidity of the Jews alone was enough to make them odious. Alfonso de Espina cites a usurer from Zamora who had succeeded in collecting 60,000 pieces of silver on the basis of 10,000 which he had actually lent. Others charged 100% interest; esquires and hidalgos were in a sense their prisoners. The peasants, to pay the interest on their debts, were obliged to transfer the profit from their entire harvest to the Jews. At the Cortes of Valladolid, in 1385, the complaint was made that certain nobles were conspiring with the Jews to pillage the municipalities of their goods.[247]

Alfonso de Espina also presents a catalogue with figures and chronology of ritual murders committed by Jews: “Their fifth famous crime was committed at Pforzheim in 1267...”; “Their seventh great crime”, at Vienna in 1420. Ritual murders and acts of sorcery form the essential part of this black series.[248]

The Franciscan maintained that, every year, Jews agreed to cut the throat of another Christian child in one city or another. He cites a certain Emmanuel, son of a physician from Genoa named Salomon, who told him of a scandalous affair which he had been compelled to witness. In 1450, this Emmanuel confessed to the bishop who was to baptise him, to the doyen of the church of Compostela, as well as to other notable men, both ecclesiastics and laymen, regarding the sacrificing of children by the Jews. The notary at the royal hearing

drew up a record of the deposition to be conserved in the archives of the convent where the document was signed:[249]

“When I was at Savone, a dependent city of Genoa”, he declared, “my father took me to the house of a Jew, in whose house seven or eight men of his religion had met secretly to sacrifice a Christian child. After shutting the doors very carefully, they all solemnly swore never to reveal what they were about to do, to die or commit suicide rather than reveal the slightest thing to any mortal man. When this oath had been taken, a child of about two years of age was brought in, and placed on top of a vase usually used to collect the blood of circumcised children. Two Jews pulled his arms out in the form of a cross, while a third held his head raised high. A fourth man, responsible for the execution, put a steaming piece of oakum in the child’s mouth to prevent him from crying out. He then took long iron spikes and pierced the child’s body with them in such a way as to pierce his entrails, causing an abundant flow of blood into the vase. I experienced a profound horror at this spectacle; I could not watch any more, and I was obliged to leave. My father followed me and begged me never to tell anyone what I had just seen, and to kill myself rather than confess it. I then took myself back into the room: the child had already died. They threw the body into a deep latrine. They then took various fruits, such as apples, pears, nuts, hazelnuts, etc., and threw them into the vase filled with blood; then everyone ate some of this horrible mixture. I was compelled to do the same thing; but as soon as I tasted it I started to feel sick, and for two days I felt as if my insides churned in horror every time I wanted to eat anything.”

Alfonso de Espina tells of another case in which a Jewish physician supplied a nobleman, John de Vega, who wished to get rid of his elder brother, with poison, to get his hands on his inheritance. The crime was discovered. The hidalgo escaped prosecution by taking monastic vows, and the Jew committed suicide.[250]

The eschatological perspective is not absent from the *Fortalitium*; when the anti-Christ appears, the Jews will gather around Him and will adore him as a god. Using the example of Duns Scotus and Capistrano, Alfonso de Espina advocated taking Jewish children away from their parents and raising them as Christians.[251] What’s more, he also approved of all the preceding persecutions and even the massacres. The *Fortalitium fidei* went through at least 8 editions in 58 years (1471–1529), three of them at Lyon.

In Spain, the common people of Spain, at this time, attacked the marranos first of all, because these new Christians had succeeded in occupying the highest political and ecclesiastical positions, and played

a preponderant role in the Cortes and Council of State, even occupying episcopal seats. The Franciscans were the first to sound the alarm concerning false converts within the religious orders or in the secular clergy. In 1461, they requested the General of the Order of Saint Jerome, the brother Alfonso de Oropesa, to assist them in eradicating the problem. The order of Saint Jerome included many neo-Christians and the General found himself caught between two fires. He nevertheless proposed to entrust the task of judging the marranos to the bishops, and to institute an Inquisition to judge the case. He also wrote the treatise *Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloriam Israel* (1465) on this subject, in which he denounced the Jews and the marranos.

The *Libro de Alboraque*, published in 1488 by an anonymous author including about ten pages of accusations, applied, this time, to the new Christians as well as to the Jews: deceivers, vain, cowardly, blasphemers, sacrilegious sodomites.[252] His author starts off by writing that he wished to supply his readers with "arms against the enemies of Christ".

The sermons of Alfonso de Espina against the suspected marranos aroused the popular effervescence at Madrid. Disturbances occurred at Toledo in 1467, where the scenes of 1449 were repeated; but this time it was the conversos who attacked first, by breaking into a cathedral. Then, he took possession of the bridges and ports of the city. Their momentary success came to an end when they returned to the cathedral. Well fortified inside, the old Catholics, under siege, succeeded in sounding the alert and ringing the tocsin. Soon reinforcements arrived and the "old Christians" went on the offensive. The marranos, repulsed, were soon vanquished, and the crowd killed more than 130 marranos. Those who attempted to defend themselves were hanged. 600 marrano houses were burnt.

In 1469, the marriage of the infante Isabella, later nicknamed "the Catholic", with the infante Don Ferdinand of Aragon, finally inaugurated the era of Spanish preponderance. At the beginning of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, popular revolts against the Jews were still occurring. In 1471, the inhabitants of Sepúlveda, a small city near Segovia, revenged itself on the Jews of the locality after the death of a Christian child hanged during Holy Week. On the order of bishop John Arias Dávila, son of the marrano minister Diego Arias Dávila, eight of the defendants, those who were considered to be among the guiltiest, were taken to Segovia and sentenced, some, to be burnt to death, the others to be hanged or strangled. This execution did not appear sufficient punishment to the population of Sepúlveda, who threw themselves upon the Jews and killed almost all of them, without pity.

At Córdoba, it was the turn of the marranos to be accused. In 1473, a pious fraternity from which the marranos were excluded was formed in the city under the protection of the Virgin. On the occasion of a procession organised by this fraternity on evening before Easter, the houses and streets of Córdoba were decorated with flowers and carpets. During the procession, a young marrano girl threw dirty water on the image of the Virgin. The houses of the marranos were then set on fire and most of the marranos were killed, while the rest of the Jews fled the city.

## 80

### Bernardine of Feltre

In Italy, as elsewhere, Jewish usurers had reduced many Christians to the most extreme misery. The Jews “possessed great capital and were able advisors”, writes the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz, “Yehiel, of Pisa, possessed enough capital to be master of the silver market in Tuscany”.

Franciscan monks then decided to combat usury by creating money-lending institutions – the “*monti di pietà*” – which would compete against the Jews on their own ground, by lending on collateral but at a very low rate.[253] The indefatigable preaching of these institutions created approximately 30 of these institutions between 1462 (the *monte di pietà* of Perugia) and 1496 (those of Treviso, Udine, Pisa and Florence).

In 1462, at Perugia, a Franciscan monk named Barnaba had gathered capital which he intended to make available to borrowers. The poor were always supposed to be able to borrow small sums at modest interest intended to cover the costs of upkeep against pledges.

Like the Perugians, the inhabitants of Savarona, who had also complained of Jewish usurers, created a similar institution and obtained, in turn, confirmation from the Holy See in 1479. A few years later, the city of Mantua founded a similar establishment, which was to be managed by twelve directors, made up of four monks, two nobles, two jurisconsultants or physicians, two merchants and two other members of the bourgeoisie. The monks were perpetual members of the board, the eight laymen only sat for two years, half of them being replaced each year.

Bernardine of Feltre, a native of Venice, was the most zealous promoter of these *monti di pietà*, and one of the most ardent enemies of Jewish bankers and usurers. He was the most implacable enemy of the Jews of his time, a worthy student of Capistrano. A remarkable popular orator, he preached in Italy against luxury, and raised crowds against the usurers.

“Since he found himself surrounded by rich capitalist Jews, who had amassed a rather great fortune”, writes Graetz, “he called all Jews bloodsuckers, without exception.”

In his eyes, Capistrano was the model of a true Christian. In one of

his sermons, he thundered, "It is true that that religious laws prohibit frequenting Jews, having recourse to their physicians, or staying in their inns. The usury of the Jews is so enormous that the poor are strangled. And I who eat the bread of the poor, should I be a mute dog at this place of truth?"[254]

Indefatigable in his zeal, Bernardine succeeded in founding *monti di pietà* at Assisi, Parma, Cesena, Chieti, Rieti, Narni and Lucca. At Campo San Pietro, a small village near Padua, he first expelled the Jews who lent at usury, before founding an establishment. All Jewish undertakings were the object of more or less fiery persecution.

At Piacenza, the usurers took interest which could amount to 100% per year. It was not difficult to adopt the idea of a lending house. The same was true at Padua, where the *monte di pietà* lent sums less than 30 sous free of interest. For larger sums, they charged 5%.

Ravenna, Cremona, Vicenza, Bologna, and Florence, as well as many other cities in Italy, had their own *monti di pietà* at the end of the 15th century or the beginning of the 16th century. Rome and Naples only got them in 1539 and 1540. In the latter city, as soon as the *monte di pietà* was founded, the viceroy of Toledo, who governed the region, expelled all the Jews from the kingdom of Naples.[255]

Bernardine of Feltre often embarrassed the local authorities due to the riots he caused. Some high personages, corrupted by Jewish gold, contributed to cause the failure of his plans. At Florence, and, in general, all over Tuscany, the prince and the council energetically defended the usurers. Bernardine of Feltre accused them of allowing themselves to be bought by Yehiel de Pisa and other rich Jews of the country. When he came to Bergamo to preach against the Jews, Galeazzo, the Duke of Milan, imposed silence upon him. The magistrates of Venice similarly prohibited him from preaching against the Jews. The Jews, who had bribed the magistrates, had therefore returned to the city since Bernardine of Feltre, who was even prohibited from residing there. At Florence, after one of his sermons, the young people wished to attack Jewish houses and pillage them during the night. But the corrupt magistrates ordered them to leave the city and the region.

Bernardine then went to Tyrol, and the churches of Trent were echoing his imprecations against the Jewish usurers. At this very moment, a new ritual murder was committed. On Holy Tuesday of the year 1475, during Easter Week, a 28 month-old child from a poor family, Simon, disappeared, and was later found drowned in the Adige. The body, carried by the currents, had been caught by a barrier. Bishop Hinderbach, accompanied by two notables, visited the spot and had the

body transported to a church. Bernardine of Feltre and other priests publicly exposed the child's body, and on Hinderbach's orders, all the Jews in the city were incarcerated.

The trial began immediately. A physician, Mathias Tiberinus, attested that the child had been murdered, and a "baptised Jew has formulated the most odious accusations against his former fellow Jews" (Graetz). A letter addressed from Saxony was then found at the home of a rabbi, Moïse, demanding Christian blood for the next Passover. The defendants, subjected to torture, declared that they had martyred little Simon and used his blood for the Passover feast, adding that their accomplice, Brunetta, had supplied the pins to pierce the body. Nine of them were executed and four of the defendants accepted baptism to save their lives.

In all the countries informed of this event, the Jews were exposed to the most extreme dangers. Even in Italy, they could no longer leave the cities for fear of being beaten to death by Christians. Anti-Jewish riots broke out at Brescia, Pavia, Mantua, Florence, certainly provoked by Bernardine of Feltre. The clergy organised pilgrimages to visit the bones of the sainted child, and Simon of Trent was beatified in 1582.

In Germany, above all, anti-Jewish hatred was constantly on the increase. A few years before, at Endingen, in the region of Baden, parishioners had discovered the body of a man and a woman, as well as the remains of two decapitated children while repairing the ossuary of the church. This occurred in 1470. The remains were identified as being the remains of a poor family which had disappeared eight years before after having been seen entering a Jew's house. A ritual murder trial was held and four Jews from the city were found guilty and executed. The affair gave rise to a famous contemporary theatrical production, *Das Endinger Judenspiel*.

After the murder of Simon of Trent, the bourgeoisie of Frankfurt-am-Main raised a statue depicting a martyred child, surrounded by horrible Jewish personages conversing with the Devil, near the bridge leading to Sachsenhausen. The pedestal bears these words: *So lang Trient und das Kind wird genannt/ Der Juden Schelmstück bleibt bekannt*. Which means: *As long as people speak of Trent and the child, the memory of Jewish wickedness will remain*. [256]

At Ravensburg, the new bishop, Henry, reached an understanding with Duke Louis, who was an enemy of the Jews. They assured each other of the Pope's assistance and of several influential members of the council of the bourgeoisie, and had recourse to the services of two renegade Jews. One of them, Peter Schwarz, "published an odious indictment against his former fellow Jews", writes Graetz. The other,

Hans Bayol, "directed the most serious accusations against the old rabbi Israel Bruna, affirming that the man had purchased and later cut the throat of a 7-year-old Christian child."

The news of the martyrdom of the child of Trent reached Ravensburg. Bishop Henry then immediately requested the Ravensburg Council to bring criminal proceedings against a certain number of Jews from the city. Guards blocked the four gates of the Jewish quarter, and permitted no one to enter or leave. All Jewish property was confiscated.

In the spring of 1478, the Jews of Passau were found guilty of purchasing and profaning hosts and were executed on the bishop's order. Some were condemned to decapitation, others to be burnt at the stake, while others were sentenced to have the flesh torn from their bodies with red-hot pincers. Emperor Friedrich nevertheless prohibited torturing or killing Jews for profanation of the host. All Jews were expelled from Swabia at this time. Ritual murders were also said to have been committed at Mantua, Arena, Portobuffolè (near Treviso), Verona and Fano, leading to death sentences. In 1490, the city of Nuremberg expelled the Jews after establishing a *monte di pietà*.

Bernardine of Feltre had already returned to Italy, since we see him again at Ravensburg in 1488, where he founded a *monte di pietà* and succeeded in convincing the authorities to expel all usurers from the city.

Bernardine died at Pavia, on 28 September 1494, which has remained his feast day. His tomb is in his native city, in the church of Santa Maria del Carmine.



## 81

### **Torquemada versus the Marranos**

In Spain, the marranos, or new Christians, writes Heinrich Graetz, had "attained the highest situations in the State and Church and had become rich and powerful." At Seville, "large numbers of new Christians still occupied very high offices". For the great mass of the population, this situation was intolerable. "It seemed to them that the entire court was of Jewish origins".

The marriage between Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, in 1469, was to change the situation in the peninsula. In 1478, on the instances of Ferdinand and Isabella, Pope Sixtus IV promulgated a bull authorising the royal couple to appoint ecclesiastical inquisitors who would have the power to judge heretics and relapsed converts, as well as their protectors. It is possible that the royal reaction was favoured by a Dominican named Alfonso de Ojeda, prior of the convent of Saint-Paul of Seville, and who had the Queen's ear.

A commission appointed by the "Catholic Kings" was charged with drawing up the statutes of the new tribunal, and, in 1480, the inquisition tribunal was set up. It was made up of two Dominican monks, Miguel Morillo and John de San Martino, and lay assessors. The tribunal began to function at Seville and the surrounding regions, because this region was directly governed by the sovereign, without the intermediary of the Cortes, which had consisted of a large number of marranos for nearly a century. All the functionaries were invited to grant their full assistance to the inquisitors by royal ordinance.

"If demons had coalesced to seek a tormenter of men and make their lives a long series of sufferings, they could not have invented a more perfect torture instrument than that which the monks fabricated against the marranos", writes Graetz, adding: "Before the imminence of danger, the most influential of the marranos formed a plot to prevent the functioning of the Inquisition. The conspirators included one excessively rich man, named Diego de Susón, a scholar, John Fernando Abulafia, and several persons who were at the head of the police of Seville".

This plot was denounced by one of Susón's daughters, who secretly maintained amorous relations with a Christian knight. Several conspirators were thrown into prison. Other arrests followed, and soon

so many marranos had been arrested that the dungeons of the convent of Saint-Paul were filled with them.

Although the New Christians of this city took refuge in the territory of Medina-Sidonia and Cádiz to escape persecution. But on 2 January 1481, an edict of the Inquisition tribunal prescribed all functionaries to deliver up fugitive marranos and to seize their property, threatening with excommunication those who failed to obey orders as well as the punishment reserved for heretics. The arrests were so numerous that the tribunal had to find a larger building in which to try all the defendants, as a result of which it moved to a castle in a suburb of Seville called la Tablada.

The tribunal was then able to hold its first session. Six relapsed marranos, who proclaimed their loyalty to Judaism before the judges, were sentenced to death and burnt by the prior Alfonso de Ojeda. Then came the turn of the conspirators, with the extremely wealthy Diego de Susón at their head. Then, every day, there were so many victims that the city of Seville was obliged to make one of its squares available to the tribunal as a permanent place of execution. This square was then renamed the Quemadero (the furnace).

After the marranos all the Spanish Christians were invited by the inquisitors to report any Judaising heretics whom they might know. To facilitate these denunciations, the Inquisition listed the elements of the crime of heresy or apostasy. A converted Jew who relapsed if he celebrated the Sabbath or any other day of the Jewish calendar, if he had his children circumcised, if he followed their alimentary laws, if he wore a white shirt on the Sabbath or any other clothes more beautiful than normal, or if he abstained from lighting his fire. He was also accused of apostasy if he was seen going out without shoes or asking forgiveness from a friend on the Feast of Expiation, or if he blessed his children by placing his hands on their heads without making the sign of the cross, or if he pronounced a blessing over a cup of wine before offering it to his guests to drink. One became particularly suspect if one abstained from following Christian customs, such as finishing a psalm without adding "Glory Be to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost", or eating meat during Lent. Anyone sending or receiving gifts to or from a Jew on the Feast of the Tabernacles was accused of Judaising. Thus, the prisons of the Inquisition were rapidly filled. There were fifteen thousand arrests in just the first few days.

At the first act of faith – or *auto da fe* – the priests inaugurated the stake by a solemn procession: dressed in homespun penitential robes (or *sanbenito*) bearing a red cross, the condemned persons advanced to the place of execution, accompanied by ecclesiastics, nobles dressed in

black, in the midst of the chants of a considerable multitude. When they arrived at the stake, the inquisitors read the decree. Upon the place of execution, the heretics were immediately delivered to the flames, or, if they showed some repentance, strangled beforehand. On 26 March 1481, 17 victims were burnt on the Quemadero. Since this day until November, more than 3,000 persons were made to climb the steps to the stake in the district of Seville alone. If marranos who had already died were convicted of having Judaised during the post-baptismal lifetime, their remains were disinterred and burnt, and their goods confiscated from their heirs.

Let us note that only the marranos could be the object of a trial, not Jews. Nor could non-baptised Jews be summoned to appear before the Inquisition any more than non-baptised Moors. Only relapsed converts from both nations were summoned. But the Jews, in particular, exerted themselves to induce the conversos to return to Judaism, exhibiting an indefatigable proselytism.

On the different sides, the desire was expressed to isolate the marranos from the Jews completely. In 1482, the Royal Couple ordered the Jews expelled from Andalucía, and particularly from the dioceses of Seville and Córdoba, where there were large numbers of new Christians. More than four thousand houses having belonged to Jews remained in part inhabited. Outside Andalucía itself, in the cities in which they were permitted to reside, laws were applied to them which prohibited them from any commerce with Christians and obliged them to wear distinctive signs. "The time was finished", writes Graetz, "when influential Jews could cause the court to intervene in favour of their fellow Jews and soften the effects of the restrictive laws".

After the Inquisition had been functioning for three years, several thousand marranos had disappeared from Spain, some of them burnt at the stake, but most left to rot in prison. Until then, the action of the Inquisition had been limited to southern Spain, to the districts of Seville and Cádiz, to properly Christian Andalucía, since, due to the opposition of the Cortes, it was unable to spread to the other provinces of Spain.

Despite the complaints of Jews to the Holy See, Pope Sixtus IV permitted the royal couple to introduce the Inquisition into the provinces of Aragon and to appoint a supreme judge. The sovereigns thus appointed an Inquisitor General responsible for instructing the tribunals wherever he might think it necessary, as well as for directing them and supervising them. This post fell to the Dominican monk Thomas de Torquemada.

Immediately after his appointment, Torquemada established three new tribunals in the cities of Córdoba, Jaen and Villareal. They drew

up a sort of code to be used as a rule by the judges in heresy trials. A one-month grace period was granted to those who spontaneously denounced themselves as Judaizers, but they had to put their answers in writing, provide frank and honest answers to any questions which might be asked of them, report the names of their accomplices and even of those who appeared suspect to them. Guilty persons who revealed their identity only after expiration of the grace period would lose their property. They were given absolution, but they would remain sullied, could never occupy public office, neither they nor their descendants.

The tribunal of the Inquisition of Toledo, opened during the month of May 1485. In the kingdoms of Aragon and Valencia, the Inquisition was established the same year. Highly-placed marranos then used their influence to pressure the Cortes of Saragossa to protest energetically before the Pope and the King against the institution of these tribunals. In Rome, success was practically certain, since, "in putting up the price", writes Graetz, one could obtain favourable intervention of the pontifical court. But it seemed difficult to convince King Ferdinand. And in fact, he strongly refused to eliminate these tribunals.

The Jews then decided to conspire to cause the death of Canon Peter de Arbués, whom Torquemada had appointed grand Inquisitor in the kingdom of Aragon. At the head of the plot were John Peter Sánchez, who was influential at the royal court, a jurisconsultant named Jaime de Montesa, and two marranos. The conspirators were supported by notables of Jewish origin.

On 15 September 1485, before dawn, Arbués was stabbed while he knelt to pray in the cathedral of Saragossa. The news of this assassination produced profound emotion, and all the marranos would have been massacred if it had been for the intervention of Archbishop Alfonso of Aragon, who rode all over the city on horseback to calm the population while promising that the guilty would be severely punished.

The Dominicans were able to exploit the murder of Arbués, who was revenged. Thanks to the public confession of one of the conspirators, Vidal de Uranso, the inquisitors discovered the names of all those having taken part in the conspiracy, and persecuted them with redoubled determination, as heretics and enemies of the Holy Office. Once they were arrested, the principal defendants were dragged through the streets of Saragossa, after which their hands were cut off and they were hanged. More than three hundred marranos were sentenced to be burnt, and, among them, nearly 30 men and women from the best families of the city.

Gaspar de Santa Cruz, one of the conspirators, succeeded in fleeing to Toulouse, where he died. After burning him in effigy, the inquisitors

imprisoned his son, who was accused of helping his father to escape, then sentenced him to go to Toulouse and have his father's body disinterred and burnt by the Dominicans of the city.

In 1486, the Inquisitors of Toledo, after forcing the rabbis from the synagogue to denounce converts who had reverted to Judaism, sentenced 750 marrano women to make honourable amends, in their underclothing, barefooted, with a candle in hand, in the midst of a great crowd. Approximately 1,700 others suffered the same punishment, and 27 were burned alive.

The wish of King Ferdinand and Torquemada's tenacity triumphed over all resistance. In the year following Arbués' death, the inquisitors began to investigate at Barcelona and Mallorca, and delivered 200 marranos to the flames. "The smoke of the stakes", said a Jewish contemporary (Isaac Arama), "mounted to the sky in all the regions of Spain and outwards to the Balearic Islands. A third of all marranos were burnt, another third were on the run, wandering everywhere and attempting to conceal themselves, and the rest lived in a continual trance, ceaselessly trembling at the thought of arrest by the Inquisition".

Driven on by the eleven tribunals which functioned in Spain, the number of marranos discovered increased from year to year. During the 13 years of Torquemada's reign (1485-1498), more than 7,000 marranos mounted to the stake, and it is estimated that 17,000 of them were banned after performing an act of contrition. From 1480 to 1487, in Seville, 5,000 conversos were accused of having Judaized, and 7,000 relapsed new Christians were burnt. At Toledo, in four years, there were 4,850 "reconciliations" and 200 death sentences.

In 1490, six Jews and 5 conversos of La Guardia, near Toledo, were accused of black magic as well as having crucified a Christian child. The Spanish venerated the "Holy Child of La Guardia", as the Italians and Germans had done with the cult of Simon of Trent.

Torquemada was not unaware that his energetic action had aroused the hatred of the Jews, and was in constant fear for his life. On his table was a vial alleged to contain powdered "alicorn" (fake unicorn horn, actually made from narwhal horn), which, according to the superstitious beliefs of the time, acted as an antidote to all poisons. When he went out, he was escorted by an armed guard (known as his "familiars") consisting of 50 knights and 200 infantry.

After attacking the marranos, the Inquisition naturally had to break the power of the Jews. The latter, writes Graetz, lived "in such close relationships with the marranos that they could not help be affected by the buffets striking their former fellow Jews. They profoundly

sympathised with the converts, who were Christian in name only, and attempted to maintain a love of Judaism in their hearts". And Graetz adds: "Even the marranos born in Christendom were instructed in the rites of their fathers by the Jews, who convened them secretly to divine offices, provided them with religious books, informed them of the dates of the holidays and fasts, practised circumcision on their children, supplied them with unleavened bread for Passover, and, throughout the year, with meat prepared according to Jewish law."

Ferdinand and Isabella strictly prohibited all commerce with Jews. But this prohibition produced no result. "On the contrary, Jews and marranos felt stimulated, by the very certainty of the risk they were running, to tighten the ranks that united them; their relations only became more secretive, surrounded by even greater precautions."

Once the Inquisition became convinced that not only were the Jews refusing to denounce the marranos, but were secretly continuing to maintain relations with them, it requested the Catholic kings to expel all Jews from Spain. The Jews did not believe that catastrophe was so close. They had, writes Graetz, "a limitless confidence in the influence of Jewish favourites on the court". Apart from Abraham Senior, who enjoyed considerable consideration, another Jewish personality still occupied a high position at the court of Castile at this time: the famous Isaac Abravanel (or Abrabanel). Isaac Abravanel was the last of a long series of Spanish Jewish statesmen who weighed down so heavily, and in such a fateful manner, upon the history of this country.

## 82

### 1492: Expulsion of the Jews from Spain

Alphonse V, the King of Portugal, had previously called upon Abravanel before him to entrust him with the administration of finances. Admitted to court, he had acquired the confidence of his sovereign, who asked his advice on all serious matters. Abravanel had an entire train of deputy ministers at the court of Portugal and, thanks to his credibility, Jews already living in the Kingdom, as well as refugees from Castile, were not disturbed and could continue their wheeler-dealing. Most of the country's tax farmers were Jews. In Portugal, they wore no distinctive sign and enjoyed an autonomous juridical status.

But upon Alfonso's death, the good times were over for the Jews. Alfonso V's successor was John II (1481–1495). More energetic than his father, he imitated his contemporary, Louis XI, the king of France, and attempted to establish an absolute monarchy by reducing the power of the great lords. In June 1483, the Duke of Braganza was imprisoned, tried for treason and executed, and his possessions were added to the royal domain. In his capacity as friend of the Duke of Braganza and his brothers, Isaac Abravanel was also implicated in the treason accusation, and fled to Spain. The Portuguese sovereign took no account of the Jewish financier's protests and confiscated all his goods.

In Castile, Abravanel began a new career. He opened a bank, enriched himself once again, was introduced at Ferdinand's court, and wasted no time in gaining the sovereign's trust. Ferdinand and Isabella then entrusted him with the Spanish finances, despite the prohibition, frequently renewed by the Cortes, against entrusting any employment whatever to a Jew. "He himself", writes Graetz, "recalls that his services brought him riches and honours, that he was highly esteemed at court, and before the high nobility of Castile". As at Lisbon, he caused his fellow Jews to profit from his elevated position. It was certainly Abravanel who protected the Jews of Castile from the punishments which the inquisitors would have inflicted upon them for supporting the marranos.

The Kingdom of Granada, still dominated by Moslems, was also the place of residence of large numbers of Jews, together with many marranos after the initial Inquisition trials. The Jews could freely

practice their religion and their rackets in any way they saw fit. There as well, some of them, enjoyed influence before the prince, such as Isaac Hamon, who was the physician to one of the last kings of Granada. And here, once again, the Jews made themselves intolerable. Popular anger produced a violent explosion: "Fanatical Moslems attacked the Jews of Granada", writes Graetz. "Those who escaped massacre took refuge in the royal fortress. To avoid further exciting Moslem jealousy, Jewish physicians of Granada resolved, after this event, to stop wearing silk garments and to stop riding horseback."

The kingdom of Granada finally fell into the hands of the Christians on 2 January 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella, surrounded by their troops, made their solemn entrance into the city, to the sound of church bells. Islam as a political force disappeared from the Iberian peninsula. After eight centuries, Spain had become Christian once again, as in the time of the Visigoths.

On 31 March 1492, by an edict dated from the palace of the Alhambra, the Catholic Kings ordered the expulsion of all Jews from Spain. They were ordered, on pain of death, to leave the territories of Castile, Aragon, Sicily and Sardinia within four months. They were permitted to take their property with them, except for precious metals and cash. They were ordered to leave their gold and silver in Spain, and to take with them only letters of exchange and merchandise. Upon expiration of the 4-month period, the goods of any Christian who protected them or sheltered a Jew would be confiscated.

It was, for the Jews, a "frightful catastrophe", says Graetz. They were "totally dumbstruck by the blow which had befallen them". Abravanel went to Ferdinand and Isabella, and offered them considerable sums, three times, in attempts to obtain the revocation of the edict of expulsion. As soon as Torquemada became aware of the insistent proceedings of the Jewish minister, he hastened to the sovereigns, crucifix in hand, and addressed these words to them: "Judas Iscariot sold Christ for 300,000 ducats. Well, here he is, sell him". And he left the crucifix in the room. Isabella then resolved to maintain the edict of expulsion, and, since she had a great deal of energy and tenacity, she succeeded in convincing her husband to share her opinion.

Don Abraham Senior, the Queen's great favourite, attempted to intervene in turn in favour of his fellow Jews, but in vain. At the end of April 1492, it was proclaimed throughout the land, to the sound of trumpets, that the Jews were no longer authorised to remain in Spain after the end of the month of July and that those who overstayed would be subject to the death penalty.

The Jews of England, expelled in 1290, and the Jews of France,



expelled a century later, were permitted to leave and take their wealth with them.

The Spanish Jews, for their part, were obliged to sell everything and to convert their cash into letters of exchange, since they were forbidden to take cash with them. But they could not procure enough letters of exchange. "The trade was predominantly in the hands of the Jews and marranos", writes Graetz, "and the latter feared the wrath of the Inquisition as a result of assisting their former fellow Jews."

In view of the lack of buyers, the immovable property of the proscribed Jews was sold at risible prices. If we are to believe the testimony of a contemporary, Andrés Bernaldez, curate of Los Palacios, a house was traded for an ass, and a vineyard for a piece of cloth or canvas.

To make the sale of their immovable assets even more difficult for the Jews, Torquemada prohibited Christians from engaging in any form of commerce with them. "Thus did the considerable wealth of the Jews of Spain vanish in a sort of puff of smoke".[257]

Approximately 50,000 Jews chose baptism, while 200,000 preferred exile, no longer dreaming of embracing Christianity and continuing to Judaize in secret, since they finally understood that the Inquisition was not a joke. One year before the promulgation of the edict of expulsion, in the city of Seville alone, 33 new Christians had been burnt alive and 16 in effigy; 625 others had been sentenced to humiliating acts of penance. Graetz estimates the number of exiles at 300,000. The latter left for the neighbouring kingdoms of Navarre, Portugal, Italy, Turkey and Africa.

The conversos assisted their banished brothers as best they could, agreeing to store gold and silver for them, and then sent them these precious metals secretly, through trustworthy persons, or providing letters of exchange in compensation drawn on foreign financial centres. When the King was informed of this, he ordered that these gold and silver deposits be searched for and confiscated.

Despite the prohibition, numerous proscribed persons attempted to take their gold and silver with them, swallowing large quantities. The rumour of this practice became current, and certain Spaniards did not hesitate to disembowel them in order to search for treasure in their entrails. The captains of Genoese ships treated them with "ferocious savagery". "Out of greed of simple caprice, to revel in the sufferings and desperate cries of the Jews, they threw large numbers of them overboard". It was clear that the Spanish had nourished notions of vengeance against the Jews for many years, and were not about to waste their opportunity.

Approximately 95,000 Jews crossed the Portuguese border and reached the villages designated for them by their sovereign for their provisional stay. Approximately 12,000 became established in Navarre, but Ferdinand, the king of Navarre, compelled them to choose between emigration and baptism. Most of them converted, because they were only allowed a very short period of time in which to decide.

Several thousand Jews from Aragon, Catalunya and Valencia established themselves in the kingdom of Naples. Among these proscribed persons were Abravanel, with his family. Initially, he lived in retirement, occupied solely with commenting upon the historical books of the Bible, a work which he had been compelled to interrupt in Spain. But when Ferdinand I, king of Naples, learned of his presence, he called upon him to entrust him with the administration of his finances.

A few Jews, in peril of their lives, still gathered in secret to practise their cult and to curse the Christians, while publicly pretending to be good Catholics. "Jews nevertheless remained in Spain", writes Graetz, "but concealed by the mask of Christianity and hiding under the name of new Christians... They were obliged, for their part, to forebear showing any outside signs of their secret attachment to Judaism, to show a perceptibly greater zeal for the Christian religion, to be lavish in making signs of the cross under all circumstances, to drone out numerous rosaries and mutter endless paternosters."

In 1501, in Valencia, a clandestine synagogue was discovered. The owner was identified and arrested, forced to do penance, and his house was razed. The Inquisition then erected a chapel on the spot, which is still recognised under the name of Cruz Nueva or New Cross.[258]

Many years later, popular hatred for the Jews was still perceptible, which is solid proof that the Jews had left a very bad memory of themselves there. At Seville, there was a Jewish cemetery near the gate of Minjoar, which was thus named because of a very rich Jew who had resided there. In 1580, the beautiful tombs and funereal monuments were systematically pillaged and demolished, as if the populace were exorcising a demon. Surveillance was taken so far to keep watch over the chimneys of houses inhabited by converted Jews on Saturday, to ensure that no smoke left the chimneys on the Sabbath.

As for Torquemada, he never enriched himself personally from the considerable property seized from the marranos. The proceeds were always used for the administration of the Inquisition tribunals and for the establishment of monasteries of the Dominican order. Once his mission was accomplished, Torquemada returned to the austere life of poverty of a simple friar of the convent of Saint Thomas in Ávila, where he died a Christian death, on 16 September 1498.

83

**1497: Expulsion of the Jews from Portugal**

On the instigation of Pope Innocent VIII, king John II of Portugal appointed a commission of the Inquisition to arrest and condemn relapsed marranos coming from Spain. He sent their children aged 3 to 10 years into newly discovered regions, such as the island of São Tomé e Príncipe, off the coast of West Africa, to rear them away from the tyranny of Judaism and raise them normally.

Upon the death of John II in 1495, young Manuel, his cousin, inherited the throne. The Catholic kings, who dreamed of making an ally of him, granted him the hand of their daughter Isabella, on the condition that he contract an alliance against the king of France, Charles VIII, and that he expel all Jews from his country, without exception, both native-born and immigrants.

Isabella, Queen of Portugal, was the instigator of the measures taken against the Jews, particularly the banishment of the Jews from Portugal. The marriage contract was signed on 30 November 1496. On 5 December 1496, the King promulgated a law ordering the Jews and Moslems to become Christians or leave Portugal within a given period of time, on pain of death. He allowed them almost an entire year, until October of the following year, to make their preparations.

An ex-Jew, Levi ben Schem Tob, who bore the Christian name of Antonio, published a factum against his fellow Jews. It was on his advice that Manuel closed all the synagogues and Jewish schools and prohibited the Jews from meeting on the Sabbath. As the Jews met in their houses, the king, at the instigation of Antonio, secretly ordered all Jewish children less than fourteen years old baptised on Easter Sunday. Approximately 20,000 Jews were thus baptised at the beginning of the month of April 1497.

During the month of October, most of the Jews were still in Portugal. King Manuel, according to the terms of the agreement, declared that they were now to be considered his slaves, that their fate depended solely on his decisions, and he undertook to baptise them all. At this point, the historian Heinrich Graetz carefully shores up the myth of the Jews who preferred death to baptism, and states, as often as the occasion allows, that many Jews committed suicide: "There were those who killed themselves in the church itself. A father covered his

children with his *talith* (prayer shawl), cut their throats and then killed himself". There is no doubt a good deal of legend mixed up in these repeated assertions.

Those who were converted continued to practise Judaism in secret. Among the thousands of Portuguese Jews who resigned themselves to baptism, "most were only awaiting a favourable occasion to emigrate to a country where they would be free to return to Judaism".

The Jews remaining in Portugal, who had submitted to baptism to avoid being separated from their children, sent a delegation before Pope Alexander VI, with a large sum of money, asking him to nullify the baptisms forced on them. On 30 May 1497, King Manuel finally promulgated an edict of tolerance, which only applied to Portuguese marranos, protecting all baptised Jews for 20 years; no inquiry would be made into their private lives. Throughout the entire reign of Manuel I, those who wished to could easily continue to practise their ancient religion in secrecy without risk of harassment by the authorities. Respecting the terms of his marriage contract by virtue of which all the Jews condemned by the Inquisition in Spain and who had taken refuge in Portugal should be expelled within one month, King Manuel ordered the expulsion of all Spanish marranos. At Lisbon, the people pillaged their houses and massacred the inhabitants.

**84**

**Savonarola and the Expulsion from Florence**

At Florence, the Dominican Jerome Savonarola preached against luxury, profit-seeking, the depravity of the powerful and of the Church. When the Medici were overthrown by the French in 1494, he negotiated the peace conditions and prevented the sack of the city. The Florentines were authorised by the King of France to choose their own form of government, and Savonarola became director of the city. From 1494 to 1497, he instituted a theocratic dictatorship which he personally called a Christian and Religious Republic. He amended the system of taxation to make it fairer, abolished torture, promulgated new laws against usury, established a court of appeals and instituted a system of assistance to the poor. Savonarola also accused the Jews having accumulated a profit of fifty million florins in 60 years. He also ordered their expulsion from Florence.

But his excesses in the repression of luxury, pleasures and the arts were his downfall, and the Jews returned in carriages stolen from the Medici.

85

**The Sephardic Diaspora**

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain – the aristocracy of Israel, “nobles among all of them”, writes Graetz, was a veritable catastrophe for them. “They, the princes of Israel”, were compelled to beg at their brothers’ doors. And Graetz states: “Upon leaving Spain, they possessed at least thirty million ducats, but all these riches had melted away.” The Jewish historian provides us with a glimpse of Jewish psychology at this point: “In the minds of Sephardic Jews, there was this idea that they must be particularly well-beloved of God for Him to have punished them so severely. Thus, against all expectations, they rapidly recovered from discouragement”.

Since all those who were expelled from Spain, Portugal or Germany went to Italy first of all to become established under the protection of some tolerant prince; if not, they went to Greece, Turkey or Palestine. Of all the Italian sovereigns, Alexander IV, Jules II, Léon X, Clement VII, more preoccupied with affirming their temporal power than in applying restrictive laws against Jews, even employed Jewish physicians, they and their cardinals, despite the decision of the council of Basel. Thus, Alexander VI had the Jew Bonet de Latès from Provence as his personal physician, while Julius II took Simeon Sarfati into his service.

Among the fugitives, the Abravanel family, who had taken refuge in Naples, were highly experienced where trials and tribulation were concerned. Isaac Abravanel was appointed by the King of Naples, Ferdinand I to a high post. But he had to flee the Italian peninsula once again to escape the French invasion, led by Charles VIII.

On their way to Rome in 1494, men from the French and Scottish guards attacked the Jews and were about to demolish the synagogue. The King of France, Charles VIII, ordered a search for the guilty parties, six of whom were publicly hanged.[259] Abravanel, for his part, sought refuge, first in Sicily, accompanied by his sovereign, and then on the island of Corfu. He then moved to Monopoli, in Apuglia. Those who remained in the kingdom of Naples were seized by terror and declared themselves ready to embrace Christianity, solely to preserve their property and their freedom. But as soon as the danger was past, they forgot their professions of faith and their baptism and

returned to Judaism. Little care was taken to keep such Christians in the faith. Thus, when Gonzalo de Córdoba took Naples for the king of Spain, there was discussion of expelling all the Jews, since they had already been expelled from the Spanish states. But the king's captain believed it was more worthwhile to persecute them as bad Christians than to expel them as Jews. As a result, instead of promulgating the edict of banishment, he wished to introduce the Inquisition. This occurred in 1504. Objections were raised on all sides, and in 1510, the Jews were all banished from the kingdom. Such was the end of the presence of the Jews in the south of the peninsula. Abravanel, for his part, went to die in Venice, where he was able to earn the trust of the government, as he did wherever else he went. The Venetians even made him responsible for negotiating a trade treaty with Portugal on behalf of the Venetian republic. Charles V, little inclined to favour the Jews, later expelled them from his states in Italy. They dispersed into Turkey, the papal states and elsewhere.[260]

Sephardic Jews transplanted their Spanish language and manners in all the countries where they became established, whether Africa, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, as in Italy and Flanders. The Sephardim presented a strong contrast with the German Jews, or Ashkenazim, who spoke a German dialect and lived separately from Christians. The Ashkenazi, in turn, recognised the superiority of their Sephardic fellow Jews, whose influence was not long in making itself felt, even where they were a distinct minority. Placed between these two groups, the Jews of Italy hardly counted, and were obliged to learn German or Spanish.

The majority of the exiles then travelled to Turkey. The Jewish community of Constantinople, which increased considerably as a result of the flood of fugitives from the Iberian peninsula, amounted to nearly 30,000 Jews, with 44 synagogues. Salonica also had a considerable and highly entrepreneurial Jewish population. After the explosion of the Jews of Spain, the sultan Bajazet, just like your typical naive goy, made the following remark: "You call Ferdinand a wise monarch, he who has impoverished his empire and enriched mine!"

The Jews, writes Graetz, "represented at once the merchant class and the bourgeoisie of Turkey. Not only did they have retail and wholesale trade in their hands, but practised the manual professions and various arts". The marranos also manufactured fire arms, cannons and gunpowder for the Turks, and instructed them in their use. Soon, they were pushing the Turks into war against the Christians, thus slaking their thirst for vengeance.

86

**The Ashkenazim Expelled from Germany**

The Jews of Germany and Central Europe at that time lived withdrawn into their community, carefully avoiding mixing with Christians. The well-known Jewish historian Léon Poliakov recalls the primacy granted to study and scholarship among the Ashkenazi Jews of the 15th century: "All the aspects of the life of the Jewish communities reflects this climate of penitence and austerity. Only once per year, at Purim, were they permitted and even encouraged to abandon themselves to straightforward jubilation at Carnival, to disguise themselves and get drunk, to revenge themselves upon their prosecutors, burning Haman – the prototype of all anti-Semites – in wooden effigy in a public square... On other days, their distractions were very few in number, and above all strictly regulated. Profane theatre, which was assimilated to debauchery, was strictly forbidden, as were even boys and girls dancing together, even at weddings. Card games were only occasionally permitted, so that in the end, chess and society games such as charades on Biblical themes were the only entertainments which never aroused the suspicions and censoriousness of the rabbis. Any ornamentation, any attempt at fantasy in clothing was prohibited; men and women wore black or grey, at a time when colour and sartorial coloured patterns reigned supreme".[261]

These austere customs were manifestly incompatible with the Jewish greed for gain, illicit trafficking and the desire to harm the goyim. In Germany, as we have seen, the expulsions of the Jews date back to the 15th century, and accelerated after 1450. By the end of the century, only a few residual pockets of Jewry remained.

At Villach, in Carinthia, Jewish families lived under the protection of the bishop of Bamberg, whom they bribed in exchange for protection. In 1421, after a case of host profanation, the bishop finally responded to popular exasperation. The rabbis of the city were all arrested and sentenced to death.

Ladislaus the Posthumous, King of Hungary and Bohemia and Duke of Austria starting in 1454, permitted the bourgeoisie of Znaym, Brunn and Vienna to expel the Jews from their cities and confiscate their houses, synagogues and lands by means of the poll tax which they had been formerly been allowed to pay, and to extinguish all loans still outstanding against the bourgeoisie.[262]



The people of Prague rose up against the Jews on numerous occasions, while the bourgeoisie regularly demanded the Jews' immediate expulsion. The nobility, by contrast, corrupted by usurers' gold, was favourable to them. In the midst of the 15th century, King Ladislaus finally authorised the expulsion of the Jews and even threatened to banish any Christian who intervened in their favour. But despite the royal decision – as a result of some unknown set of circumstances – the Jews remained in the city.

Emperor Maximilian had watched impassively as they were expelled from the cities and different states of the Empire. Under his reign, Jews were accused of immolating Christian children, counterfeiting money, imitating the seals on charters, and charging usury at enormous rates. The Emperor, ceding to popular clamour, resolved to banish them from his states; the Bishop of Bamberg no longer dared to protect the Jews of Villach, so the Jews dispersed themselves at Gorice, Udine, Venice.

One village near Villach bears the name Judendorf or “village of the Jews” to this very day.

The Jews were also banished from Styria at this same time, where they had large, beautiful houses, particularly at Gratz, Marburg and Judenburg. As the Emperor had formerly derived a good revenue from the Jews there, the Styrian states of south-eastern Austria believed they had an obligation to indemnify Maximilian for his financial losses by giving him the sum of 38,000 florins. It is obvious that the inhabitants of the country were ready for anything to get rid of the Jews. The representatives of the country even inscribed the expulsion of the Jews as one of their official rights, which they swore to maintain upon the advent of the archdukes of Austria.[263]

The Jews were then expelled from Nuremberg in 1499. The Emperor had been requested by the bourgeoisie to expel the Jews from the city, due to their licentious conduct: “They are criticised”, writes Graetz, “for too easily sheltering foreign Jews amongst them and for increasing their number beyond the regulatory number; lending at rates which were far too high, and ruining workers through exaggerated and often unjustified demands, and, in sum, of providing hospitality to people without religion”. The Jews had already been expelled once, during the Black Death, but they came back and established themselves again after the dissipation of the plague. In 1490, a rich bourgeois from Nuremberg, Anton Koberger, at his own expense, printed the Spanish Franciscan monk Alfonso de Espina's pamphlet denouncing the crimes of the Jews: their blasphemies, ritual murders, swindles and usury, causing the ruin of the Christians.

After long hesitation, and under increasingly insistent pressure from the bourgeoisie, Maximilian decided to permit the Council of the city to expel them, but he demanded that their houses, landed property, synagogues and even their cemetery, should revert to the imperial treasury. The decision was taken on 5 July 1498. The Council did not at first wish to grant the Jews any grace period of more than four months to make their preparations for departure, which was extended by three months. On 10 March 1499, the Jews of Nuremberg were definitively expelled.

Other imperial cities expelled the Jews at this time, particularly Ulm, Nordlingen, Colmar and Magdeburg. The Jewish community of Ravensburg was expelled a few years later. Only two large Jewish communities still existed in Germany at that time, that of Frankfurt-am-Main, and that of Worms, who were also under threat of expulsion.

At the beginning of the 16th century, the members of the sect also lost their establishments in Brandenburg; the Jews were not merely banished; they had to swear that they would never return, and that they would prevent their fellow Jews from returning.[264] This oath was apparently only applicable to banished individuals, since otherwise their successors and heirs were soon to return.

Expelled from their countries of origin, the German Talmudists established themselves further east, in Poland, in Lithuania, Ruthenia, in Volhynia. German Jews also transplanted their language, which was also adopted by the indigenous Jews of these countries. Poland, as we have seen, was then the only country in Europe where Jews were still tolerated by the reigning princes. No visible mark distinguished them from Christians, and they were even permitted to carry swords. "Tax farming and alcohol distilling were almost entirely in the hands of the Jews", writes Graetz.

Nevertheless, John-Albert I and Alexander I, sons and successors of Casimir IV, abolished the privileges of the Jews, confined them to special quarters, and even expelled them from a few cities (1496–1505). But upon the succession of Sigismund I (1506–1548), the Jews recovered all their privileges. They also obtained powerful support from the Polish nobility, who supported the Jews out of self-interest. Thus, since the high Polish officials were chosen from among the nobility, the restrictive laws against the Jews remained almost a dead letter, to the great scandal of the clergy and working classes.

## 87

### 1501: Expulsion from Provence

Numerous Jews from France had become installed in the peripheral regions, particularly in Provence. Here, as everywhere else, the inhabitants distrusted them like the plague. The statutes of Avignon prohibited Jews from touching bread or fruit laid out for sale in the markets. If they did so, they were forced to pay for them. There was a great fear of leprosy and other contagious skin diseases, often affecting Jews.[265] Jewish physicians were also distrusted. The Frejus statutes prohibited Christians from calling a Jewish physician or taking any medication prescribed by him.[266]

In the Comtat Venaissin, in 1343, the Jewish community of Carpentras amounted to approximately 400 individuals. In 1359, barely ten years after the large-scale massacres, there were 210 Jewish family fathers, which presupposed a total number of approximately 1,000 Jews in total. That is to say that the Jews, despite the setbacks suffered at regular intervals, perceived a certain interest in remaining in the midst of a Christian environment, which they exploited to the last drop of goy blood.

In 1261, the inhabitants of Manosque brought a complaint against the usurers. The latter had taken 6 pennies per livre interest per month, or 30% per year, and had thus taken control of more than half the territory of that city.[267]

Almost every time the states of Provence met, the privileges of the Jews and their usury were the subject of complaint. All the available governmental records of their sessions are full of these complaints. It was therefore demanded that the Jews be required to wear the *rouelle*, or that they be prohibited from charging more than 5 pennies per month in interest per livre, or that they be compelled to live in a separate district. In 1421, the states, or, rather, the lords, even demanded an amnesty for crimes committed against Jews. But certain lords had an interest in this. In 1448, the Jew Bonnefoy de Chalons was granted the banking monopoly for the city of Nice, for the money-changing business, foreign currency exchange and lending at interest.[268]

The region experienced anti-Jewish revolts in 1475. Between 1484 and 1486, anti-Jewish physical attacks occurred at Aix, Marseilles and Arles. After the absorption of Provence into the kingdom of France in

1481, the inhabitants of other cities in Provence demanded the expulsion of the Jews.

In 1484, the harvesters of Provence, Dauphin and Auvergne caused a riot in the city of Arles and destroyed the local synagogue.[269] In 1487, Marseilles sent a deputy to demand their banishment due to their usury, which was ruining the country. In 1498, finally, on the order of new complaints against Christians, the Jews received the order to leave the kingdom. Nevertheless the edict was not strictly enforced. Through a new edict issued in 1501, the king of France, Louis XII, ordered their definitive expulsion and the confiscation of all property owned by Jews who refused to become Christians.[270] Some of them fled into the Levant, others into the Comtat Venaissin. Others found asylum in the principality of Orange, but four years later, Prince Philippe de Chalons banished them from this small state. Only the Pope continued to protect them in the Comtat Venaissin, and they retained their synagogues at Avignon, Carpentras and Cavaillon, where they have always remained.

## 88

### Lisbon, 1506

Spanish conversos were strictly supervised by the Inquisition and were profoundly hated for their duplicity and ceaseless crimes, despite their conversion to Christianity. The new Inquisitor General who succeeded Torquemada was the Dominican Diego Deza, who treated them perhaps even more strictly. Assisted by Diego Rodríguez Lucero, Deza caused the deaths of thousands of marranos. The third Inquisitor General, Ximénes de Cisneros, treated new Christians of Jewish origin with the same inexorable strictness as his predecessors. When Charles V got the idea of authorising the marranos of Spain to practice the Jewish religion freely and openly, against the payment of a sum of 800,000 gold crowns, Ximénes de Cisneros did not hesitate to use threatening language.

In Portugal, a riot broke out at Lisbon on 19 April 1506 during Easter Week. The Dominicans led the popular tumult, while German, Dutch and French sailors joined the mobs. More than 10,000 people thronged through the city, killing all the marranos they could find, men, women and children. The carnage lasted three days and caused 2,300 deaths. King Manuel I reacted firmly, executing several dozen persons guilty of rioting, and closing the Dominican convent. On 1 March 1507, he eliminated the juridical differences between old and new Christians, who thus obtained the right to leave the country, which they did *en masse*.

In 1536, on the pretext of pursuing the adepts of the new Protestant doctrine, the Inquisition was finally introduced into Portugal by common accord between the Pope and John III. Judaisizing Jews were not forgotten. King John placed a few spies among the marranos. The most important of these spies was a neo-Christian from Spain, Henrique Núñez. Educated in the school of the Inquisitor Lucero, he wished Portugal to imitate its Iberian neighbour. He entered the homes of his former fellow Jews under the guise of friendship, spying upon them and communicating their secret thoughts, conspiracies and swindles to the king.

Under Inquisitor John Soares, the prisons became filled with marranos and numerous autos-da-fe were held, to the great relief of the Christians. The Jewish poet Samuel Usque, who was present at these

scenes in his youth, has left us with this description: "The Inquisition", he said, "burned a great number of our brothers; not one by one, but in groups of 30–50, who were given over to the flames. Sadly, the Christian people even glorified in these massacres, happily watching the autos-da-fé of the sons of Jacob and bringing wood to feed the flames".

Between 1538 and 1609, there were 105 autos-da-fé in Portugal. The stakes of the Inquisition, although less frequent than in Spain, spread such great terror among the marranos that those who remained faithful to Judaism were gradually dissipated.

89

**Joseph Pfefferkorn versus Johann Reuchlin**

The German intellectual reaction against Jewish aggressiveness was quite strong at the beginning of the 16th century. Ortwin von Grätz, known as Gratius, who was the son of an ecclesiastic, "hated the Jews with a passion", writes Graetz. Born in 1491 at Holtwick, Westphalia, he was one of the leading figure of the Dominican order in Cologne, and published a book entitled *De Vita et Moribus Judaeorum* (1504), which he then translated into German. Ortwin also translated the works of Pfefferkorn into Latin.

Joseph Pfefferkorn was becoming increasingly well known. Baptised at the age of 36, with his wife and children, he left Judaism forever, a fact easily confirmed by the degree of anti-Semitism shown by him. As a result of his conversion, he became a favourite of the Dominicans of Cologne. He was also in touch with Cunegonde, Emperor Maximilian's sister, who was married to the Bavarian duke Albert of Munich. When the latter died young in 1508, Cunegonde withdrew into a convent and became Abbess of the Poor Clares. With Pfefferkorn, the two of them undertook an intellectual and spiritual crusade against Judaism, and were in complete agreement as to the absolute and primary necessity of destroying the nauseating spirit emanating from the Talmud. Cunegonde gave Pfefferkorn a letter for her brother Maximilian, in which she begged him to receive with favour the request of the Dominicans. Bearing this letter, Pfefferkorn visited the Emperor, and, on 10 August 1509, he succeeded in obtaining a general commission from him authorising him to seize and examine the books of the Jews throughout the Empire, and to destroy all those which contained assertions hostile to Christianity. By means of this same decree, the Jews were strictly prohibited from opposing the searches or hiding the incriminated books.

Pfefferkorn began his career of public salubriousness in the important community of Frankfurt, where numerous Talmudists were still to be found, "as well as Jews who were very well-off", as Graetz writes. Numerous new copies of the Talmud and other Hebrew religious works could still be found in Frankfurt. At Pfefferkorn's request, the Senate of Frankfurt convened all the Jews to the synagogue where they were informed of the imperial edict. On Friday, 28 September 1509, all the prayer books that could be found in the

synagogue were confiscated, in the presence of numerous ecclesiastics and several members of the Senate. It was the eve of the Feast of the Tabernacles. Pfefferkorn went even further and prohibited the Jews from attending synagogue because he wanted to take advantage of the feast days to search their houses, but the ecclesiastics present did not wish to prevent the Jews from celebrating their feast days and they put off the house searches until the following Monday.

During this same period, the Jewish community of Frankfurt sent a delegate to Uriel of Gemmingen, Prince-Elector and Archbishop of Mayence, responsible for the clergy of Frankfurt, requesting that the ecclesiastics be prevented from conducting the search. The prelate acceded to their desire and strictly prohibited them from searching their homes. When the Senate of Frankfurt learned of the Archbishop of Mayence's decision, he withdrew his support for Pfefferkorn. The Jews also delegated Jonathon Cion before Emperor Maximilian to plead their cause, and invited all the German Jewish communities to a meeting the following month.

Pfefferkorn came back to see the Emperor again, equipped with a new, very urgent letter from his sister Cunegonde and, on November 1509, Maximilian gave him a mandate permitting him to confiscate the offending books. Archbishop Uriel of Gemmingen was made responsible for examining them, but he had to seek the opinion of the faculties of theology of Cologne, Mayence, Erfurt and Heidelberg, and scholars such as Reuchlin, Victor von Carben and even the Inquisitor, the Dominican Hochstraten.[271]

Pfefferkorn returned to Frankfurt, where he seized 1,500 handwritten works, which he deposited at City Hall, and acquitted himself of his task zealously in other localities as well. The Jews nevertheless put pressure on the Emperor, and, on 23 May 1510, Maximilian partially revoked his earlier orders, instructing the Senate of Frankfurt to return all their books.

At this very moment, an incident occurred which the Dominicans were well suited to take full advantage of. A ciborium with golden monstrance was stolen from a church on the Margraviate of Brandenburg. The guilty party was arrested in a church of the Brandenburg Marche. The thief who was arrested claimed to have sold hosts to the Jews of his region. Prince-Elector Joachim I caused the defendants to be taken to Berlin where they were accused of profanation of the host and of murdering a child. On 19 July 1510, on Joachim's order, 38 Jews were tortured on a red-hot grid. Two of them accepted baptism and were simply decapitated. This affair caused profound emotion in Germany.



Cunegunde attempted once again to convince her brother Maximilian. During an interview with him in Munich, she entreated him to withdraw his protection of the Jews. On 6 July 1510, for the fourth time, Maximilian issued a decree relating to the confiscation of the Hebrew books; archbishop Uriel was to request memoranda on this matter from certain universities of Germany, as well as of Reuchlin, Victor von Carben and Hochstraten, and Pfefferkorn was assigned the task of submitting the conclusions to the Emperor.

The erudite "humanist" Johann Reuchlin, of Pforzheim, played a major role in this dispute. At the court of the old Emperor Friedrich III, at Linz, Reuchlin entered into contact with the Jewish physician Jacob Loans, who also taught him Hebrew. He attempted to prove that, far from being harmful to Christianity, the Jewish works could, on the contrary, be used to show their divine nature, and then pronounced himself opposed to the suppression of the Talmud. Pfefferkorn published a pamphlet in German against him entitled *The Hand Mirror* (*Handspiegel*, Mainz, 1509), which was widely disseminated inside the country in the thousands of copies. But in September 1511, Reuchlin responded to Pfefferkorn's pamphlet with another pamphlet in German, entitled *The Mirror of the Eyes*.

At Rome and at Paris, the struggle between Reuchlin and the Dominicans awakened ardent discussion. The Dominican Jacob van Hochstraten, professor of theology and inquisitor at Cologne, attached great value to the opinions of the masters of the University of Paris, whom he wished to conciliate by all means. At Rome, he also used all his influence.

A trial was held to settle the dispute, in which the prosecution was entrusted by Pope Léon X to Cardinal Dominique Grimani. We know that this prince of the Church knew the rabbinical literature and the Kabbalah. What is more, in his capacity as patron of the Franciscans, he detested the monks of the order of the Dominicans. The Jews kept in the background, but their role here is obvious: "It is very probable", writes Graetz, "that the Jews of Rome contributed to Reuchlin's success".

In June 1514, Cardinal Grimani invited Reuchlin and Hochstraten to appear before him, nevertheless permitting the first named, by reason of his advanced age, to be represented by a delegate, Jacob von Hochstraten being seconded by Arnaud de Tongres, a professor of theology.

The efforts and hopes of the Dominicans were concentrated chiefly in Paris. The University of Paris was the oldest of all European universities and enjoyed very great authority in the theological field. If

it condemned Reuchlin's book, even the Pope himself would no doubt never dare to oppose their judgement. The King of France, Louis XII, also exerted great pressure on the University of Paris in favour of the Dominicans. France and Germany were not on very good terms, and from the moment Maximilian pronounced for Reuchlin, Louis XII declared himself opposed.

The University hesitated a very long time before pronouncing judgement. The discussions were protracted until August 1514. The vote of numerous French theologians was finally decided by an example given three centuries before: it was recalled that Saint Louis had ordered the burning of copies of the Talmud at the request of the apostate Nicholas Donin and by order of Pope Gregory IX in 1242. It was therefore declared that Reuchlin's *Mirror*, which defended the Talmud, contained heresies and should be burnt. "If it is Christian to hate the Jews", said Erasmus at the time, "we are all excellent Christians". In Germany, the Dominicans hastened to publish a new pamphlet to publicise the verdict of the Sorbonne.

Maximilian and several German princes pressured the Pope, Leon IX, to acquit Reuchlin at last, while the king of France and young Charles, the future Charles V, while the Duke of Burgundy and later Emperor of Germany, king of Spain and sovereign of the Americas, demanded that the *Mirror* be condemned.

The Pope then seized the occasion which offered itself to evade his responsibility. He chose a commission from among the members of the Great Lateran Council, which was meeting at that time, to examine the affair once again and pronounce a verdict. This commission announced that Hochstraten was in the wrong, but the latter would not give up the fight. By dint of proceedings and applications he succeeded in convincing Leon X to suspend pronouncement of the judgement indefinitely. Despite everything, the Dominicans had suffered a defeat, and Hochstraten left Rome angry and confused. His energy had nonetheless not abated, and he did not despair of recommencing the struggle under more favourable circumstances.

In avoiding any open declaration for either party, Leon X hoped to avoid disappointing either the humanists nor the Dominicans. But this long struggle had overexcited people's spirits, and the two sides wished to fight to the finish. When Hochstraten returned to Rome, his life was in danger, and the Dominican escaped several assassination attempts.

Some time later, Leon X, corrupted by Jewish gold, finally authorised the printing of the Talmud. In 1519, a rich and generous Christian printer in Venice, Daniel Bromberg, published a complete edition of the Babylonian Talmud in twelve in-folio volumes, which

served as a model for later editions. The Pope even granted the printer privileges to protect him against counterfeiting.

But a movement soon appeared in Germany which would cause the disputes of Reuchlin and the Dominicans to be forgotten: the Protestant Reformation, which was to shake the foundations of the Papacy, causing the Catholic Church to tremble on its foundations and shatter Europe.

**90**

**Albert of Brandenburg**

At this time, there were only three major Jewish communities left in Germany, those of Ravensburg, Frankfurt and Worms. Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, initially the bishop of Magdeburg, promoted to Archbishop of Mayence, revealed himself to be a true adversary of Israel. He invited the ecclesiastics, laymen and municipalities, particularly those of Frankfurt and Worms, to meet to decide upon the definitive expulsion of the Jews of Germany. Numerous delegates responded to the appeal and met at Frankfurt starting in January 1516. On 8 March, the resolution to banish the Jews forever was adopted; but this resolution had to be submitted for ratification by the Emperor.

The Jews naturally sent a deputation before Maximilian to attempt to bribe him. Although they were the subjects of various princes and lords, the Jews of Germany, as is well known, were only responsible to Maximilian as serfs of the Imperial Chamber. Corrupted by Jewish gold, Maximilian then addressed a very severe missive to Albert of Brandenburg and the Mayence chapter, as well as to all those who had taken part in the Diet of Frankfurt.

But Maximilian died in February 1519. An anti-Jewish riot immediately broke out, under the effective leadership of the fiery preacher of the cathedral, Balthazar Hubmayer, and the Jewish community of Ravensburg was condemned to exile.

In 1529, another ritual murder occurred in the Empire. In the Jewish community of Bösing, near Pressburg (Bratislava), the body of a young Christian was found mutilated. 36 Jews of all ages were then burnt, and almost all the Jews of Moravia were thrown into prison. It should be borne in mind here that the Jews, two years beforehand, had acted as spies for the Turks who were besieging Vienna, and had helped them as much as they could.

91

## The Judaic Origins of the Protestant Reform

Catholic authors of the 19th century puzzling to discover the causes of the French Revolution and analysing the ferment of destruction of traditional Europe had very little difficulty in tracing these things back to their Judaic origins. One Jewish intellectual, Bernard Lazare, in his famous book *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes* (1894), corroborated the idea of the Jewish origins of medieval heresies, Protestantism, rationalism, and the "Enlightenment". The objective always remained the destruction of the Catholic Church: "It was the rationalists and *philosophes* (Jews)", he writes, "who, from the 10th to the 15th century, until the Renaissance, were the auxiliaries of what one might call the general revolution of humanity". In the 13th century, "they were the forefront of the exegetics, the rationalists... Jewish Averroists were the direct ancestors of the men of the Renaissance. It was thanks to them that the spirit of doubt and investigation arose. The Platonists of Florence, the Aristotelians of Italy, the humanists of Germany originated from these people. It was thanks to them that Pomporiazzo composed his treatises against the immortality of the soul, thanks to them again that a form of theism corresponding to a decadence of Catholicism became widespread among the thinkers of the 16th century".[272]

The Argentinian Abbot Julio Meinvielle, in 1936, in his book *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, cited another passage of Bernard Lazare's book: "During the centuries which announced the Reform, the Jew became the educator and professor of Hebrew of the scholars. He initiated them into the mysteries of the Kabbalah after opening the doors of Arabic philosophy for them; he provided them, for use against the Catholics, with that terrible exegesis which the rabbis had cultivated and reinforced over the centuries; this exegesis of which use was later made by Protestantism and Rationalism".

The Jewish linguist James Darmesteter, who also wrote at the end of the 19th century, corroborated the remark, and said, regarding the Jews: "All the rebels of the mind come to him in the shade or open sky. He is at work in the immense workshop of blasphemy of the Great Emperor Friedrich and the Princes of Swabia or Aragon; it he who forged this entire arsenal of reasoning and irony which he was to

bequeath to the sceptics of the Renaissance; the libertines of the Great Century, the sarcasm of Voltaire, are merely the last resonant echo of a word murmured six centuries before in the shadows of the ghetto, and even more anciently, during the time of Celsius and Origen, at the very cradle of the religion of the Christ".[273]

For the Abbot Julio Meinvielle, there was therefore no doubt: all the sects and secret societies, occultists, cabbalists, who pullulated everywhere at the end of the Middle Ages in a more or less disguised form, were "redoubts of conspiracy against the Church and the Christian states, skilfully manipulated by the Satanic hand of Judaism".[274]

Meinvielle furthermore cites the famous German historian Werner Sombart, who was, he says, "neither Catholic, nor anti-Semitic", and who showed, in his book *The Jews and Economic Life* (1911), that the Protestant sects, Protestantism in particular, were of Judaic inspiration.

The fact is that close links were effectively established during the Protestant Reformation between Judaism and certain Christian sects. The Gospels were neglected for the Bible (the Torah of the Jews), and the influence of this book on Lutheranism, particularly the Calvinists and Anglo-Saxon Puritans, is well-known. We also know that there was an ardent infatuation for the Hebraic language and studies.

In 17th century England, the Puritans surrounded the Jews with an almost fanatical cult. The Levellers called themselves Jews, demanded the promulgation of a law which would make the Torah the Code of England. Cromwell's officers proposed to compose its Council State of 70 members, like the Sanhedrin of the Jews. In the year 1629, it was even proposed in Parliament that the Sunday holiday be replaced by Saturday.[275]

Mgr Henri Delassus, in his book *La Conjuration anti-chrétienne* (*The Anti-Christian Conspiracy*), published in 1910, also recognised in Judaism the source of the evils undermining the Catholic Church:

"Since the beginning of the Christian era", he writes, "the Jew has been and is truly the great revolutionary and the great originator of heretical doctrine in all things and on all points. He destroys for the sake of destruction, out of hatred for what exists, as well as in the hope of building the Temple upon these ruins which we have said: the Jerusalem of a new order, located between the East and West...[276] For 1800 years, the Jews have been inspired and dominated by hatred, the most tenacious, the most irreducible of peoples. His hatred has taken all possible forms, it has dissimulated itself and infiltrated, with a skill equalled by its constancy, into all the revolts of the human spirit against God, his Christ and his Church. Judaism has introduced itself,

at the beginning, into the Church itself, to bring trouble, division and heresy. This was the work of Simon Magus, the Gnostics, the Manes and their adherents or emulators. Later, the Jew favours all heresies, even when he has not inspired them; the more one makes a detailed study of his actions, the more one sees that he is mixed up in all resistance against the Spirit of God. In the Middle Ages, the Jew betrayed the Christians for the benefit of the Moslems, who nevertheless despised and mistreated them, in both Spain and in the Middle East; he is with the Albigensians against the Catholics, as he is with the Protestants, as he is with the free-thinkers, the Jacobins, the socialists and Freemasons; as he is today with the nihilists in Russia".[277]

Protestantism was only therefore a new avatar of the Judaic poison. "A Protestant", said the Jewish poet Heinrich Heine, "is only a Catholic who has abandoned the Trinitarian idolatry for Jewish monotheism".

The Franciscan teacher Nicholas of Lyra made a careful study of rabbinical literature and was the precursor of modern exegesis, which is, as the Jewish historian Bernard Lazare writes, "the daughter of Jewish thought, the rationalism of which is purely Judaic". For Nicholas de Lyre, the literal explanation of the text of Scripture must be the basis for ecclesiastical science. He borrowed many of his arguments from the Jew Raschi (a medieval rabbi named Shlomo Yitzchaki or Salomon Isaacides), and Luther borrowed the same arguments from him.

Bernard Lazare explicitly stated: "Exegesis and free examination are fatally destructive, and it is the Jews who have created Biblical exegesis, it was they who first criticised the Christian symbol and beliefs... It is the Jewish spirit which triumphed with Protestantism".[278]

The Renaissance and Protestantism effectively opened a breach in the solid edifice of Christianity. From there, the Jew went on to occupy himself with destroying Christianity and attempting to establish the universal empire of his dreams. But in the 16th century, the Jews were still rather far from having triumphed.

While the Protestants sought their sources in the Bible, the Spanish, for their part, distanced themselves from it. The Bible had become for them an object of aversion. One inquisitor, Jerome de Villanueva, wrote in 1791: "The zeal with which the Holy Office has sought to withdraw the Bible from the hands of the people is well known; with the result that the same people who formerly researched it regard it with horror and detestation today; many are those who are indifferent to it; while the majority are not familiar with it".[279]

At this time, Russia also had a Judaising heresy. There were no Jews in Russia at that time, because the Muscovite grand-dukes distrusted them like the plague. But in 1480, a Jew from Kiev named Zachary arrived at Novgorod accompanied by a few Lithuanian fellow Jews and misled several Christian priests. The latter travelled to Moscow, engaged in proselytism and founded the sect of "Judaising Christians". Great-Duke Ivan III reacted in 1504 by ordering the arrest of the leaders, after which they were burned alive, thus quickly solving the problem.



## 92

## Martin Luther

In considering the Bible the sole legitimate source of religious authority, Martin Luther, the father of Protestantism, defied papal authority. He was excommunicated in early 1521 after numerous debates, but his influence only increased. The wars of religion spread to half of Europe and lasted until the following century.

His position with regards to Judaism had evolved. Initially, hoping to attract Jews to Christianity, he showed himself benevolent in their regard. But, as soon as he realised that the Jews were extremely rebellious when it came to conversion and rejected instruction in the reformed religion, he declared merciless war upon them.

In 1537, he succeeded in having them expelled from Saxony, then, in 1540, from a few other German cities. In 1543, he attempted, without success, to have them expelled from Brandenburg.

That year, three years prior to his death, he published a two-hundred page pamphlet entitled *On the Jews and Their Lies* (*Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*), in which he let rip against the incestuous sect: "The Jews", he said, "complain of enduring a harsh servitude among us, when we, on the contrary, could complain of having been martyred and persecuted by them for nearly 300 years... We do not know today what devil brought them to our country. We did not go looking for them in Jerusalem, and no one is keeping them here."

And again: "How the Jews love the Book of Esther, which corresponds so perfectly to their appetite for vengeance, their murderous hopes! The sun never shown on a more bloodthirsty people than they, who consider themselves the chosen people so as to have a licence to kill and strangle the gentiles. There are no creatures under the sun greedier than they are, have been, and will be – just look at them practise their cursed usury. They flatter themselves with hope that when the Messiah arrives, he will gather all the gold and silver in the world and divvy it up with them".

Luther recalled that the Jews had been violently expelled from France, and, more recently, from Spain, "by our well-beloved Emperor Charles, as well as from all of Bohemia, and, in my time, from Ravensburg, Magdeburg and so many other localities".

He did not hesitate to incite even highway robbers against the Jews. Having learned that a rich Jew was travelling across Germany with 12

horses, he advised brigands to prove themselves less tolerant than Christian princes, and to capture the Jewish travellers and their wealth. He referred to the Jews in the following terms: "A brood of vipers", "children of the devil" (from Matthew 12:34), "miserable, blind and stupid", "thieves and scoundrels", "lazy rascals", "perpetual murderers", and "vermin", comparing them to "gangrene".

"So we are even at fault in not avenging all this innocent blood of our Lord and of the Christians which they shed for three hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the blood of the children they have shed since then (which still shines forth from their eyes and their skin). We are at fault in not slaying them. Rather we allow them to live freely in our midst despite their murdering, cursing, blaspheming, lying, and defaming; we protect and shield their synagogues, houses, life, and property. In this way we make them lazy and secure and encourage them to fleece us boldly of our money and goods, as well as to mock and deride us, with a view to finally overcoming us, killing us all for such a great sin, and robbing us of all our property (as they daily pray and hope). Now tell me whether they do not have every reason to be the enemies of us accursed Goyim, to curse us and to strive for our final, complete, and eternal ruin!"[280]

The Popes often recommended that synagogues be spared, but Luther advised destroying them. We see here that for Luther, the Jews had in no way changed:

"First, to set fire to their synagogues or schools and cover with dirt whatever will not burn, so that no man will ever see a stone or cinder of them... Secondly I advise that their houses be razed and destroyed. For they pursue in them the same aims as in their synagogues... Third I advise that all their prayer books and Talmudic writings, in which such idolatry, lies, cursing and blasphemies are taught, be taken from them. Fourth I advise that their rabbis be forbidden from teaching, on pain of loss of life and limb... Fifth, I advise that safe-conducts on the highway be entirely abolished for Jews... Sixth, I advise that usury be forbidden to them, and that all cash and treasures of gold and silver be confiscated... If a Jew converts sincerely, he should be given a certain sum of money... Seventh, I recommend that one place a flail, an axe, a hoe, a shovel, a distaff, or a spindle in the hands of young Jews or Jewesses, and let them earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. Since it is not just that they should let us toil, we, the damned goyim, while they, the chosen people, spend their time loafing around in front of the log stove, displaying themselves and farting, but more than this, bragging blasphemously of their lording it over the Christians, with the aid of our sweat."

Luther described their criminal instincts: "They are thieves, brigands, who never wear a single thread upon their bodies which they have not stolen and filched through the most voracious of usuries. They live every day from rapine and thefts, they, their wives and children, practise brigandage everywhere and prove themselves the craftiest of thieves... I have heard many stories told of Jews, such as: how they poison wells, how they have committed homicides in secret. I have learned that one Jew sent another a vase of fresh blood through a Christian intermediary. Similarly, I have heard tell of a barrel, which, when it was emptied, contained a cadaver. How many crimes and kidnappings can one not reproach them for? Apart from the devil himself, the Christian has no crueller enemy than the Jew".[281]

"Do not take their defence, let us not eat and drink with them, do not grant them hospitality, let us not share their madness and demoniacal fury... They are as many wicked, perverse, venomous, satanic beasts, who, for fourteen hundred years and more, have been and still are, the ruin of governments, black plagues and our cancers. In sum, the Jews are for us devils incarnate... We must separate ourselves from them. They must be expelled from our country... We must pursue them like mad dogs".

Several months after the publication of *On the Jews and Their Lies*, Luther wrote another pamphlet, *Vom Schem Hamphoras und das Geschlecht Christi (Of the Name of Hamphoras and of the Line of Christ)*:

"Here at Wittenburg, in our parish church; there is a sow sculpted in stone, under which there lie young pigs and Jews being suckled, and behind the sow is a rabbi lifting the sow's right foot, standing up behind the sow, leaning over and peering at the Talmud with a great effort, underneath the sow, as if he wanted to read and see something very difficult and exceptional; there's no doubt, they received their Chem Hamporas from this location."

"When Judas hanged himself and his intestines spurted, and, as happens under such circumstances, that his bladder exploded, the Jews were ready to gather the water and other precious things, and since they gorged themselves on it and drank avidly amongst themselves, and they were then equipped with such finesse of sight that were able to glimpse the comments in the Holy Scriptures that neither Matthew nor Isaiah themselves were ever capable of seeing, or perhaps they were looking up the ass of their God 'Shed', and found these things written in this steamy hole."

Finally, the Jews were the people of the devil: "The devil, with his angelical snout, devours that which is secreted from the oral and anal

apertures of the Jews; this is in reality their favourite dish, which he gorges himself on like a sow behind a hedge".[282]

Holy Roman Emperor Charles V expelled the Jews from the kingdom of Naples in 1541. Under Luther's influence, other sovereigns also reacted. In 1543, the prince-electors John Frederick of Saxony revoked certain concessions. John, Margrave of Brandenburg-Küstrin (also known as Neumark), abrogated the safe-conducts of all Jews in his territories. Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, added new restrictions to his order concerning the Jews.

The Jewish communities intrigued through their lawyers, Josel of Rosheim, who often appeared before the Emperor and princes to plead in favour of the sect. Josel of Rosheim was a familiar of Emperor Charles V's court, and often spared Jews from rude ordeals in the years 1520–1550.

Towards 1570, Pastor Georg Nigrinus published *The Jewish Enemy*, which incorporated Luther's program. Nikolaus Selnecker, one of the authors of the *Konkordienformel* (in Latin: *Formula concordiae*; in French, *la Formule de la Concorde*), republished Luther's books. In 1573, the Jews were expelled from all of Brandenburg.

Luther's treatises against the Jews were reprinted at Dortmund at the beginning of the 17th century, where they were seized by order of Emperor Rudolph II. In 1613 and 1617, they were published at Frankfurt-am-Main, where the Jews had just been expelled. These editions were the last popular publications before those of the 20th century.

Johann Eck (1486–1543), was Luther's great Catholic adversary in Germany. He had a profound understanding of the nature of Judaism, the very essence of which is to destroy everything which is not Jewish.[283] He denounced the religion, visionary plans and behaviour of the Jews as forcefully as Luther. In 1541, he published a pamphlet in which he showed that "these Jewish rascals had done a great deal of harm in Germany and other countries", denouncing the blood-thirstiness of the Jews, who profaned the hosts and used the blood of Christian children for their Passover.

93

**Julius III and the Talmud**

The progress of the Reformation had caused an energetic reaction against the general relaxation of the Catholic world, beginning with discipline and morals. Two men, in particular, had taken the reaffirmation of Catholicism and the consolidation of the Papacy to heart: the Neopolitan Pietro Caraffa, who later became Pope under the name of Paul IV, and the Basque Ignacio Íñez de Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order.

The Catholic reaction against Protestantism reached the Jewish population of Italy, who had, until that time, lived more peaceful lives than anywhere else. In a bull written in 1542, entitled *Cupientes judeos*, Pope Paul III (1534–1549) ordered the surveillance of all Jewish converts, as well as their complete separation from Jews, prohibiting Jews from marrying Christians and bringing before the Inquisition all those who practised Jewish customs.

The adversaries of the Jews also raised the question of the Talmud all over again. Forty years before, Dominican attempts to have it burned had failed. But the situation had changed. As always, the principal accusers were converted Jews. Elia Levita, the famous Jewish grammarian, had left two grandchildren, Eliano and Salomon Romano. Eliano, the eldest, knew Hebrew and was employed as a reviser and scribe in several Italian cities. He converted to Christianity under the name of Vittorio Eliano, entered holy orders and became a canon. When Romano learned of his brother's apostasy, he hastened to Venice to attempt to persuade him to return to Judaism, but allowed himself to become persuaded himself, accepting baptism in 1551, under the name of Jean-Baptiste. Romano became a Jesuit and published ecclesiastical works. These were the descendants of Elia Levita, supported by two other apostates, Ananel di Foligo and Joseph Moro, who renewed Nicholas Donin's old accusations against the Talmud.

Pope Julius III (1550–1555) was not hostile to the Jews, but he was not responsible for pronouncing on the matter. The affair had to be submitted to the Inquisition, that is, before Pietro Caraffa. Caraffa naturally pronounced against the Talmud, and in August 1553, Julius III could only ratify his judgement. By means of the bull *Cum sicut nuper*, Julius III demanded that the Talmud be burnt. The emissaries of

the Inquisition searched all the Jewish houses in Rome, confiscating all the copies that could be found, and the books were given over to the flames on 9 September 1553, the day of the Jewish New Year.

From Rome, the searches extended throughout Romagna, to Ferrara, Mantua, Venice and even the island of Candia (modern-day Crete), which belonged to the city of Venice at the time. Thousands of copies of the Talmud were destroyed. The authorities soon expanded their mission to cover all Hebrew books without distinction, confiscating them all. The Jews put pressure on the Pope, who, on 29 May 1554, promulgated a bull prohibiting the delegates of the Inquisition from seizing Hebrew books other than the Talmud.

At the beginning of the 16th century, thanks to the newly invented printing press, the Talmud had been widely disseminated. The first complete edition of the Talmud, containing all the blasphemies against the Christian religion, was published at Venice in 1519. The Amsterdam edition of 1600 was still intact, and practically all Jewish books published in the 16th century were complete. But towards the end of the 16th century and the early 17th century, when numerous famous men versed in Hebraic studies undertook to study the work seriously, the Jews, fearing for their lives, began to expurgate the chapters. Thus the Talmud published at Basel in 1578 was censored and numerous passages attacking Christ and in which it was declared that the precepts of justice, equity, charity towards one's neighbour, not only did not apply to Christians but were a crime.[284] It was left up to the teachers to explain the missing passages to their students orally.

Some time afterwards, the Jews believed that they had to restore them in an edition published in Cracow. But these reinserted passages only raised the ire of the Hebraising Christians, and, in 1631, in Poland, a Jewish synod ordered their expurgation from future editions. "That is why we command, under pain of major excommunication, that nothing be printed in future editions of the *Mishna* or *Gemara* relating, for good or for ill, to the acts of Jesus of Nazareth".[285]

The synod ordered that "all pages relating to Jesus of Nazareth are hitherto be left blank". A circle placed at that place shall warn the rabbis and school teachers to teach these passages orally only. The famous converted rabbi, David Paul Drach, who published his *Harmonie entre l'Église et la Synagogue* at Paris in 1844, declared that the Talmud contained "strange aberrations, cynical turpitudes, atrocious and insane calumnies against all the objects most revered by the Church".[286]

Nevertheless, certain Jewish books were published later with very few mutilations, particularly in Calvinist Holland, where the Jews

expelled from Spain were well received. The Talmud published in Holland in 1644–1648 is thus almost similar to the Venetian version.

The last subterfuge invented to trick the censors was the introduction of the word *haiah* (“was”) in certain places in the place to indicate where the censored passages could be found. In many passages, the rabbis could not help but reveal that which they sought to conceal, through the use of words like *gam attah* (“still now”), to indicate that the law was still in force; and *aphilu bassseman hazzeh* (“even unto this day”), indicating the same thing, and other subterfuges of a similar nature.[287]

94

**Paul IV, *Cum Nimis Absurdum*, 14 July 1555**

Pietro Caraffa, who had directed the Inquisitorial offensive against the Talmud, became Pope Paul IV (1555–1559) in 1555. He belonged to a family from the Neapolitan nobility. Upon his accession, he imposed a tax of 10 ducats on each synagogue in his states for the maintenance of the establishment of the catechumens, where Jews were initiated into Catholicism.

On 14 July 1555, less than two months after his election, he promulgated his famous bull *Cum nimis absurdum*, named after its first few words: It is “too absurd, and too inappropriate that the Jews, condemned by God to eternal servitude due to their sin, may, on the pretext that they are treated with love by Christians and authorised to live in their midst, be so ungrateful as to insult them instead of thanking them, and audacious enough to set themselves up as masters where they should be subjects. We have been informed that, in Rome as elsewhere, they take their effrontery so far as to live among Christians in the vicinity of churches without wearing a distinctive sign, that they rent the most elegant houses around squares in the cities, villages and localities where they live, acquire and possess immovable property, keep Christian women servants and wet nurses as well as other salaried domestic servants, and commit various other misdeeds to their shame and in contempt of the name of Christian...”

Essentially, these provisions were merely a summary of canonical legislation from past centuries, but contrary to all his predecessors, the inflexible Paul IV applied them to the letter.

At Rome and in the other cities of the pontifical states, the Jews would henceforth have to inhabit separate districts from Christians, with one single entrance and one single exit. There was to be only one synagogue per city. They would be prohibited from possessing immovable property outside the ghetto and would be required to sell those which they possessed outside the ghetto. They were granted a grace period of six months in which to sell their immovable property, and were required to sell it for one-fifth of its real value. The Jews would be required to wear yellow hats and would no longer be allowed the employ Christian servants. They would no longer be permitted to work on Christian feast days. They would only be permitted to use



Italian or Latin in their books of account, which was equivalent to prohibiting the use of Hebrew, which permitted them to falsify their accounts without the possibility of audit by any Christian. They were no longer permitted to sell the pledges which they accepted as collateral against loans at interest before the expiration of 18 months time. They were to be prohibited from dealing in wheat or any product required for human nutrition. Let us note here that this prohibition implicitly reveals that certain Jewish traders traded in grain, profiting from human misery. Officially, they could no longer trade in anything but old rags or money lending, which was their speciality. But the Jews could also continue their clandestine traffic, as receivers of stolen goods or pimps, for example.

These laws were strictly applied, and many Jews emigrated from Rome. Those who remained were subjected to the hardest labour to assist in repairing the ramparts of the city, which were being repaired to defend against the attacks of the Spaniards. A few days later, 24 marranos who came from Portugal were burnt at Ancona. This was the only time this ever happened in Italian history.

Ghettos were officially established in the republic of Venice, at Padua, in Tuscany, Florence and Siena, Genoa and Turin. But let us recall here that the Jews, in actual fact, already lived in ghettos. These ghettos, writes Bernard Lazare, "which the Jews often accepted and even sought out in their desire to separate themselves from the world, to live apart, without mixing with other nations, to maintain the integrity of their faith and their race... In some places, the edicts ordering the Jews to remain confined in special quarters simply acknowledged a state of affairs which already existed".[288]

The famous 20th-century Jewish historian, Simon Dubnov, also acknowledges: "It was not solely by order of the powerful that the Jews live in separate streets. They often wish it themselves. Men of the same nation, surrounded by hostile foreigners, felt the need to live in common, near their schools and their synagogues, near their rabbis and the heads of their community. Often, the Jewish quarter of the city was separated from the Christian quarter by a wall, or by streets which ended at gates which could be locked, to defend themselves against the attacks of the hostile populace. This precautionary measure saved the lives of the Jews from massacre on more than one occasion. In the papal residence, at Rome, the police locked the gates of the ghetto at night; after that, no one could go in or out".

Emperor Ferdinand I, who succeeded Charles V in 1556, proved himself implacably hostile to Jews. Any Austrian Jew who went to Vienna on business was required to appear at the governor's offices

upon his arrival and declare the nature of his business and how long he intended to stay in the city. After taking other restrictive measures against the Jews, Ferdinand I decreed their expulsion from Lower Austria, establishing the feast of Saint-John as the last limit date of their stay. They were nevertheless granted grace periods for two years, but, in the end, they had to resign themselves to taking the path of exile.

At Prague, in 1559, a Jewish renegade, Ascher of Udine, provoked the confiscation, not only of the Talmudic works, but also of the prayer books. The books were sent to Vienna, while a fire reduced a large part of the Jewish quarter of the city to ashes. Instead of fighting the fire, the Christian working classes invaded the district and pillaged and burned the houses.

At Cremona, in 1559, the vast Jewish library was destroyed by a fiery Dominican, Sixtus of Siena. The monk coldly recalled in his writings that he had consigned 12,000 volumes to the flames, and regretted that the weakness and greed of the princes had permitted the Jews to continue to own Talmudic works.[289]

This same year, the Jews were expelled from the pontifical states, with the exception of the ghettos of Rome and Ancona.

Upon the death of Paul IV, the Jews of Rome dragged his statue in the mud of the ghetto, wearing a yellow cap. They succeeded in bribing his successor, Pius IV, and obtained from him the annulment of the greater part of the bull of 1555. Pius IV acquitted them of all the crimes which they might have committed against the constitution of Paul IV, and ordered the return of all their account books, which had been seized.

95

**Ivan the Terrible**

In Russia, Jewish merchants were known as the principal slave dealers and pimps. In the 13th century, they were invited into Kiev by the Tatars, and attracted the hatred of the other inhabitants. The great 20th century Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn quotes a certain Karamzine in this regard:

“These people purchased, from the Tatars, the right to collect tribute, practised exorbitant usury against the poor, and, in the event of non-payment, declared them slaves and sold them into captivity. The inhabitants of Vladimir, Suzdal and Rostov soon lost patience and rose up unanimously, to the sound of church bells, against these wicked usurious merchants; some were killed, the others expelled”.

Jewish merchants and usurers amassed huge fortunes at that time. Solzhenitsyn opened the *Petite Encyclopédie juive*, published in Jerusalem in 1976: “The archives of the 20th century mention that the Jews of Kiev made huge fortunes as tax collectors”. [290]

In the mid-16th century, the Czar Ivan IV, known as “Ivan the Terrible”, solved the problem in his own way. There were no Jews in Muscovy in those days. Jewish merchants from the Polish state were formerly free to visit Moscow as much as they liked, whereas during his reign, they were prohibited from entering Russia. When in 1550, the Polish King Sigmund Augustus demanded that the Jews be once again granted free access to Russia, Czar Ivan refused in the following terms:

“As regards the subject matter of your request – that we permit the Jews entry into our lands – we have already written several times, speaking to you of the wicked deeds of the Jews, who turn people away from Christ, introducing poisoned drugs into our State, and cause great harm to our people. You should be ashamed, our brother, to write to us in their regard, while knowing their misdeeds. They have caused great harm in the other states as well, and for that reason have been expelled or put to death. We cannot permit the Jews to come into our State, since we do not wish to see the evils that result; we want God to permit the people of our country to live in peace, without any worries. And you, our brother, should no longer write to us on behalf of the Jews in the future”. [291]

In 1563, the Russians annexed the city of Polotsk, formerly part of

Poland. Since large numbers of Jews were living there, Ivan IV ordered them drowned in the Dvina: men, women and children.

The Dane Pierre d'Arelsund has left us a testimony on this Czar: "As cruel and intolerant as he was, Ivan the Terrible never persecuted anyone for religious reasons, with the exception of the Jews; he did not seek to introduce them to Christianity or to baptise them; he burnt them alive, hanged them, drowned them; he usually said that no prince should believe their words or take pity on them".[292]

96

Pope Pius V

Pope Pius V (1566–1572) was born into a peasant family. He entered the Dominican order at the age of 14, then taught philosophy and theology within the order. In 1546, he entered the Holy Office. Paul IV appointed him commissioner general of the Inquisition in Rome in 1551, then, in 1556, in Milan and Lombardy. The following year, he vigorously opposed Pius IV and succeeded him in January 1566.

Pius V showed great firmness faced with the hyper-aggressiveness of Judaism. Alarmed by the permanent subversive actions of the Jews, he renewed the old obligation that they wear a visible sign so as to place Christians on guard against their fallacious discourse. On 19 April 1566, three months after his election, he promulgated the bull *Romanus Pontifex*, which restored the effectiveness of all the restrictive laws issued by Paul IV against the Jews of the pontifical states, and extended their application to the Jews of all Catholic countries.

The bull confirmed the obligation of all Jews to wear a distinctive sign.

The Pope did not merely denounce their usury, but accused them of “shameful brigandage”. The Jews were the biggest receivers of stolen goods, dedicated themselves to pimping, which is really one of their favourite activities.[293] “The impiety of the Jews, initiates in all the most perverse acts, has reached such proportions that there is a need, if one is concerned with the community health of Christians, to provide a rapid remedy to the magnitude of the evil. Since, to avoid assuming the numerous forms of usury practised by the Jews to filch the resources of poor Christians, we believe it is too obvious that they are the accomplices and receivers of tricksters and thieves who either conceal them, transport them elsewhere or transform them completely, to prevent recognition of the objects, both religious and profane, which they have stolen. Many, too, on the pretext of doing business in their own professions, hang around near the houses of honest women, many of whom they cause to fall into shameful brigandage; and what is worst of all, they deliver themselves to spells and curses, causing many simple and sick people to fall into their nets, believing that they are prophesying future events, revealing thefts, treasures, secret things and announcing many things which no mortal has the power to explore. Finally, we know perfectly well how contemptibly this perverse race

suffers the name of Christ, how dangerous they are for all those who bear the name of Christian, through what tricks they sow pitfalls against their lives...These people, apart from a few supplies which they bring from the East, are no good to our Republic in any way, for anything".[294]

Abbot Julio Meinvielle, who reproduced this text in his book, nevertheless explains that, in Catholic theology, the "Jewish people" are a "Holy People" towards whom the Church "must have an extreme consideration", since in a certain way, they were the bedrock of the Church. The conversion of the Jews, prophesied for the End Times, therefore prohibits any kind of radical measures in any case, whatever the enormity of their crimes. Thus, the Church, which has vanquished the Jews, has always "warmed up the serpent in its bosom" instead of "crushing its head".

Pius V ordered the incarceration of all the Jews in his States who violated the canonical laws. He spoke with particular harshness of the community of Bologna, "a few of whose members possessed great riches", writes Graetz. They were summoned before the Inquisition tribunal to be asked a certain number of questions: did the Jews apply curses against the Christians and the papacy? Did the tale of the bastard, son of a reprobate woman, allude to Jesus?

These various items of accusation had been drawn up by an apostate Jew, Alessandro Franceschi, who had become a Jesuit missionary. The Curia prohibited the richest Jews from leaving Bologna, but they succeeded in bribing a guard, and a large part of the community succeeded in fleeing with their wealth to Ferrara. Pius V then announced to the college of cardinals his intention of expelling all Jews from his States.

On 19 January 1567, the Pope promulgated the bull *Cum nos super*, which confirmed those of the previous Popes, prohibiting the Israelites from acquiring landed property and requiring them to sell all such property within a certain period of time. If they attempted to evade the law, the property would be confiscated.

On 26 February 1569, Pius V finally promulgated the bull *Hebraeorum gens sola*, which required all Jews in the pontifical states, with the exception of those of Rome and Ancona, to emigrate within a period of three months; past this time, they would be sold as slaves or sentenced to even harsher penalties. A few Jews agreed to be baptised, but most of them resigned themselves to emigration. As they had been given only very short notice, the exiles left ruined. They requested asylum in the small neighbouring states of Pesaro, Urbino, Ferrara, Mantua and Milan.

In his book *Complots contre l'Église* (1962) Maurice Pinay noted that this bull contained a major innovation: Pius V decreed the expulsion of the Jews pure and simple without allowing them recourse to conversion, which they had always resorted to, in the past, to evade precisely this type of measure. "We therefore note that the very Holy Pope knew the Jewish problem a great deal better than the civil and religious leaders of the past".

The Jews of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, who were permitted to stay following the expulsion from France two centuries before, were also asked to leave. All these expellees went to request asylum in Turkey, where they were warmly welcomed, that is, if they weren't waylaid and captured by the Knights of Malta en route.

At the end of the 13th century, the Angevins, reigning in Naples, decided to order a general conversion of the Jews in their domains, who resided near the city of Trani, in southern Italy. These converts (neophytes from Apulia) had continued to live as crypto-Jews for three centuries. The Inquisition became active in Naples in the 16th century. Many of these Jews died at the stake in February 1572. Some succeeded in fleeing into the Balkans, where they integrated into the existing Jewish communities.[295]

Pius V also attempted to unite Christendom against the Turkish danger. In 1566, Emperor Maximilian II attempted to take back Hungary, but failed. Sultan Suleiman, attempting to capture the island of Malta, met the resistance of the Knights of Rhodes, later known as the Knights of Malta, with the Pope's backing. In 1570, Selim II, his successor, conquered the island of Cyprus and decimated the population. It was necessary to block the Ottoman advance at all costs. Pius V then exhorted the princes to unite, arousing great patriotic and religious fervour throughout Christendom.

On 7 October 1571, 200 ships from the Catholic army, mainly Venetian and Spanish, arrived in the gulf of Lepanto, in Greece, killing 30,000 Turks in the ensuing battle. The magnificent victory of Lepanto put an end to Islamic expansion. Pius V died on 1 May 1572. He was beatified 100 years later, then canonised in 1712. He remains one of the most illustrious Popes in the history of the Church.

97

The Synagogue, "Blind and Obstinate", 1593

The Jews were brought to order by Gregory XIII, at least in a few cities of the States of the Church, particularly Ravenna, where they were up to their usual tricks.

In his bull of 1581, Gregory XIII (1572–1585), taught us that the Jews were accustomed to hang a sheep or lamb from a cross on Holy Friday in mockery of the Christ. Gregory XIII also prohibited giving the last sacraments to any dying Christian who called a Jewish physician to his deathbed. Violators were then buried in non-consecrated ground.

This prescription was valid for all, without regard to class, rank or any privilege whatever.

Pope Sixtus-Quintus (1585–1590), bribed by the Jews, permitted a great number of them to return to Rome, and, towards 1599, there were approximately 200 Jewish families in the city. Sixtus Quintus also prohibited the Knights of Malta from continuing to enslave the Jews they captured at sea, while crossing towards the Levant.

The Jews were always banned from the kingdom of Naples. But at Venice, they lived in great numbers at this time, in a sort of splendour. In contradistinction to other Jews, they wore scarlet hats, lined in black.

Pope Clement VIII (1592–1605) followed the example set by Paul IV as regards the Jews, Pius V and Gregory XIII. He also renewed the expulsion orders, only permitting them to stay in Rome, Ancona and Avignon, where, moreover, they were subject to numerous restrictions. The bull *Cum hebraeorum malitia* of 25 February 1593 prohibited them from reading the Talmud, encouraging prostitution, gambling, receiving stolen goods, pederasty and denouncing the usury of the synagogue as "blind and obstinate" (*caeca et obdurata*). *Caeca et obdurata Hebraeorum perfidia... pietati christianae pro gratia injuriam reddens, non cessat quotidie tot committere enormes excesses, tot detestanda patrare flagitia in prejudicium ipsorum Christi fidelium...* ("The entire world suffers from the usury of the Jews, their monopolies, their trickeries. They have reduced numerous unfortunate people to misery... particularly farmers, artisans, and the neediest of the poor...")

When the Holy See later acquired the Duchies of Urbino and Ferrara, the Jews who lived there were tolerated. But by another



encyclical, Clement VIII ordered that the Talmud and the books of the Kabbalah be searched for and destroyed everywhere.[296]

In 1597, Philip II of Spain expelled them from the duchy of Milan. At Genoa, towards the mid-16th century, the Jews obtained permission to remain in the places which had been assigned to them, to run banks, and to lend at interest. Jewish physicians were even permitted to practise medicine. The actions of the Jews aroused complaints, and in 1598, an ordinance banned them from the Republic. They later returned, but they lived under close surveillance, the butt of public insult.[297]

The bishop of Volturara (near Naples), Simone Majoli published a treatise entitled *Dierum canicularium* (*The Canicular Days*) in 1615. In the chapter "De perfidia Judeaeorum", he accused the Jews of being spies, traitors, as well as the principal pimps and traffickers in human flesh:

"These traitors, the most rascally of all men, deliver to the Turk our country, our resources, our forces, and we tolerate them, we nourish them! It is to stoke the fire in our bosom, it is to warm up the serpent... Experience never ceases to show us that, from the first to the last, the Jews pursue Christians with the most implacable hatred... and, that, if the occasion promises impunity, they group together and attack them in closed ranks, like troops of harpies who can never be satisfied by the blood they suck... Ah! you should fear everything from their kindness to their most obsequious submission; since you have all the more reason to fear that perfidy will slip in under cover of their zeal. See the thousand forms with which they dress up their usury; led by them, it is ready to employ unimaginable artifices to devour you; and what is more, if they meet thieves, criminals, women dedicated to prostitution, the house of the Jew opens of itself and recognises its residents (*promptum praebeant hospitium*). That these people of rapine come to offer the products of a theft to the Jew, and the latter purchases it at a risible price; he encourages these unfortunates, and stimulates them and assists them in all their crimes".[298]

The Popes had tolerated the Jews in the pontifical states and in the Comtat, but in applying to them the regulations of the Church and in renewing their force when the administrators and lords became lax or allowed themselves to be bribed. The Jews are therefore said to have had to establish themselves in territories where they didn't need to fear persecution or pillage. Moreover, when a bloody reaction took place here and there, many of them came to take refuge; but they didn't stay there. The reason for this is quite simple; while they were protected in the pontifical states, they were also under strict surveillance and kept

apart. In other countries, on the contrary, they enjoyed a certain freedom to manoeuvre and could exploit the Christians at their leisure, despite the angry reactions they aroused.[299] This is why, once the storm had passed, they were always ready to pay the price to be accepted among the goyim whom they despised.

98

Vincent Fettmilch's War

At Frankfurt, the artisans' guilds were demanding the expulsion of the Jews loud and clear. The pastry-maker Vincent Fettmilch, at their head, openly proclaimed himself the new Haman, after the Persian king Assuerus' minister, at the beginning of the 5th century before Christ, who was hanged, according to legend, because a Jewess named Esther had seduced the king and intrigued against the "anti-Semitic" minister. The affair terminated in the massacre of 75,000 Persians by the Jews, as described in the *Book of Esther*. [300]

Once again, public exasperation reached a paroxysm. On 1 September 1614, the Jews, who were meeting in their houses of prayer, heard a clamour and a ruckus that shook the gates of the whole district. There were deaths and injuries on both sides, but Vincent Fettmilch's gangs triumphed, and they sacked the Jewish quarter for an entire night, destroying the synagogues and pillaging the houses. Those of the Jews who were unable to conceal themselves fled into the cemetery, expecting to be massacred at any moment. The rioters left them in uncertainty for an entire day. In the afternoon, the Jews finally received the order to leave Frankfurt by the Sinners' Gate, stripped of all their property. Almost 1,400 Jews were thus expelled from the city.

Analogous disturbances occurred at Worms, at the instigation of a lawyer named Chemnitz. In April 1615, despite the magistrate's protests, the guilds of the city, directed by Chemnitz, ordered the Jews to leave Worms on the next to the last day of Easter. The archbishop of Mayence and the Landgrave Louis of Darmstadt authorised them to establish themselves temporarily in the small cities and villages of their domains. At the news of the events of Worms, Friedrich, Prince-Elector, friend of the Jewish physician Zaccuto Lusitano, sent infantry, cavalry and cannon to repress the disorders. Chemnitz, with several of his accomplices, was thrown into prison, and the Jews of Worms were permitted to take back possession of their homes again in January 1616, on the order of Emperor Matthias.

Two months later, the Jews of Frankfurt were also allowed to move back into their houses. They came almost triumphantly, preceded by imperial commissioners, and to the sound of music. Since there had been scenes of pillage and murder at Frankfurt, the authors of these

disorders were punished more severely than the agitators at Worms. Vincent Fettmilch was hanged, his house razed and his family banished. To indemnify the Jews for their losses, the city had to pay them 175,919 florins.

As a result of these events, the Jewish community of Frankfurt decided to celebrate the 20 Adar, the day of the punishment inflicted upon the "German Haman", each year. This holiday was called the "Vincent Purim" (from Fettmilch's first name). Two centuries later, the Germans of the region still remembered the arrogance of the incestuous sect.

We know that some marranos from Spain and Portugal sought exile in northern Europe, particularly at Amsterdam, London and Hamburg. The Portuguese Jewish community of Hamburg had long since grown in wealth and influence. The Teixeira family in particular was noted for its regal luxury. The founder of this banking house, Diego Teixeira de Mattos, was known in Hamburg as "the rich Jew", like Joseph de Naxos at Constantinople. A native of Portugal, he had fled as a marrano, and had returned to Judaism once he arrived in Flanders. At the age of seventy, he had the courage to submit to the operation of circumcision. "Thanks to his immense fortune and his relations with the nobility and haut commerce", writes Graetz, "he enjoyed very great consideration at Hamburg."

In addition to the Portuguese community, there was also a small German Jewish community at Hamburg. The Lutheran pastors resumed their attacks on the Jews with renewed force. Among them was a certain Johannes Müller, who was one of their keenest enemies. Doyen of the Church of St Peter, he never ceased to demand the closure of the synagogues, from 1631 to 1644. He was supported in his campaign by the three Faculties of Wittemberg, Strasbourg and Rostock. Johannes Müller denounced the riches and arrogance of the Jews: "They walk abroad bedecked in gold and silver, pearls and precious stones. At wedding feasts, they eat from silver vessels. They go abroad in magnificent carriages, preceded by horsemen and accompanied by numerous domestic servants". The Germans could only keep silent, tolerating their innumerable swindles and enduring their constant mockery and insults.

99

France, 1615–1617

The 150 years which followed the expulsion of the Jews from the kingdom of France, in 1394 were a liberation. Throughout the entire Renaissance, Jews were singularly absent from France. If by chance a few wandering Jews washed up on the territory, they were always required to pay the old tolls established for them in ancient times, “the cloven foot tax”, a few examples of which should be provided.

Lucien Rebatet, in the weekly, *Je Suis Partout*, of 17 February 1939, dedicated to the Jewish question, exhumed this document. It concerns payment of the toll road invoice from Châteauneuf-sur-Loire, “by virtue of a decree of the Court of 15 March 1558”. After the list of animals for which duty was due, we read:

“On each head of cattle, pig and every Jew: one sol. A Jew owes: twelve pennies. A pregnant Jewess: five sols. A dead Jew: 30 pennies.” And Rebatet added: “I confess that the sense of this last price escapes me. Is it a slip of the pen carelessly repeated by all the historians? Or a macabre joke, which we naturally deplore...”

On the Seine, on the Saône, at Lyon, at Trevoux, border regions, the Jews were taxed at the same rate as pigs. At the tolls of Montlhéry, Jewish travellers paid more if they carried their seven-branched candelabra with them or their Hebrew books. These tolls remained in force until 1784.

Certain marranos came seeking refuge in France. First, they could only live there if they disguised themselves as Christians. In 1550, King Henry II authorised them to remain at Bordeaux and if they dedicated themselves to trade. There was also a small marrano community at Bayonne and other localities. “On the outside,” writes Graetz, “they acted like Christians, having their children baptised, marrying with the assistance of Christian priests and bearing Christian names. But in secret, they practised Judaism”. In 1636, Bordeaux had 260 marranos, and several of them succeeded in reaching top positions as physicians, masters of jurisprudence or writers.

King Louis XIII was informed of the presence of a few Jews on the territory and wished to put an end to the situation. By means of the declaration of 23 April 1615, “all Jews are hereby ordered to leave the kingdom, country, lands and seigneuries owing obedience to the King,

within a month, on pain of death, plus confiscation of all their property". His Majesty banished all Jews from his kingdom, and prohibited them from living there. The Jews had one month in which to leave the country. The following is a short extract from the text of the ban:

"Louis, by the grace of God, King of France and Navarre: To those to whom the present letters are addressed, greetings.

"The Kings, our predecessors, having always conserved this beautiful title of very Christian which we possess today, have as a consequence a horror of all nations which are enemies of this name, & above all the Jews, whom they have never wished to suffer in their Kingdoms, Countries, Lands, and Seigneuries of their obedience; even since the times of the Royal King Saint Louis of praiseworthy memory, who expelled from the State all those Jews whom they had previously tolerated; in this, we are resolved to imitate them insofar as possible as in all the other excellent qualities which have rendered them admirable among all foreign nations. So as to omit nothing which might serve the reputation of this State, & the conservation of the benedictions which it has pleased God to spread over the same, & particularly as we have been advised that against the Edicts and Ordinances of our predecessors, the said Jews have disguised themselves in several places in our Kingdom for several years now; being unable to tolerate the impieties of this nation without committing a very great fault towards God's divine goodness, offended by several blasphemies which are ordinary for them; we have been advised to take measures, & remedy the problem as rapidly as possible. To these causes, we have said, declared, wished and ordained, we hereby say, declare, wish and order & it pleases us to command that all Jews present in our Kingdom, Country, Lands and Seigneuries owing us obedience, shall be required, on pain of death and confiscation of their property, to withdraw therefrom immediately & without delay, & this within the period and term of a month after the publication of the present edicts".[301]

At this point it is necessary to recall how the young King Louis XIII took power. Since their expulsion on 17 September 1394, there were no more Jews in France, until the conquest of Alsace by Louis XIV in 1678. Neither the Sun King, nor any other European sovereign, granted them the right of citizenship, which they only obtained due to the general chaos engendered by the French revolution.

After the assassination of King Henry IV, however, a few Jews succeeded in infiltrating the country under the regency provided by the Queen, Maria de Medici. They fell under the spell of the Italian Concino Concini and his wife, the hysterical depressive Leonora

Galigai, a capricious and avaricious woman, suffering from epilepsy, who practised exorcism and bewitchment.

For seven years, from 1610 to 1617, this combination of foreign origin, surrounded by Jews, accumulated a colossal fortune and reigned over France by terror: Leonora Galigai's fortune was estimated at 15 million livres, or the equivalent of three-quarters of the annual budget of France, not counting approximately a million livres in jewellery and silverware. "The country had never seen such enormous power, exercised for so long, with such a total lack of scruples", writes the historian Michael Carmona in his biography of Maria de Medici.

The French reaction was a forceful one. The Parliament of Paris solemnly recorded the edict of expulsion of the Jews by letters patent of 12 May 1615. From that time onward, the country existed in an atmosphere of civil war.

To intimidate the Parisians, Concini constructed 24 sets of gallows at various locations in the capital; the French guards were replaced by Swiss Germans, not greatly inclined to fraternize with the population, as well as Italians, all devoted to their compatriot.

The Baron of Vitry, captain of the corps of guards, finally took charge of settling this matter, with the approval of Louis XIII, who was only 15 years old. On 24 April 1617, in the courtyard of the Louvre, Vitry and his guards approached Concini, isolated from his escort:

"By the King's authority, I hereby place you under arrest", he said in a strong voice. The French drew their pistols and Concini received three well-aimed bullets: one right between the eyes, one in the throat, and a third in one eye. For greater certainty, the body was riddled with stab wounds, after which he was completely undressed – jewellery, papers, clothing, were all taken.

In the hall of the guards, Louis XIII's words could hardly be heard: "Thank you! Thank you very much. Now I am King". After breakfast, Louis mounted a horse and rode around Paris, where he was acclaimed by a grateful crowd.

The next day, Concini's body, which had been hastily buried in the church of Saint-Germain d'Auxerrois, was exhumed by the Parisians, beaten and kicked and dragged through the streets of the capital. The mutilated body was then hung by the feet from one of the gibbets which Concini himself had had built, then beaten and kicked some more by the outraged crowd. The body was cut into pieces, a few of which were roasted over a fire. His remains were entirely burnt and thrown away in little bits.

While the King reviewed an uninterrupted parade of courtiers coming to greet him, Leonora Galigai was arrested in turn. "She hid her

gold, precious stones and silverware in her mattress, lay down on top of it like a beast protecting her young”, writes Philippe Erlanger in his biography of Louis XIII. She sank so low as to tell him her husband “deserved it”, but this last piece of villainy didn’t save her. Galigai was accused of sorcery, and the presence of Jewish physicians at her sides, such as Philothée Montalto, did not help her. The Kabbalah, magic and witchcraft were all one in the minds of the people of that time. On 8 July 1617, she was sentenced to be decapitated on a scaffold set up in the Place de Grève. The decision was effective immediately. Her body and head were burnt and reduced to ashes.



## 100

### Uriel and Vicente da Costa

With the expansion of the Inquisition within the Iberian peninsula, a few marranos preferred to emigrate to America, Brazil, Mexico or Peru, where they enriched themselves off sugar plantations, slave trading, and even the famous mines of Potosí.[302] Others went to live in northern Europe, particularly at Hamburg, London and Amsterdam. We know that the Calvinists of Flanders and Holland, in their war against Spain, were supported financially by the Jews, always prepared to weaken the Catholic Church. "In 1566, among the leaders of the Flemish resistance, were the influential marranos Marcus Pérez, Martin López and Fernando Bernuy".[303]

Having become a republic, Holland was to become a refuge for all Jews and Protestant sects. The Protestant religion, particularly Calvinism, accommodated itself well with the mercantile spirit, even exalting money-getting, and for a time Holland became the most important commercial nation in Europe, before being surpassed by England. Materialistic Jewish values seemed to triumph with Calvinism and Anglo-Saxon Puritanism.

In 1593, a Jewish community was first founded at Amsterdam. It grew rapidly under the tolerant legislation which restricted itself to prohibiting mixed marriages and access to public employment. Soon the Jews spread all over Dutch territory. They invested chiefly in banking and overseas trade. In constant contact with the marranos of Spanish America and the Caribbean, they amassed immense fortunes in the slave trade and the triangle trade with Africa. Amsterdam was known as the "New Jerusalem" at the time.

At Amsterdam, the famous philosopher, Spinoza (1632–1677), descended from a family of Portuguese marranos, was in conflict with his own Jewish community and was finally excommunicated in 1656.[304]

But before him, Uriel da Costa (1594–1647), also of Portuguese origin, with a Jewish mother, had already defied the rabbinical authorities of Amsterdam. When he arrived in Holland to practise Judaism freely, he was bitterly disappointed. The Pentateuch, with its complicated code of 613 commandments, was only the visible part of a parasitic vegetation the ramifications of which were insinuating

themselves into the most intimate recesses of existence. Uriel da Costa attacked the extremely fastidious practices of Judaism and openly ridiculed the rabbis, whom he called "Pharisees". To him, religions were human inventions. Threatened with excommunication, he persisted. The rabbinical college excluded him from the community and his closest relatives distanced themselves from him. Isolated from his fellow Jews, his friends and his family, being unable to enter into relations with his Christian fellow citizens whose language he couldn't even understand yet, da Costa published a work entitled *Examen des traditions pharisiennes* in 1623, in which he proclaimed his definitive break with Judaism.[305]

Representatives of the Jewish community of Amsterdam burnt the book, following their usual custom, and accused da Costa of rejecting not only Jewish doctrines, but the teachings of Christianity as well.[306] He was imprisoned for a few days and sentenced to pay a fine.

It took him 15 years to reconcile himself with the Synagogue. But this reconciliation was of short duration. He once again declared war on Judaism and was again summoned to appear before the rabbinical college. His judges decided that he would only escape a second excommunication if he submitted to a solemn penitence. Through vanity, he initially refused to yield. Then he shortly afterwards decided to accept the sentence of the rabbis. He was taken into a synagogue filled with men and women, where he had to declare his repentance in public. Standing on a podium, he read a detailed confession of all his sins, accusing himself of having transgressed the prohibition against working on the Sabbath and the alimentary laws, denying several articles of faith. After solemnly promising not to fall back into his errors, he swore to live as a good Jew thereafter. He withdrew into a corner of the synagogue, removed all his clothing above the belt and submitted to 39 lashes with a whip. He then sat on the ground, and the sentence of excommunication was raised. Finally, he had to lie full length on the threshold of the temple, and all those present stepped over him.

The anger he felt at this humiliating treatment inspired him with the idea of killing himself, but, at the same time, he wished to revenge himself upon the persons he considered the principal instigator of these persecutions, his brother and cousin. "To alert his contemporaries and posterity to his fate", writes Graetz, "he wrote an account of his sufferings, adding vivid accounts and even whole files of odious accusations against the Jews. After finishing his last will and testament, he prepared two pistols, discharged one at one relative, missing him,

but killed the other with the other one (in April 1640). When they entered his house, they discovered the autobiography which he had written under the title *Exemplar humanae vitae* (Specimen of a Human Life), which was a violent diatribe against the Jews and their religion.”

In 1623, the year in which Uriel da Costa published his first book, another da Costa appeared, Vicente da Costa, published a 428-page book in Lisbon against his former fellow Jews: *Discurso contra los Judíos* (the original title is *Breve discurso contra a herética perfidia do judaismo*). In it, the Jews are depicted as “naturally avaricious, rebellious, mendacious... It would be impossible to list their vices: envy, pride, their noble pretensions, their ostentatious luxury, which could be seen daily in Portugal and even worse in Madrid, their insolence or outrages... they are the mortal enemy of humankind.” Vicente da Costa also denounced their morals: “Sodomy as well” (which is the topic of a separate chapter), “originating from their natural lasciviousness or the idleness in which they take pleasure... Moreover, the Jews of North Africa daily sodomise their wives and children!”[307]

Daniel Tollet, who published the book in which we compile these testimonies, pretends not to take these accusations seriously – which initially seem grotesque – but as we have seen, in *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, *Le Fanatisme juif* and *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, these practices are actually encouraged by the Talmud and are obviously rather common, judging from the literary production as well as by the numerous problems of a psychopathological nature within the incestuous sect.

## 101

### Back to Free Spain

Thanks to the Inquisition, Spain, which had expelled the Jews in 1492, was able to preserve itself from the influence of the marranos, good Catholics in appearance, but who were attempting to destroy the Church and the country from the inside.

The problem was not completely solved. In 1575, a Córdoban of noble family, Diego de Simancas (whose pseudonym was Didacus Velázquez), a famous jurist, published the *Defensio statuti toletani* (*Defence of the Blood Purity Statute of the Church of Toledo*), in which he insisted on “Jewish perfidy” and accused the conversos of being false Christians. He recognised that there existed sincere conversos, but he believed that they should be made to pass through a social purgatory. Towards the middle of the 16th century, the purity of blood statutes acquired the force of law. The decision episode was the purging of the Toledo chapter, within which the New Christians had retrenched themselves.

The man who declared war on them was Juan Martínez Siliceo (1485–1557), the Archbishop of Toledo, who also came from a modest family of *cristianos viejos* (old Christians) from Estremadura. Trained in Paris, he was preceptor to the young king Philip II, then appointed archbishop of Toledo in 1544, before being appointed cardinal by Pope Paul IV in 1555. He strongly defended the concept of “purity of blood”. Juan Martínez Siliceo was also the first to have thought that Christ was of pure Jewish blood.[308] Upon his admission into an order of the college, an inquiry was conducted at the candidate’s expense to establish his non-membership in the “Jewish race”.

It should be noted here that *limpieza de sangre* remained proper to each institution and was never generalised by the Spanish state. A memorandum drawn up in 1600 stated that there were two types of nobility: a greater type, which was *la hidalguía*, and a lesser type, measured by *la limpieza*. A commoner was esteemed higher than a *hidalgo no limpio* (nobleman of unclean blood). It was thus that all the Spanish peasants legitimately considered themselves of noble blood, not without a certain pride.

The Spanish *statuto de limpieza de sangre* (law on the purity of blood) made headway all over Europe. In France, Joachim du Bellay

(1522–1560) keenly advised the King to retain the aristocratic purity of blood:

“And not permit the most generous blood to become the bastardy of a less hardy blood,

“Since if we are so careful to preserve the breed of good horses and good hunting dogs,

“How much more must a King carefully take measures to protect the race of his people, which is his principal source of power?”

But this idea of racial purity, in France, Germany and England, would never attain the force it had in Spain, infiltrated, as it was, by *marranos*.

The order of Jesuits had always taken measures to prevent the infiltration of crypto-Jews into the Company from the inside. It was only in fact during the lifetime of its founder, Ignacio de Loyola, that no further account was taken of blood purity. Thereafter the Company of Jesus considered that converted Jews were always a little bit impure (known as *maculados*) whose blood bore a stain (*macula*). It was not therefore advisable for them to be permitted to take public offices and charges from the Christians, particularly in the priesthood.

The fact is that numerous *marranos* did not hesitate to declare themselves “More Christian than the Christians themselves”, “More Spanish than the Spanish themselves”, while secretly desiring the destruction of the Church and of Spain, and preparing for a Turkish invasion. Spanish distrust of them was therefore justified, even if there were numerous Jews who had sincerely broken with Judaism as we have seen. Let us repeat here once again that the sincerity of a converted Jew can only be judged by the degree of his hostility to Judaism.

Three principal dates punctuate the history of the Company of Jesus in this regard. In 1593, for the first time, on the day after the death of Ignacio de Loyola, the Convention of the Order prohibited the membership of “any Christian of Jewish ancestry”; in 1608, then, a decree stipulated that novices had to prove that they had not had a drop of Jewish blood for five generations; in 1923, finally, an amendment to the above mentioned decree stated that it sufficed for novices to be free from Jewish blood for four generations.

It was thus that R.P. Koch, in his book *Jesuiten-Lexikon*, was able to write with satisfaction in 1934 (or one year after the triumph of the National Socialist party in Germany), “As a result of this rule, the Company of Jesus was the best protected of all the orders against any Jewish influence”.

## 102

### **Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 1648**

In 1648, a general uprising against the Jews occurred in Eastern Europe, during the wars against the Kingdom of Poland waged by the Cossacks under Bohdan "Khmelnytsky". Kabbalists of the time were predicting that the Messiah would arrive that year; once again, they were mistaken.

At the time, Catholic Poland dominated the entire region, which extended from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, and part of the Ukraine was under Polish domination. The Cossacks, of Orthodox Christian religion, formed a sort of rampart against the Turks and Tartars in these regions. Numerous Jews then filled the functions of tax administrators and collectors for the account of the Polish nobility. They often also worked as managers of lordly estates, while the Ukrainians remained subjugated peasants, living in poverty. In effect, the Jews in the Ukraine acted as active accomplices of the Polish nobility, oppressing the Cossacks and Ukrainian peasants. The first uprising of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, under their leader, the hetman Pavlyuk, took place in 1638. 200 Jews were killed and several synagogues were destroyed.

After the death of the Polish king, Ladislas, during the interregnum (May-October 1648), Poland sank into anarchy, and there was a general uprising, in support of the hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky. A valiant warrior and capable strategist, Khmelnytsky defeated the Polish army for the first time. After this victory, the Cossacks invaded the cities located east of the Dnieper, between Kiev and Poltava, pillaging and massacring the Jews. To escape death, four Jewish communities, amounting to some 3,000 people, surrendered to the Tatars with all their property. These prisoners were transported to the Crimea and purchased by their Turkish fellow Jews. To raise the sums necessary to the purchase of these prisoners, the Jewish community of Constantinople sent a delegate to Holland, to collect subsidies.

Khmelnytsky's lieutenants and soldiers devastated the Polish provinces, massacring Poles and Jews. Morozenko was one of the chiefs of the revolt. Another chief, Ganja, marched against the fortress of Nemirov, where there were 6,000 Jews. These were attacked by the Cossacks, as well as by the Greek Catholics of the city, who hated them just as much, and almost all of them were massacred.

At Toulezyn, there were 6,000 Christians and approximately 2,000 Jews, who decided to sell their lives dearly.

The Catholic Poles hated the Jews at least as much as the Cossacks did, since the latter initiated negotiations, informing the Polish nobles that their only quarrel was with the Jews, and that they were prepared to withdraw if they were freed from their ancient oppressors. The gates of the city were opened, as agreed, and the Jews were abandoned to fight their enemies alone.

Other insurgents, led by Hodki, penetrated Little Russia and killed numerous Jews at Gomel, Starodub, Chernihiv and other cities located east and north of Kiev. More than 300 Jewish communities were destroyed during these ten years of war (1648–1658), and more than a quarter of a million Jews were killed.[309] The Jewish historian Poliakov estimates the number of victims at 100,000. But one thing seems certain: after that, there were no Jews on the right bank of the Dnieper.

Later, the dispute between the Cossacks and peasants, on the one hand, and the Jews, on the other hand, worsened again. The Jews continued to ruin the peasantry with their usury, and were also the principal vendors of alcohol in the countryside. A naive peasant who agreed to a small loan to relax a little in the village tavern soon found himself broke and compelled to sell his lands, farm and livestock.

The settlement of accounts took place during a new revolt which broke out against the Jews in the Ukraine in 1734. In 1768, the massacre of Uman occurred. The Haidamakas (Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants), under hetman Ivan Gonta, massacred thousands of Jews in the city of Uman. Chief Vasily Voshchilo proclaimed as follows: "Ataman Voshchilo, grandson of Khmelnytsky, great hetman of the troops, responsible for the extermination of Jewry and the defence of Christianity". He accused the Jews of murder, blasphemy, the rape of Christians, etc.: "Impelled by my fervour for the holy Christian faith, I have decided, in the company of other right-thinking men, to exterminate the accursed Jewish people, and with God's help, I have already done them a great deal of harm in the regions of Krichev and Propoyisk. Although the Jews have raised governmental troops against me, God's justice will protect me in any case".

Jewish pimps and slavers were much talked about on both sides of the Black Sea. In the 17th century, Jews from the Ottoman Empire were specialists in the sale of slaves trained in all forms of depravity, and the trade in girls was controlled entirely by Jews, as were the brothels. "There were Jews at Constantinople who had no other function than to verify the virginity of girls sold as pleasure-bait".[310]

## 103

### William Prynne

The Jews, expelled from England in 1290 by King Edward, attempted to regain a foothold in the country during the confusion engendered by the 1648 revolution, over the course of which King Charles I was decapitated. Manassès ben Israel, writer, scholar, diplomat, printer at Amsterdam, also came from a family of Portuguese conversos, who returned to the open practice of Judaism in the Netherlands. In the fall of 1655, he went to London, accompanied by several other Jews, to convince Cromwell to permit the Jews to return. Cromwell welcomed them with extreme cordiality. At that time, London was inhabited by Jews, "but they lived under a Christian mask, as at Bordeaux", writes Graetz.

Manassès's plea made a favourable impression, since in 1656, Cromwell decided to permit the Jews to return to England. His decision was taken under cover of an incident which occurred at the time: a rich Portuguese merchant, Robles, was summoned before an English court on the charge of being a Papist. Since England was at war with Portugal at the time, his fortune was confiscated. But at Cromwell's order, the confiscation was reversed by the Council of State, because the defendant was in reality a Jew, and not a Catholic. This amounted to an implicit recognition of a Jewish right to settle in England.

The marranos established at London then hastened to throw off the mask of Christianity. In February 1657, they were even able to acquire a special cemetery for members of their community. They were also authorised to observe their holidays publicly, and to celebrate their religion in private homes. Cromwell could not reveal himself as more liberal at the time, because the clergy and people were agreed in opposing the admission of the Jews. They continued to be considered strangers, and were, therefore, more highly taxed.

Their principal adversary of the Jews at the time was William Prynne, a very popular publicist in the mid-17th century. Prynne, who wrote nearly 200 books and pamphlets, spoke out against the readmission of the Jews to the country. In a pamphlet published in 1656, *A Short Demurrer to the Jewes...*, he renewed the accusation of ritual murder and compiled all the decrees promulgated against them in the Middle Ages. They were a "race of criminals, a generation of



vipers, who avidly did evil with both hands, according to all the surrounding nations, as bad, or worse, than Sodom or Gomorrah".[311]

In the mid-18th century, England was home to about 22,000 Jews, including 20,000 Ashkenazis. In 1753, the Chamber of Municipalities voted the "Jewish Bull", which granted naturalisation facilities to Jews with more than 3 years' residence and whose children were born on English soil. But the law was rejected the following year, due to the fact that King George III had promulgated an edict stipulating that army officers, government officials and members of Parliament should thereafter be required to swear an oath including the words "On my Christian faith".

## 104

### **The Expulsion from Austria, 1670**

In Spain and Portugal, the problems caused by the marranos had not still not been completely solved by the mid-century. At Lisbon, the marrano Manuel Fernando da Villa-Real, who had directed the Portuguese consulate at Paris for a time, was incarcerated upon his return to Portugal, subjected to torture and executed on 1 December 1652. At Cuenca, on 29 June 1654, 57 Judaising Christians were dragged to an auto-da-fe in a single day, and 10 of them were burned. One of the victims was Balthazar López, of Valladolid, "a very rich, much-respected man", writes Graetz.

Spain was governed by Maria Anne of Austria at the time, widow of Philip IV (deceased in 1655), who had elevated his confessor, the German Jesuit Neidhard, to the dignity of Inquisitor General and Prime Minister. In 1669, on complaints from victims, the queen decided to expel the Jews who still lived in north Africa, at Oran and a few other localities. The governor granted them a delay of 8 days, until Easter (end of April 1669). The exiles were obliged to sell their immovable property at risible prices, and went to live in Savoy, at Nice or Villefranche.

Her daughter, Margaret Theresa, Empress of Germany, did not long hesitate to imitate her mother's example, and decreed the expulsion of the Jews from Vienna and from the Arch-Duchy of Austria, who were once again established in the place. At this time, Vienna had become the residence of the Germanic emperors. During the Middle Ages, the Jews had been expelled, but over the course of the 16th century, a new community had gradually formed. The emperors authorised the Jews to come and live there, "since among them", writes the Jewish historian Simon Dubnov, "there were many very rich men", who had helped the government with money and credit. But their mentality of treason to the benefit of foreign powers, particularly the Ottoman Empire, was correctly feared.

After a rather long resistance of Emperor Leopold I, the Jesuits finally succeeded in convincing him to expel the Jews, and they were finally ordered to leave Vienna and the surrounding regions on 14 February 1670. The Jews requested the intervention of one of their fellow Jews, Manuel Teixeira, one of the richest and most influential

men of his time, the representative of Swedish Queen Christina at Vienna. Teixeira asked a few Spanish grandees with whom he was in close contact to intervene with the Empress's confessor. He also addressed himself to the powerful and skilful cardinal Azzolino, at Rome, a friend to Queen Christina. The latter, after her conversion, enjoyed a great influence in the Catholic world, and had promised to support Teixeira. But his intervention was to no avail, and the Emperor of Vienna purchased the Jewish quarter of Vienna for 100,000 florins and called it Leopoldstadt, in honour of the Emperor. On the former location of the synagogue, a church was built, the first stone of which was laid by Leopold in person, on 18 August 1670.

The exiles spread out across Moravia, Bavaria – where they had been provisionally permitted to settle – to Prague and Berlin; Hungary remained closed to them. But after a few years, the Jews succeeded in gaining re-admittance to Vienna by offering the Emperor a large quantity of gold.

That same year a new ritual murder scandal broke out, involving a livestock dealer from Boulay, in Lorraine, named Raphael Levy. On 25 September 1669, Raphael Levy visited Metz to buy things there in order to celebrate the Jewish New Year. That same day, at Glatigny, a village located on the road from Boulay to Metz, a mother reported the disappearance of her son, little Didier Le Moyne, aged 3. Shortly afterwards, the child was found horribly mutilated in a forest. A knight stated that he had seen the Jewish merchant carrying a child under his coat. In 1670, Raphael Levy was condemned to death by the Parliament of Metz. On 17 September 1670, he was burned alive at Glatigny for his horrible crime.

105  
Madrid, 30 June 1680

Spain, which had suffered so much at the hands of the Jews in the Middle Ages, was determined to eradicate the marrano poison from its territory. In 1673, a Franciscan monk, Francisco de Torrejoncillo, who was the prior of several convents of the order of Saint Francis, published the book *Centinela contra judios* (*Sentinel against the Jews*). The work was divided into 14 chapters and showed that the Jews were presumptuous and mendacious, that they had always been traitors, that those who favoured them came to a bad end, that we should believe neither them nor their works, that they were trouble-makers, vain and seditious, that the Church only kept them to permit them to engender the Anti-Christ, their Messiah, who would eventually be vanquished.

Torrejoncillo observed that it was not necessary to have two Jewish parents to feel entirely Jewish. The author speaks here of the deleterious influence of Jewish “blood”, when in reality it is a question of the Jewish “mind”, which is transmitted from generation to generation, and can even infect true Gentiles, by hysterical contagion.[312]

“To teach hatred of the Christians, of Christ and of his Divine Law, it is not necessary to have a Jewish father and Jewish mother”, he writes. “If the father is not a Jew, it is enough for the mother to be Jewish. And the mother need not even be fully Jewish, half is enough; or even a quarter, or an eighth. Our Holy Inquisition has discovered people who, separated from their Jewish ancestors for 21 generations, continued to Judaize”.[313] And he continues: “In the palace, the wet nurses chosen to suckle the children of the king and princes must be old Christians (*cristianas viejas*), since it is not advisable for them to suck vile Jewish milk. Coming from infected persons (*personas infectas*), the milk can only engender perverse inclinations.”

Spain had as its head at that time the young king Carlos II. On his order, the Grand Inquisitor Diego de Sarmiento invited all the tribunals in Spain to sent already condemned heretics to Madrid. One month before that time, heralds solemnly informed the inhabitant of the capital of the forthcoming execution of traitors. For several weeks, they worked to erect platforms for the court, nobility, clergy and the people.

On the scheduled date, 30 June 1680, 118 persons of all ages, including 70 marranos, barefooted, wearing a sanbenito, with a candle

in their hand, were led to execution early in the morning, surrounded by priests and knights stationed in the midst of the crowd of working men. The king, queen, ladies of the court, high dignitaries and the entire nobility watched the spectacle from the early hours of the morning until evening. After all they had suffered at the hands of the Jews, the Christians savoured their vengeance.

## 106

**Johann Andreas Eisenmenger**

The Jewish question excited people's minds in Germany. A Protestant from Friesland (Holland), Jacob Geusius, an ecclesiastic and physician, published two pamphlets, *Anan and Caiphas Escaped from Hell*, and *Human Sacrifices*, in which each one compiled all the categories of crime to which the Jews were dedicated, as shown by Apion and Tacitus, to the testimony of Bernardine of Feltre, who had recounted the story of the martyrdom of little Simon of Trent.

Fifteen years later, in 1697, the preacher Paolo Medici, an apostate who was a native of Livorno, published a pamphlet in which he also denounced the practice of ritual murder among the Jews. For fifteen years, he travelled all over Italy, placing the inhabitants on guard against the incestuous sect.[314]

Johann Christoff Wagenseil, born at Nuremberg, professor of history and Oriental languages at the university of Altdorf, undertook to research the entire body of Jewish literature for attacks on Christianity. He visited Spain and Africa to gather the greatest possible number of these anti-Christian writings. In 1681, he published his research in a book entitled *Satan's Fiery Darts* (*Tela Ignea Satanae, sive Arcani et Horribiles Judaeorum Adversus Christum, Deum, et Christianum Religionem Libri*). Wagenseil simply desired that the Jews be brought to Christianity by persuasion. In 1703, he published a book at Altdorf entitled *Denunciatio Christiana de Blasphemiis Judaeorum in Jesum Christum*, which he sent to high personages of the Empire, imploring them to diminish the power and pride of the Jews. He also published a few other works on Judaism, including a Latin translation of the Talmudic treatise *Sotah* (Altdorf, 1674), and the *Disputatio Circularis de Judaeis* (Altdorf, 1705).

In the very early 18th century, a German bibliophile, J.C. Wolf, in his *Bibliothecae Hebraeae*, listed over a thousand works of *Scriptores Anti-Judaici*. This list was no doubt incomplete, but we see that the Jewish question was of serious concern to German minds. The pamphlets, the prototype of which was supplied by Luther, had very explicit titles: *The Enemy of the Jews*, *The Scourge of the Jews*, *Jewish Practices*, *Small Repertory of Horrible Jewish Blasphemies*, *Sackful of Jewish Serpents*, etc.

Johann Andreas Eisenmenger had more influence. A German Protestant, he stood out at an early age for his zeal in the study of Hebrew and Semitic languages at Heidelberg University. He later became a professor of Oriental languages, Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic at Heidelberg and studied the Talmud for 27 years. The Talmud had long since become "the sole recognised authority" in Judaism, to the point that it had "caused the Bible to be almost totally forgotten", writes Graetz.

Eisenmenger collected the quotations found in 193 works, which he then used to compile his book in two volumes: *Judaism Discovered* (or unmasked, *Entdecktes Judentum*), which was long the source for all detractors of the Talmud and of Judaism. The book is also entitled: "True and Sincere Account of the Manner in which the Hardened Jews Proffer Horrible Blasphemies against the Trinity, Outrage the Holy Mother of Christ, the New Testament, the Gospels and the Apostles, Mock the Christian Religion, and Manifest their Contempt and Horror for all of Christianity".

In this 2,000 page work, Eisenmenger reported all the cases of ritual murder and all the misdeeds which had led to the innumerable expulsions to which the Jews had been subjected. Let us note that at no time did the author cite Luther's diatribe against the Jews and never even mentions his name.

Here are two passages which show the seriousness of his work quite clearly: "In the Talmudic treatise *Baba mezia* (The Intermediary Door), sheet 61, 4, towards the end, in the *tosephat* (or commentary), it is written: 'It is permitted to deceive a non-Jew and to lend to him at usury', as it is written (Deuteronomy 23:20): 'To a stranger mayest thou lend upon usury'. It is also permitted to deceive him, as stated in Leviticus 25:14): 'When you sell something to your neighbour, or when you purchase something from him, no one may deceive his brother'. It is therefore permitted to deceive a goy, since in the law of Moses, it is only prohibited to deceive one's neighbour or brother".[315]

And yet again: "The Jews only understand the word 'neighbour' as referring to another Jew, and never a non-Jew. Nevertheless, 'neighbour' only includes one who participates in their religion, since in the book *Choschen hammischat* (sheet 132, column 2), in the notes or remarks, under number 95, paragraph 1 of the Amsterdam edition, we read: 'In none of the editions in which (in the law of Moses) mention is made of one's neighbour, is an idolater understood to be included' ".[316]

In 1700, when the Jews of Frankfurt learned that Eisenmenger was having a book critical of Jewry published in their city, they attempted

to block the publication. They got in touch with the court Jews (*Hofjuden*) of Vienna, particularly the money-changer Samuel Oppenheimer, who financed the Emperor's wars.

Oppenheimer succeeded in corrupting Leopold, who promulgated an edict prohibiting the sale of Eisenmenger's book. This prohibition ruined the author, who had dedicated his fortune to the printing of his book, all the copies of which, two thousand in number, were confiscated. To lift the imperial ban, Eisenmenger requested the intervention of Frederick I, the king of Prussia, but he died in 1704 without obtaining any satisfaction. It was only in 1711 that the work saw the light of day, thanks to king Frederick Wilhelm I, who decided to cause the publication of the work in Berlin at his expense, ordering a run of 3,000 copies.

Eisenmenger, through the power of his work, the precision of his sources and the quality of his interpretations, exceeded all his predecessors, and *Entdecktes Judentum* was a major source of information for anti-Semites in the following centuries.[317]



107

**The Jews of Rome under Surveillance**

At Rome, the Jews were being watched closely. In 1667, Clement IX levied new taxes on them and required them to pay homage to the representatives of the city under humiliating conditions. The rabbi had to prostrate himself before the Conservator while calling for Christian commiseration for Jews. The Conservator put his foot on the rabbi's neck and authorised him to get up.

In 1668, however, Clement IX abolished a bit of secular bully-ragging described by Montaigne in his *Journal d'Italie*, which doesn't seem to have bothered him much, despite the Jewish ancestry which some people have attributed to him. The matter in question is said to have involved the "two-footed races" held in Rome every year: they took 7 or 8 Jews, rigged them out in rags, stuffed them with food, made them run over a kilometre, between two lines of hilarious Romans. The joy reached a climax when the weather was bad: "Last Monday, the Jews were favoured by a rainstorm so cold as to be worthy of this perfidious people..." This detail, like the masquerades of the Roman carnival, necessarily opened by a band of Jews wearing ridiculous disguises, gives an idea of the popular esteem in which the people of the ghetto were held by the city of the Popes.

At the beginning of the 18th century, it was necessary to crack down again. Innocent XIII, in his bull *Ex injunctis* and Benedict XIII (in his bull *Aliae emanerunt*) prohibited the Jews from selling new objects. Benedict XIII (1742–1730) prohibited Christians from eating, playing or dancing with Jews. Christians were reminded that it was prohibited to be present, even as a spectator motivated by mere curiosity, at Jewish ceremonies. Two edicts (1704 and 1721) also reminded the Jews of the Comtat Venaissin of the obligation to wear the yellow hat, an obligation which was only abolished in 1789.

108

**The Jew Süß, 4 February 1738**

Joseph Süß Oppenheimer (1698–1738) was a “court Jew”, as the Jewish financiers who assisted the princes of numerous principalities of the Germanic empire were called. They administered the finances, were responsible for provisioning the armies, coining money, supplying the court with precious cloths and stones, managing the tobacco or salt monopolies, etc.

Oppenheimer had had a meteoric rise. He first worked for the Jewish mercantile houses at Frankfurt, Amsterdam and Vienna, enriched himself considerably, then began to lend money to numerous German princes and prelates. As he showed great talent for business, he became responsible for the collection of taxes in the Rhineland Palatinate, and, finally, in 1733, found himself advising Charles Alexander, the Duke of Württemberg, who quickly entrusted him with his business affairs. To raise money, Joseph Süß Oppenheimer created a ducal monopoly over trading in salt, leather, the manufacture of playing cards, tobacco and liquors, and created new fines. He founded a bank and enriched himself even more. He lived in luxury and ostentatiously maintained a Christian mistress. It was thus that he became known all over Germany as an exceptionally capable businessman. He also systematically favoured his fellow Jews, and succeeded in obtaining supply contracts for Jewish merchants on behalf of the Württembergish army.

On the political level, together with the Duke, who had become a Catholic, he prepared a conspiracy against the Parliament, which had determined to abolish privileges. Arrested soon after the death of his sovereign, in March 1737, Oppenheimer was sentenced to death on 13 December of the same year for “high treason, theft, usurpation, swindling, and violation of the laws”. He was hanged in an iron cage, on the highest scaffold in Germany, before 12,000 spectators on 4 February 1738. His last words were “Shema Israel”.

Süß remains the emblematic figure of the ten “court Jews” who had risen to the pinnacle of power in a few German states in the 18th century. From 1737 to 1739, the pamphlets against the Jew Süß were numerous. Wilhelm Hauff dedicated a novel to him in 1827, drawing an unsympathetic portrait of him, presented as a Jew with corrupt

morals. But the personage was identified above all with Veit Harlan's film, released in 1940.

At the beginning of his famous novel, *The Jew Süss*, published in 1925, the German Jewish novelist Lion Feuchtwanger painted a striking portrait of the medieval Jew reigning in the shadows through the power of money: "[Isaac Landauer] knew that only one thing in the world was real: money. War and peace, life and death, women's virtue, Papal power, national liberties, the purity of the confession of Augsburg, ships at sea, the domination of princes, the conversion of the New World to Christianity, love, piety, cowardice, pride, vice and virtue, all came from money and came back to money: everything can be explained in figures. He, Isaac Landauer, knew all this, he was at the source, he contributed to directing the course, he could dessicate or fecundate the soil. But he was not mad enough to cry his power from the rooftops, he kept it a secret, and singular smile of amusement was all that he allowed to appear. And there was another thing: the rabbis and wise men of the *Rue des Juifs* ('Jew Street') were perhaps right to speak of God and the Talmud, of Paradise and the Vale of Tears, in exact detail, as of things which were certain; he, for his part, did not have a lot of time to waste on these discussions and was more inclined to believe certain Frenchmen who treated these questions with an elegant irony. He hardly worried about it, ate comfortably and considered the Sabbath an ordinary day. But as for his dress and outward appearance, he clung obstinately to tradition and never abandoned his caftan, any more than he would abandon his skin. He entered with it into the cabinets of princes and even the Emperor: It was the secret and profound sign of his power: they needed him – it was his triumph – even with his corkscrew curls and his caftan".[318]

In the Iberian peninsula, the situation of the marranos was less enviable. At Lisbon, on 1 September 1739, there was another auto-da-fe. Four men and eight women were burnt alive for refusing to repent for practising Judaism in secret, and 35 others were sentenced to imprisonment for life.

## 109

### Empress Maria Theresa

The largest Jewish community in the Empire was at Prague at that time. Its ghetto was a real Jewish city of 15,000 inhabitants, possessing its own magistracy and all sorts of institutions. This community had long enjoyed a good reputation in the Jewish world, thanks to its rabbis, its schools and its print works. Smaller communities had also formed in the other cities of Bohemia.

To brake their expansion, an edict was published stating that only the eldest son of each Jewish family had the right to marry and found a family. The other children, if they married, could no longer remain in the country.

In 1740, on the death of Emperor Charles VI, his daughter Maria Theresa caused her rights to the succession to be recognised. The King of Prussia Frederick II profited from the occasion to attack and invade Silesia, a rich territory belonging to the Habsburgs, and the war of the Austrian Succession began.

The Jews had acquired a certain power in Prussia by that time. Among those who had been expelled from Vienna in 1670, some had been authorised to come and install themselves in Berlin and in other cities of Prussia by the Grand Duke of Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm. Jewish merchants and bankers rapidly enriched themselves and occupied an important position at court. Their business affairs prospered even further under the “philosopher king” Friedrich II. Although he was not particularly fond of Jews and had promulgated an edict to diminish their numbers, he helped them get rich during the wars he waged against Austria and France. A great number of Berlin Jews, in fact, provisioned the army and profited from the misfortunes of the times to enrich themselves greatly.

When the Prussian army entered Prague, the population observed that the Jews openly demonstrated their sympathy for the “enlightened” Protestant Emperor, friend of Voltaire and the *philosophes*, completely enthralled by the ideals of the Enlightenment.

Maria Theresa, mother of the future queen of France, Marie Antoinette, then took the decision to expel the Jews from Prague and the entire kingdom of Bohemia, which was part of the Empire. On 22 December 1744, the Empress forced the Jews to sew a little piece of

yellow cloth on their sleeve. She also published the following edict in Prague:

“For various reasons, I have resolved no longer to tolerate the Jews in my hereditary kingdom of Bohemia. I therefore wish that as of the last day of January 1745, there shall be no more Jews in the city of Prague; if any are found there after such time, they will be expelled by the army. Nevertheless, they shall be permitted to dwell anywhere else in the kingdom of Bohemia for one more month in order to arrange their affairs and to dispose of such of their property as cannot be carried away. Finally, this evacuation from the entire country shall take place before the last day of the month of June 1745.”

The result was a panic. The Jews fled Prague to take refuge in the surrounding villages, wandering the roads in severe cold. For four years, hundreds of families remained reduced to extreme poverty. Finally, Jewish insistence and money persuaded Maria Theresa to authorise them to return to Prague.

## 110 Benedict XIV, 1751

Benedict XIV marked the 18th century by his long pontificate of 18 years (1740–1758). He was a pope of sciences, physics, chemistry and mathematics. He created a faculty of surgery and anatomical museum at Rome. He also attempted to calm religious quarrels, particularly with the Jansenists.

At the beginning of his reign, he showed himself favourable to the Enlightenment and maintained relations with Friedrich II of Prussia, through the scholar Maupertius. Voltaire sincerely admired this cultivated Pope, open to the ideas of the age. In 1745, he even dedicated his play *Mahomet* to him.

The Pope's letter of thanks to the philosopher testifies to their good relations.

It was nevertheless still necessary to legislate to contain the aggressiveness of the Jews. A letter to the governor of Rome dated 28 February 1747, *De baptismo Judaeorum sive infantum, sive adultorum*, was in fact a treatise, of remarkable clarity and precision, in which the Pope recalled the provisions of the councils against the Jews, taken by his predecessors. This does not mean that one could plunder them, he clarified (*Non ab iis expetendum esse quod iure non potest exigi... Quidquid iniuriam sapit Christianorum indignum est*).[319]

In 1751, Benedict XIV promulgated an ordinance which renewed the decisions of Paul IV. The Talmud was to be burnt, and the Jews were to be prohibited from selling or introducing their books into the Pontifical states.

They were not permitted to hire Christian servants; they were prohibited from moving about without authorisation, from owning carriages or horses. They had to carry their dead to the cemetery in silence; all under pain of bastinadoes and fines. The ordinance was then confirmed in 1775, then in January 1793 by Pius VI. At the same time, severe decrees punished Christians who molested them with the same penalties.

The Encyclical of 14 June 1751, entitled *Quo primo*, addressed to the bishops and to the Polish people, presented a few of the complaints against the Jews. The great Pope's declaration was a warning, an alarm signal launched to the decadent Polish people. Unfortunately, the

appeal was hardly observed, and what the Pope feared came to pass: the collapse of Poland, completely rotted, gutted by the Jews, and picked apart by the neighbouring states.

“We have learned the following facts from responsible persons whose testimony is worthy of belief, and are well informed on the state of affairs in Poland, and of people living in the kingdom, who, by zeal for religion, addressed their complaints to Ourselves, and to the Holy See. The number of Jews has increased greatly. Thus, certain localities, towns and cities, which were formerly surrounded by walls (the ruins of which attest to this fact), and which were inhabited by a great number of Christians, as we have learned from ancient lists and records which still exist, are now badly maintained and filthy, peopled by a large number of Jews and almost empty of Christians. What is more, there are, in the same kingdom, a certain number of parishes in which the Catholic population has considerably diminished. The consequences are that the revenue from such parishes has diminished so greatly that they are in imminent danger of being left without priests. Moreover, all commerce in articles of general use, such as liqueurs, and even wine, is also in Jewish hands; Jews are permitted to have charge of the administration of public moneys; they have their own hotels and farms and have acquired landed estates. By all possible means, they have acquired property rights over the poor Christians who work the soil, and not only use their power in an inhumane and heartless way, imposing difficult and tiresome tasks upon Christians, forcing them to carry excessive burdens, but what is more, they inflict corporal punishments upon them, such as beatings. It follows that these unfortunate people are in the same condition of servitude to the Jews as the slave is to the capricious authority of his master. It is true that, to inflict these punishments, the Jews are obliged to have recourse to a Christian official who is entrusted with this office. But as this official is forced to obey the orders of his Jewish master, if he does not wish to lose his job, the tyrannical orders must be carried out.

“We have said that the administration of public moneys and the renting of inns, properties and farms had fallen into the hands of the Jews, to the great and multiple disadvantage of the Christians. But we must also allude to the other monstrous anomalies and we see, if we examine attentively, that they can be the source of even greater ills yet, and of more widespread ruin than those we have already mentioned. It is a question of great and serious consequence that the Jews are admitted into the homes of the nobility in a domestic and economic capacity to fill the office of major-domo and steward. They thus live in conditions of familiar intimacy under the same roof as the Christians

and continually treat them in a haughty manner, openly showing their contempt. In the cities and other places, the Jews can be seen everywhere in the midst of Christians; and, what is even more regrettable, the Jews in no way feared to have Christians of both sexes in their houses attached to their service. What is more, as the Jews are very busy in commercial enterprises, they withdraw enormous sums of money from these activities, and they work systematically to plunder the Christians of their goods and their possessions, through excessive usurious exactions. While at the same time they lent Christians sums of money at immoderately high interest rates, for the payment of which their synagogues serve as guarantee, their reasons for doing this are nevertheless easy to see. First they obtain money from the Christians which they use in trade, making enough profit to pay the stipulated interest rate, and increasing their own wealth at the same time. In the second place, what is more, they win for their persons and their synagogues as many protectors as they have creditors”.

Benedict XIV’s text does not mention ritual murders. An affair of this kind exploded in Sandomierz, eastern present-day Poland, in 1678. The Jews were expelled from the city, and a great painting was placed in the cathedral showing the ritual murder of a Christian child.



## 111

### The Jews during the Enlightenment

The emancipation of the Jews from the supervision of the rabbis began during the century of the Enlightenment. In Judaism, this intellectual current, called *Haskala*, was principally characterised by the German Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn, who was favourable to a lay education, the use of the local language and the integration of the Jews into the surrounding society. Mendelssohn thought that the Jews would improve their condition by moving closer to the Christians, and getting better known by them, and ceasing to retrench themselves in their narrow traditions and in their mysterious ghetto, but without abandoning their ancestral religion. It was with this idea in mind that he translated the Bible into classical German.

Among Christians, the movement in favour of the emancipation of the Jews was represented chiefly by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Wilhelm von Dohm. Other intellectuals fiercely opposed these ideas. A writer from Frankfurt am Main, Johann Balthasar Kolbe, denounced the turpitude of the Jews and the harmfulness of Judaism, proving himself particularly aggressive in his *Letter to Mr. Mendelssohn* (March 1770).

Elsewhere, in Europe, the ideas of the Enlightenment progressed. Starting in 1714, an English free thinker, John Toland, published a pamphlet demanding the complete emancipation of the Jews. But other English Deists, such as Tindal, Morgan, Lord Bolingbroke, denounced Christianity by directing their attacks against its Jewish origins. This line of argument was then taken up in France by Voltaire in his *Dictionnaire philosophique* (1764), in which he ridiculed the ignorant, fanatical Jews.

The ideas of the Enlightenment bore their fruit. In 1781, Joseph II of Austria, an emperor drenched in the ideas of the *Encyclopédie*, published an edict of tolerance which practically assimilated the Jews to other citizens. But at this time, neither the princes, nor the peoples were disposed to grant full equality of rights to the Jews, which was equivalent to letting the fox into the hen house. Even the king of Prussia, Frederick the Great, the philosopher king, did nothing to improve the situation.

In the recently created kingdom of Saxony, the Jews remained subject to the restrictive laws which had governed them over the past

centuries. It is with good reason that the Jews referred to the country as "Protestant Spain". Legally, they had only the right to reside there; a few of them were tolerated at Dresden and Leipzig, but under the reserve of being able to expel them at any time. They were forbidden to have synagogues. To pray, they met in ordinary rooms. But the Russian Jews under Alexander I were treated more liberally.

## 112

### The Jews in France in the 18th Century

Since 1394, France was *Judenrein*, purified of Jews, until the annexation of Alsace by Louis XIV. A few Jewish families had also been reintegrated at Metz, by the leniency of Henry IV. Towards 1720, they formed a kernel of about 100 families, and were subject to the strictest regulation; they had to wear black clothing and they had to live in the ghetto, which had only one gate. Sometimes they were used for the purchase of furs or horses, particularly for the army.

About 20 Jews succeeded in infiltrating as far as Paris. Behind them, a small band attempted to escape, but the Parisian police took off in pursuit, an operation which had no more importance than the pursuit of any other category of petty rogues or criminal suspects. This was a minor occurrence but very typical of the spirit of the times, which shows the profound repulsion which the presence of the Jew always inspired.

Starting in 1719, the police listed these vagabonds and were looking for 25 of them, without passports, of course, and who "deserved to be expelled". A post as inspector for the surveillance of the Jews was created in 1721. M. Hérault, who replaced d'Argenson in 1725, redoubled the severity, demanded the right to expel without any form of trial any Jews whose papers were not completely in order, "because the people of this religion are highly suspect, and the great majority of them are evil".

It was strictly prohibited for a Jew to hire a Christian domestic servant, even for the Sabbath days. This measure resulted from the debauching of Christian servants by the Jews, observed even at Bordeaux, where officially there were only "new Christians" expelled from Spain or Portugal a few centuries earlier: "The Jews have pretty peasant girls as domestic servants whom they make pregnant to act as wet nurses to their children and make carry those children born of the young peasant girls have to go give birth at the foundling box" (Report of M. de Boucher, 1733).

Sexual relations with Christians were pitilessly prosecuted. In theory, a Jew convicted of seducing a Christian remained subject to burning at the stake, and the clergy refused baptism if he pretended to convert. In 1726, an Aryan domestic servant, named Marie Becquart,

maiden name Manon, was imprisoned for having been the mistress of a Levy.

Under the general lieutenantship of Berryer, starting in 1747, Jewry encountered a redoubtable adversary in the person of the inspector assigned to their surveillance, M. Legrand, who, as soon as he entered office, complained of the indulgence enjoyed by the Jews, and the resulting invasion. The number of Jews from Paris must have amounted to about 500.[320]

In 1750, Louis XV himself wrote to the lieutenant general to ensure that all Jews had their papers in order, that they be watched and they should be imprisoned if they refused. After this "wandering scum", writes Lucien Rebatet, "the Jewry of Bordeaux, installed in trade, equipped with letters of bourgeoisie by Louis XIV, confirmed in their privileges by Louis XV, evidently represents the latest fashion". But there again, complaints were raised. As long as their colony did not exceed 500 members (figure from 1718), nobody ever talked about them. Fifteen years later, it had grown to 4,000 people.

In Alsace, annexed to France under Louis XIV, the Jewish problem arose on a much greater scale than anywhere else. Louis XIV, faithful to his political principles, allowed Alsace to retain all its particular regulations, including, of course, those regarding the Jews, which accorded so closely with the convictions of the monarchy.

Starting in the mid-14th century, Strasbourg prohibited the Jews from possessing a domicile in its territories, no matter how modest or temporary. At nightfall, all the Jews went back into the ghetto to the sound of a trumpet for the Jews, the *Kraüselhorn*, which was their signal to leave. In the day, only a few businesses were open to them, for example, horse trading, and they could only enter the city by paying a special toll. Thus, from 1389 to 1681, no Jew ever slept in Strasbourg. A few Jews nevertheless received a new authorisation to spend the night, in the event of proven necessity, but in inns designated by the police. For all the rest, the ordinances against the Jews were renewed in 1708, then in 1750, and even stiffened. In 1708, to avoid fraud by Jews installing themselves at the city gates and by disguising themselves, they were prohibited from entering without a safe-conduct. Christian subjects were prohibited from concluding any transaction or contract with them whatsoever within a radius of eight miles around Strasbourg, except horse and cattle trading, and from selling them articles of primary necessity, such as food or clothing.

These regulations were observed with such strictness, until the Revolution, that the first Jew to own a house in Strasbourg since the Middle Ages was Cerfbeer, in 1780. What is more, this great army

supplier acquired the house in secret, and when the matter became known, it triggered the indignation of the entire city, which immediately brought legal proceedings against him, in a trial famous at the time.

Among the Jews of the villages, dispersed to the remotest parts of the countryside, it was much more difficult to supervise and ward off the social plague of usury, which was observed from century to century, wherever Jews meet peasants. The Jews fastened themselves like leeches upon needy peasants with large families or those suffering from poor harvests, lending at hair-raising rates of interest, or swindling them in livestock deals. Little by little, the entire peasantry of Alsace fell into their clutches.

## 113 Louis XVI

Of all the monarchs who succeeded to the throne of France, Louis XVI was certainly the most liberal, to the point of indecision or even weakness. After scrupulously studying the case of the Jews of Alsace, he settled the problem by letters patent dated 10 July 1784. Here are a few fragments of the authentic text, which give a precise idea of his inner forcefulness:

Article I – The Jews without domicile in Alsace must leave the province within 3 months. We command that any Jews found in the said province following the expiration of the period fixed by the present article shall be prosecuted and treated as vagabonds and men without faith, according to the strict terms of the ordinances.

Article II – [Makes very express prohibitions against all lords and all cities and municipalities enjoying the right of seignery to admit in future any foreign Jew until otherwise ordered to do so by Ourselves.] [...]

Article VI – [Very express prohibition against all Jews and Jewesses residing in Alsace to contract any marriage without our permission, even outside States dominated by Ourselves, under pain for violators of being immediately expelled from the said province.]

Article VII – [This article punishes all rabbis who celebrate unauthorised marriages with a fine of 3,000 livres, and decrees their expulsion in case of repeated violation. It also prohibited rabbis from providing lodgings to Jews without passports, as they unceasingly do.]

Article VIII prohibited Jews from employing Christian servants for the operations farms, and article IX prohibited them from acquiring immovable property.

Lucien Rebatet provides us with a report at this point, according to which “it is difficult to verify, but which is morally very probably plausible”: In 1787, while hunting in the woods near Versailles, Louis XVI is said to have encountered a shabby cortege of German Jews, in rags, tearful and fearful, bearing on their shoulders the body of another Jew. They explained that they were carrying the body to Paris, to the cemetery of Montrouge, which had just been opened to them. Until the previous year, they had no other place in which to bury their dead, other than a court inn at la Villette. Louis XVI was moved, and it is

said that from this encounter the idea of a general statute of French Jews was born. "It is indeed, in effect, sentimental in nature", added Lieutenant Rebatet.

A study of this statute was made the same year by a private commission presided over by Malesherbes. We no longer possess the complete file, but that which we know of it is sufficient to indicate its spirit. Louis XVI wished to improve the physical condition of the Jews in France, assuring them of complete freedom of religion and customs. But as part of his plan, he stipulated that the Jews, an impermeable nation apart, could not be assimilated as French subjects, that this would be to "introduce a nation into a nation, an armed nation into an unarmed and trusting nation".

He maintained all the provisions prohibiting them from holding public office, high or low. The Revolution did not permit him to continue his work.

## 114

### François Hell

In the third 33 years of the 18th century, the situation in Alsace became inextricable. Conflict could break out at any moment. The Jews, after absorbing a few body blows, regrouped and took their revenge. The Alsatians were also terrified by the immigration of German Jews. The last census counted 19,624 Jews in Alsace, a figure which seems much too high. Unless the Jewish population had almost tripled in 30 years.

François Hell, an Alsatian court clerk, an intelligent man with an educated mind, was one of their fiercest adversaries. He even learned Hebrew to gain a better understanding, his own understanding, of their books of commerce and better penetrate the secrecy of their operations. Appointed bailiff by a few nobles of Alsace, he took advantage of the situation and taught debtors to the Jews to fabricate false receipts to be introduced against the claims of their creditors.

In 1779, he also published his *Observations d'un Alsacien sur les affaires des juifs en Alsace*, a text in which he exhorted the population to rise up against the tyrants. One day, he sent them letters in Hebrew, threatening to denounce them for usury and swindling, unless they sent him a given sum of money.

It is necessary here to present a text from Louis de Bonald concerning this matter. Louis de Bonald, a gentleman from Rouergue, a former mayor of Millau, fled France in 1791 and ended his career as writer and man of politics at the Académie Française. This is what François Hell had to say of the matter in 1806:

“Towards the years 1777 or 78, the farmers in Alsace, overwhelmed then, as they still are, by the usurious trickery of the Jews, attempted, in their desperation, an unlawful means to free themselves, and a skilful forger had, it appears, travelled all over the province, and discharged a large number of debtors equipped with counterfeit receipts. No doubt the Jews were afraid of the courts of law of a country in which they were held in contempt; or perhaps the great numbers of cases of the same kind rendered ordinary justice too long and costly. Whatever the reason, the creditors preferred to take their complaints to the supreme authority; and one can also believe that irresistible arguments – as Figaro says, of which the Jews always have bags full, must always be heard more favourably by administrative offices than magistracy companies”.



After the publications of François Hell's pamphlet, the Jews, as Bonald tell us, "had the credit of putting the bailiff in prison". In 1780, in fact, François Hell was incarcerated on the order of Louis XVI and then sentenced to 3 years exile. When he returned he received a hero's welcome from Alsatian peasants.

At the beginning of 1788, riots broke out in Lorraine, due to the increase in the price of bread. The Jews were then accused of speculating. As it turned out, they owned granaries all over France. At Luneville, Pont-à-Mousson, Nancy, Lixheim and Sarreguemines, their windows were broken, their barns were pillaged, shots were fired at their synagogues, Jews were molested on the streets. Troops were dispatched to quell the rioting but the feelings of the populace remained unchanged.

François Hell's memorandum was only reprinted at Neuchatel in 1790, while its author had been elected deputy to the National Assembly. Bonald, who was only moderately democratic, observed that the national assembly had never debated the topic; and he was pleased to remark ironically, "We've seen the same legislators, at the same time as they eliminated feudal nobility [...] cover this new feudal nobility, the Jews, the true high and powerful lords of Alsace, where they collect both tithes and seigneurial fees, with their protection, and, of course, if in philosophical language, feudal is synonymous with oppressive and odious, then I know of nothing more feudal for a province than 11 million mortgages owed to usurers".[321] François Hell ended his days on the scaffold. He was guillotined in 1794, as a monarchist.

115

**The Revolution and the Empire**

The records of the General Estates contain innumerable grievances from the people from Alsace and Lorraine concerning the Jews. Thionville, Pont-à-Mousson, Mirecourt, Sarrebourg, Nancy, Nomeny, Sarreguemines, Bitche, Boulay, Bouzonville, Dreize, Fenstrange, Strasbourg, Vic, among others, demanded that the legislation applying to the Jews be applied more strictly, that their numbers be restricted in commerce, particularly in the fur and grain trades. But from its first day, the Constitutional Assembly, led by a handful of rhetoricians and demagogues, was prepared to put ideology ahead of the interests of the nation.

The taking of the Bastille inaugurated the struggle against the "enemies of the people". In Alsace, the enemy of the people was incarnated in Judaism. Starting the day after 14 July 1789, the people of Alsace fell upon the Jews with fists flying.

On 3 August 1789, Abbot Henri Grégoire, a revolutionary priest from Embermesnil, in Lorraine, deputy for the bailiwick of Nancy, made a passionate speech on the Jews before the tribune, arousing howls of protest. At the session of 23 December 1789, where the topic was brought up in the Assembly once again on the motion of M. of Clermont-Tonnerre, Abbot Maury replied to the pro-Jewish clan: "The word 'Jew' is not the name of a sect, but of a nation, which has its laws, has always followed them, and wishes to continue following them. They have never been anything but money jugglers, and will never be ploughmen, soldiers, or artisans. The peoples have a hatred for the Jews which their emancipation will cause to explode. For their health, there should be nothing to deliberate. They must not be persecuted [...] Let them be protected as individuals and not as Frenchmen, since they cannot be citizens."

Alsace, which held more than half of all French Jewry, was screaming out in alarm, an echo of which may be found in the unsigned report, *Les Juifs d'Alsace*: "That the Jew should be a citizen in all respects where he will not be a harmful citizen, very well (let them live anywhere, let them own a house, enjoy freedom of religion, admission into the guilds of liberal and mechanical arts, etc.). But in no case should a Jew be eligible for the political, administrative and judiciary

corps. That is, that he might not occupy any of these important and delicate functions which must always be presided over by Christian morals. The unlimited enjoyment of all these rights of citizenship would place the advantages of the condition of the Jew above that of any other Frenchman. Since, on the one hand, he harvested gold in abundance, and, on the other hand, this gold, placing a great number of slaves in his chains whose votes he would control in the assemblies, would then serve as an instrument to raise the Jew up to the chair of the President of the Nation or place himself under the fleur de lys”.

The Jews of Bordeaux, playing it safe and already fearing the competition of their Ashkenazi brethren, assured themselves that they were very comfortable in the situation and did not wish to alter it.

Suddenly, on 28 January 1790, during a great debate, the Assembly proclaimed the Jews of Bordeaux already possessing letters of French naturalisation to be active citizens. The vote had been raised by 374 against 224. The motion of an Alsatian deputy, Schwends, who wished the law to state that the Assembly did not refer to the Jews of Alsace, whose numbers now amounted to 26,000, was rejected.

As soon as the vote became known, anti-Jewish demonstrations were held at Bordeaux. In Alsace, revolutionary riots against the Jews took place with increased fury. Shots were fired at synagogues, the roofs of their houses were damaged. There was patriotic indignation all over France, and it was demanded whether one would have to be a Jew to become a bishop.

The Jews of Paris clamoured for joint citizenship, but the Assembly, before the divisions which the question raised among its members, preferred to adjourn passage of the definitive law.

Nevertheless, on 27 September 1791, Mr. Duport demanded active citizenship, with eligibility for all Jews, including those of the Comtat Venaissin, annexed to France a short time before. The Alsatian deputy Rewbell, followed by numerous other deputies, raised their voices, recalling that the Jews were owed enormous sums of money in Alsace due to all their usury and that the Assembly would therefore be taking their side against the victims. The extremists triumphed over the council of reason and the Jewish emancipation law was promulgated on 27 September 1791. On 13 November, it was officially ratified by royal decree. The Jews were now henceforth citizens like the others. Soon, as a result of Napoleon's wars, found themselves emancipated in almost all European countries, at least temporarily. The doors of the chicken house were wide open.

Louis de Bonald waxed ironic on this subject: “The Assembly declares them active citizens: a title which, with the newly-declared

'Human Rights', newly decreed, was then regarded as the highest degree of honour and beatitude to which a human creature could aspire". And he protested the blaming of Christians: "The Jews", he said, "were rejected by our morals much more than they were oppressed by our laws." Consequently, "the Assembly made the enormous and voluntary error of placing its laws in contradiction with our morals." Bonald finally warned his contemporaries: "Let us beware that the emancipation of the Jews does not turn into the oppression of Christians!"[322]

A certain number of Jews immediately enrolled in the National Guard, where they enjoyed all the pleasures of hunting suspects. On the other hand, they were hardly numerous on the battlefields of the Republic. One of the very rare documents referring to their presence is a decree promulgated by General Laurent, representing the people before the Armée du Nord, on 16 Messidor year II, which informs us of the swarms of Jewish spies and corpse-robbers: "Jews are prohibited from following the army under pain of death. The generals, commanders of the army posts and the surveillance committee of the municipality of Mons will receive denunciations against all violators, and will have them arrested immediately for execution within 24 hours".

In Alsace, since the decrees of 91, the Jewish takeover became a veritable obsession. The Jews demanded 1 fr. 50 interest on 24 francs per month, without any records, i.e., without proof of the usurious rates they were charging. Every year, they were 1,500,000 francs from forced sales, 85% of them upon the application of Jews. From the year VII to January 1806, their mortgage claims exceeded 21 million francs. Finally, they defrauded the civil registry, changing their names in each city to escape justice and above all conscription. Of 66 Jews from the Mosel intended to form part of the contingent, none had served in the army.[323]

Napoleon therefore ordered a study of the question by one of his jurisconsultants, the most famous and the most objective, Jean-Étienne-Marie Portalis, who drew up a detailed brief, stating in part as follows: "In assimilating without precaution the Jews to all other Frenchmen, we have extended an invitation to whole crowds of foreign Jews who have infested our border departments; the happy changes anticipated from the new system of naturalisation have produced no effect on the mass of Jews more anciently established in France. In this regard, the present circumstances speak sufficiently for themselves".

Napoleon himself declared: "I wish to remark again that no one complains of the Protestants, nor the Catholics, in the way that people

complain about the Jews. The evil done by Jews does not come from the individuals, but from the very nature of the Jewish people. They are caterpillars, grasshoppers who are ravaging France... We must assemble the Estates General of the Jews. I wish there to be a general synagogue of Jews in Paris. I am far from wishing to do anything against my glory and which may be disapproved of by posterity. It would be a weakness to expel the Jews, while it would be a strength to correct them”.

The Emperor despised the Jews. But at the fact of his power, conqueror of so many sovereigns, he considered himself strong enough to reduce them to his will. To merge the Jews into French society, he believed it necessary to form an alliance with the rabbis. On 30 May 1806, therefore, he convened a meeting of his ambitious but non-existent “Jewish Estates General”, meeting as an official body. A great Sanhedrin of France, made up of 70 members, was convened for the first time on 4 February 1807.

In centralising and in consecrating the religious organisation of the Jews, the Emperor was providing them with an instrument of national unity and activity.

By decree of 17 March 1808, he instituted a legal re-organisation of the Jewish religion and its protection. But one measure was in response to the endless series of Jewish swindles being committed in all the departments of eastern France over the past month. Jews not domiciled in the Upper Rhine and Lower Rhine were henceforth to be prohibited from residing in those departments. The tribunals were authorised to grant grace periods to debtors for all debts to Jews, even if not usurious. The courts were empowered to cancel Jewish claims against incompetent persons, minors, or military personnel unless authorised by their commanding officer. Any bill of exchange, any promissory note, any obligation or promise signed by French merchants in favour of any Jew would be valueless unless the bearer could prove that the value had been supplied in full and without fraud. The courts were to reduce all claims with accumulated interest to no more than 5% and annul all such claims over 10%.

What's more, no Jew could dedicate himself to any trade or business without the receipt of a special patent from the prefect of the department, attesting that the Jew had not practised usury, with the *consistoire* (a government-created Jewish body governing the Jewish congregations of a French province or region) providing proof that the Jew in question was a person of good conduct and probity. Any contracts or obligations signed in favour of a Jew without this patent could be revised. Finally, the Jews would no longer be allowed to pay

replacements for military service. These measures were valid for 10 years. The Jews of Bordeaux and the South-West were exempted if they had given rise to no complaint.[324]

The Jews, who had now solidly planted their feet in France and did not intend to tolerate the slightest hindrance, cried about the "infamy" of the decree, and the elected liberator of the people was immediately relegated to the torturers "worthy of the Middle Ages".

As French Jews had nothing more to expect from the Emperor, they began to support England.

Napoleon's Jewish policy was at once grandiose and vague. Reinforced by his prestige, he would have served his country better by restoring the essential principles of royal policies. But it is probable that if destiny had granted him another twenty years he would have re-examined the problem in the light of experience.

## 116

### The Restoration

The Catholic reaction to revolutionary ideas was incarnated under the Restoration in two writers, Joseph de Maistre and Louis-Gabriel de Bonald, whose ideas were rather similar. Maistre even wrote to Bonald, shortly before his death, "I have thought nothing that you haven't written; I have written nothing that you haven't thought". Both were the principal representatives of the traditionalist Catholic current.

Joseph de Maistre (1753–1821), was born at Chambéry, in Savoy, the eldest of 10 children. He studied with the Jesuits and was profoundly Catholic. When, in 1792, Savoy was invaded by revolutionary armies, he left for Lausanne, where he fulfilled various missions for the Duke of Savoy, who was also the King of Sardinia. At the end of 1798, he emigrated to Venice, but King Charles-Emmanuel IV ordered him to return to Sardinia, where he acted as regent of the Chancellery. Three years later, he was appointed ambassador to Russia.

Joseph de Maistre wrote little about Judaism. But according to him, the Jewish hatred of Christianity should never be forgotten by lawmakers, under pain of seeing Jewish enterprises disaggregate the social tissue and undermine the fundamentals of the State. Faced with such a threat, the authority had to inspire fear and cause the secret members of the Synagogue to tremble. In his *Letters to a Russian Gentleman*, which dates from 1815, he praised the efforts of the Spanish Inquisition: "It was therefore necessary to frighten the imagination by ceaselessly showing the anathema attached to the mere suspicion of Judaism. It is a great error to think that, to get rid of a powerful enemy, it is sufficient to arrest his progress; you have achieved nothing if you haven't forced him to retreat... It was a question of the continued existence of the Spanish nation... or the terrifying triumph of superstition, despotism and barbarism over humankind."

Louis de Bonald (1754–1840) was born at Millau, in an old noble family from Rouergue (southern France). A politician, philosopher, writer, monarchist and Catholic, he was a great adversary of the French Revolution. In his numerous works, he attacked the Declaration of Human Rights, Rousseau's "social contract", and the social and political innovations of the Revolution, advocating the return to royalty and the principles of the Catholic Church.

In 1785, he became mayor of Millau. Initially favourable to the 1790 Revolution, he was elected a member of the Assembly of the department in which he lived, eventually becoming its President. He nevertheless opposed the increasing secularisation of French society (sale of Church property, civil constitution), and resigned from his posts as president and deputy of the departmental assembly in January 1791. He then emigrated with his two sons to Heidelberg, under the control of the French Prince of Condé at the time.

It was at Heidelberg that Bonald discovered his vocation of writer. His first work, *Theory of Political and Religious Power*, was printed in 1796 at Constance. In 1797, he returned to Paris in secrecy, but only officially reappeared after the coup d'état of 18 Brumaire. He associated with Chateaubriand, published various political and legal essays then retired to his lands, while continuing to publish in the *Mercure de France* and the *Journal des débats*. In 1807, Bonald, a fervent royalist, refused Napoleon's offer of the post of director of the *Journal de l'Empire*.

At the Restoration, his struggle for the monarchy brought him official recognition and he was appointed a Knight of the Order of Saint Louis. Starting in 1815, he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies. In 1816, he was elected to the Académie Française. He finally appointed Peer of France in 1823.

In his essay entitled *Sur les Juifs*, published in 1806, Louis de Bonald studied "the religion and morals of a people in open war with religion and the morals of all peoples". He was compelled to admit that the evil was profoundly rooted in the majority of Jews. Even an "enlightened and virtuous" Jew was – perhaps – really no such thing :

"It is no more permissible, in correct logic", he wrote, "to justify a nation accused of a general disposition to baseness and bad faith, by showing a few educated and honest individuals, than to incriminate a virtuous nation through the example of a few criminals which it has produced".[325]

Under the Restoration, in 1818, numerous deputies demanded the renewal of the 1808 decree which was expiring, by reinforcing even new precautions: suspension of all sales with a repurchase clause by Jews, and prohibition against Jews trading in immovable property.

Some of them, including the Marquis de Lattier, deputy for la Drôme, proposed to confirm the Jews in the municipalities where they lived at the Revolution, but to limit their numbers, to prohibit women from marrying before the age of 25, and even to prohibit the Jews from taking any legal action. Their final summation put forth once again the incessant and systematic frauds committed by the Jews in Alsace and



Lorraine. But the Chamber of Commerce of Paris rejected all their demands while simultaneously promulgating the decree.

In 1827, the famous rabbi David Drach, who converted sincerely to Catholicism, taught us about the hopes of his sect. Here is what we find in his *Second Lettre of a Converted Rabbi to the Israelites* (Paris, 1827): "The Messiah must be a great conqueror, who will render all the nations of the world slaves of the Jews. The Jews will return to the Holy Land, triumphant and loaded down with riches stolen from the infidels. The object of their mission will be to deliver dispersed Israel and bring it back to the Holy Land, establish and consolidate a temporal reign the duration of which will be equal that of the world. All nations will then be subjects of the Jews, and the Jews will dispose as they wish of all the individuals of which they consist, as well as of their property".[326]

Here again is another passage from his book: "The Talmud expressly prohibits saving the life of a non-Jew... from returning lost property to him... from taking take pity on them, etc. According to the Talmud, the number of precepts of the laws of God... is no fewer than 612 in total, i.e., 248 affirmative precepts and 365 negative precepts. Affirmative precepts 185 and 198 permitted the practice of usury against non-Jews, and the extermination of idolaters without hesitation or mercy".[327]

A few decades later, the Bolsheviks, in the Russia of 1917, would be motivated by this same Talmudic hatred. In thirty years, from 1917 to 1947, no less than thirty million Russians and Ukrainians died, victims of Jewish fanaticism having gained power.

## 117

### Germany 1814–1819

In most of the German principalities, the Jews had acquired equal rights thanks to the introduction of the Napoleonic Code. But there was a clamour against the admission of Jewish predators into German society. In 1793, the famous philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte was still a Jacobin, but his republican ideals did not blind him to the danger represented by the admission of the Jews into society. He wrote, in his first major work on the revolution: “To protect us against them, I see only one way... conquer their Promised Land for them, and send them all there.”

In 1804, in *Les Traits fondamentaux du siècle présent*, he expressed his views on Christianity, which he only found in a state of absolute purity in Saint Joan of Arc, who seemed to him to cast doubt of the Jewish origins of Jesus. According to what the Archbishop of Toledo John Martínez Siliceo had written, we see here again the dawning of the idea of an Aryan Jesus. Like Voltaire, Fichte vituperated against the Old Testament, and criticised the New, particularly the epistles of Saint Paul. In 1808, his famous *Speech to the German Nation* became the charter of pan-Germanism.

At Berlin, in 1803, Karl Grattenauer published *Wider die Juden* (*Against the Jews*) which was distributed to the tune of 13,000 copies. Grattenauer considered the Jews, not from a religious point of view, but as a distinct race. Christian Ludwig Paalzow's book *Über die Bürgerrechte der Juden* (*On the Civil Rights of the Jews*) was published in the same year.

Numerous pamphlets expressed popular exasperation with regards to the Jews. Starting in 1809, the novelist Achim von Arnim founded a patriotic society at Berlin, the Deutsche-christliche Tischgesellschaft, to which “Jews and Philistines” were not admitted: “Neither the Jews, nor converted Jews, nor the descendants of Jews”, were to be permitted, he clarified. His brother-in-law Clemens von Brentano was famous for his haunting stories of criminal Jews.

Louis de Bonald, living in exile at Heidelberg during the Revolution, benefited from the occasion to make an in-depth study of the problems caused by the many Jews who lived in Germany. The country had not yet been turned upside down by the Jewish spirit, as it would be at the end of the century. The German people, wrote Bonald,

in his essay *On the Jews*, published in 1806, is “calm in its tastes and moderate in its desires”. But in certain regions, the people were dying of starvation. Bonald cited an article from the *Feuilleton du Publiciste*, dated the 11 Vendémiaire. The author added: “We know how the Jews of Alsace proceeded with the farmers who could not borrow money except from those same Jews, and that the lands of the peasants are mortgaged to them in this one single province for the sum of eleven million francs. It is they who, in truth, in concert with Christian third parties, organised the horrible food shortage in Moravia and Bohemia to regain the privileges and monopolies of which they had been deprived. In the Bavarian states, both old and new, the Jews were obtaining more influence every day, in the capacity of money men, and, truth be told, it wasn’t the Christian bankers, but the Jews, who regulated the rate of exchange, not only at the Leipzig fair, but at Hamburg, Amsterdam and London.”

The author of the article advocated the re-establishment of the *rouelle*, which seemed indispensable to him, and denounced the Jews as counterfeiters: “There is a continued need for a distinctive marking for people who are, in the present state of affairs – excluded from the full enjoyment of rights as citizens, either through stubbornness or through their own misery – necessarily the enemies of the public good. It has been shown that no class of men in the fertile provinces of the house of Austria has been as dreadful as the Jews, particularly since 1796; that, through their counterfeit notes and their false coins, and in causing specie to disappear, they produced the horribly high prices which could only benefit them, the Jews.”

The rich Jews were not the only ones: “Further along”, writes Bonald, the same author says, “There are no limits to the baseness of Jewish beggars or pedlars, nor to the incredible multiplication of their families. The acts of the police courts of Leipzig, during the fair, prove that of 12 thefts or swindles, there are 11 in which Jews are involved”. This is one of the very rare testimonies which we possess of Jewish criminality before the studies of the 20th century.

A German author, A.F. Thiele, a high official in the Prussian administration, published an important study in 1841, entitled *Die jüdischen Gauner in Deutschland* (*Jewish Crooks in Germany*), which we will examine in greater detail in a following chapter. Thiele confirmed that the French occupation had been a blessed time for them: “During the war years”, he writes, “between 1806 and 1814, there were legions of the most infamous Jews in the French armies. They work as spies, customs agents; others dedicate themselves to pillage. Numerous crimes were committed by Jews at the time. Among the older Jewish

criminals, most of them recall that they participated in the last French campaigns. They participated, certainly, but they could not be very highly recommended as volunteers!" (volume I, page 73).

In practice, they followed the French armies and committed pillaging everywhere they passed. Numerous Jews from Poland also arrived in Germany during the Napoleonic wars, thanks to the Russian armies. Since the French armies had thrown open the doors of the prisons and freed the lunatics from the asylums, the German police were paralysed by the occupation and the criminal scum of the underworld had their hands free.

The collapse of the Napoleonic empire arrested the progress of penetration of the Jews in German society. The movement of reaction began in Frankfurt, which sent the signal. In January 1814, hardly had the French left the city than the municipality restored the effectiveness of the ancient legislation. The Jews were excluded from meetings dealing with municipal interests, access to numerous professions was closed to them, they were refused permission to marry, and once again they were segregated in separate districts.

The struggle of the Senate against the Jews of Frankfurt went on for 9 years (1815–1824). The Jews appealed to the highest authorities, but in response to the memorandum submitted to them, the five jurisconsultants of the Faculty of Berlin seriously declared that, by virtue of the regulation of 1616, the Jews of Frankfurt must remain subordinated, almost the serfs, of the bourgeoisie of this city.

With Frankfurt as an example, the three Hanseatic cities of Germany also resolved to protect themselves against the Jews. At Hamburg, for example, the Senate was favourable to them, but the people, as everywhere, were hostile to them.

At Lübeck and Bremen, they were expelled. Hanover, Hildesheim, Brunswick, Hessen also annulled their privileges. Only the states of Saxony-Weimar, Hesse-Cassel and Württemberg emancipated their Jews.

Germany was therefore more prudent than the France of King Louis XVIII. In the Habsburg states, the liberal traditions of Joseph II were abandoned and some of the ancient traditions promulgated by Maria Theresa were restored. New laws of exception were added to these. The Jews were not expelled, but sent to the ghettos.

Access of Tyrol remained closed, as to the Protestants. In Bohemia, they were even prohibited from living in villages and small towns in the mountains; in Moravia, by contrast, they were prohibited from residing in large cities, like Brunn or Olmütz. Emperor Francis II nevertheless ennobled a few rich Jews.

Anti-Jewish literary agitation aroused passions and caused disturbances for several years. The Kantian Jakob Friedrich Fries (1773–1843), a student of Fichte, physician and professor of natural sciences at Heidelberg, published a work entitled *L'influence dangereuse des juifs sur le bien-être et le caractère allemands*, in which he did not hesitate to advocate the annihilation of Judaism.

Among Fries' imitators, Professor Frederick Rühs of the University of Berlin also became the interpreter of popular sentiment. In January 1816, in a work entitled *Revendication des droits civils par les juifs d'Allemagne*, he refused citizenship to Jews and proposed to subject them, as elsewhere, to the payment of a tax and the wearing of a distinctive sign.

Another professor, a certain Dr. Koppe, said in one of his brochures that educated Jews were a "cosmopolitan scum", and they should be "tracked down and expelled wherever they are found".

The disorders began at Würzburg in March 1819. Mobs pillaged Jewish-owned houses and stores and threw their merchandise out the windows to the cry of *Hep! Hep!* (derived from the initials of the words *Hierosolyma est perdita* ("Down with Jerusalem")). The Jews defended themselves stubbornly, and there were real battles in the streets, with injuries and deaths. Order was only restored by military intervention. The municipality then decided upon the expulsion of the Jews, and nearly 400 families were compelled to leave the city. The Jews went to camp temporarily in the fields and in neighbouring villages.

These scenes were renewed in Bamberg, and in almost all the cities of Franconia. As soon as anyone saw a Jew, he was pursued with cries of *Jude verrecke!* ("Death to the Jews!") The people were incensed.

On 9 and 10 August, at Frankfurt, the Jews were insulted in public places and on the promenades, showered with stones; their houses attacked and pillaged. The rioters turned their fury against the estate of the financier Rothschild. The diet of the Confederation, which met at Frankfurt, called upon troops from Mayence. But, despite the presence of the soldiers, the troubles continued a few more days. Numerous Jews sold their immovable property and left town, but there was little bloodshed.

At Darmstadt, Bayreuth, the people rioted against the Jews and they were expelled from Meinungen. At Karlsruhe, early in the morning of 18 August, the words "Death to the Jews!" were found written on the walls of the synagogue and the homes of notable Jews. There were also disorders and disturbances at Hamburg. In a small town in Bavaria, a synagogue was invaded and the rolls of the Law were torn up.

During this same period, a famous ritual murder, committed a few

years before, that of Andreas von Rinn, created an immense sensation in Germany. Ritual murder scandals were a regular occurrence in the Middle Ages, almost 150 such murders having been recorded since the Norwich murder in 1144.

In 1816, the famous Grimm brothers compiled an old story in the first volume of their German folk tales: little Anderl (Andreas) Oxner, a 3-year-old boy, was murdered on 12 July 1462 by foreign Jews at his village of Rinn, in the north Tyrol. It was in 1475, that, after the murder of Simon of Trent, the bones of little Anderl were transferred to the parish church of Rinn. The history was only popularised around 1620, by Hippolyte Guarinoni, a physician from Halle, Saxony. In 1642, Guarinoni published a work on the murder entitled *Triumphal Martyr's Crown and Epitaphe of the Innocent Holy Child*. The place of the crime, Judenstein, near Rinn, became a popular site for pilgrimages. It was this story that the famous Grimm brothers resurrected in turn. In 1893, the book *Four Tyrolian Child Victims of Hassidic Fanaticism*, by the Viennese preacher Joseph Deckert, which gave new life to the story of little Anderl. In 1953, after the Second World War, the feast of Anderl von Rinn was erased from the calendar of religious holidays by the bishop of Innsbruck, Paul Rusch. In 1985, the bones of the martyr were even removed from the parish church, and in 1994, the cult of the child at the Judenstein was prohibited by Bishop Reinhold Stecher. Nevertheless, nothing changed, and a pilgrimage to the Judenstein of Rinn still takes place each year, on the Sunday following the 12th of July.

## 118

### The Rothschild Era

At that time, the Rothschild brothers alone personified the triumph of high finance in Europe. Moses Amschel, their father, born in 1743, was first employed at the Oppenheim bank of Hannover. When he bought the old house At The Red Sign in the Judengasse (Jew Alley) in Frankfurt, he took the name as his own, and became Rothschild (the red sign).

At London, Nathan, one of the Rothschild sons, after becoming a fierce adversary of Napoleon, largely financed Wellington's undertakings. The latter would no doubt have encountered the severest difficulties in provisioning his troops in Spain if he had not received indispensable financial aid from the Rothschilds.

We know that the Rothschild fortune was built on the defeat of the French armies at Waterloo, in 1815. Informed of the outcome of the battle before others, Nathan Rothschild arrived at the London stock market pretending to look upset, causing a panic which permitted him to buy up all the stocks that other people had sold at low prices.

This famous episode inspired a few verses by Victor Hugo, who saw him at work:

"Hat's off, old man, this passerby made a fortune; while you were pouring out your blood, he sold short, driving the prices down, then waited for them to rise and then sell, to ensure that our fall would be further and more certain – a vulture was needed to devour our dead, and he did the job."

Upon the death of old Amschel, his five sons divvied up Europe between themselves: Nathan went to London in 1804, while James went to Paris: Salomon went to Vienna, Charles took Naples, while Anselmo the elder, who bore his father's name, kept the house at Frankfurt. The five Rothschilds thus controlled the great financial markets by keeping themselves informed of what was happening everywhere.

In all the countries of Europe, with the exception of Russia, the Rothschilds lent money to the nation-states while Jewish financial manipulators weighed down heavily upon all European governmental decisions. Salomon, at Vienna, became the personal friend of Metternich, before whom he maintained an intelligence agent, Gentz,

the Chancellor's real right arm. The Pope himself contracted a loan from the Rothschilds. The bankers were invited into the salons of high society, and, soon, the greatest families of the European aristocracy were permitting marriages with these parvenus of high finance.

The Paris revolution of 1830 brought the Orleans branch to the throne. "With the Louis Philippe government, the reign of the Jews began", writes Drumont. Rothschild placed the government loans of 1830, 1831, and 1832, enriching himself considerably with the interest. The supreme direction of French Judaism fell quite naturally to James Rothschild, who was never even naturalised a French citizen.

The poet Alfred de Vigny wrote, with regards to the revolution of July 1830: "The Jew paid for the July revolution because he manipulated the bourgeoisie more easily than the nobles". In February 1831, the rabbis began receiving a salary from the public treasury, just like Catholic priests – no doubt a tiny fraction of what they were getting behind the scenes.

King Ferdinand VII of Spain died in 1833. His brother, the infante Carlos, then found himself faced off against Ferdinand's widow, Maria Cristina, royal regent starting in 1835. The Queen set aside Salic law – which would have made Carlos heir to the throne – in favour of her daughter Isabella II. Carlos led a revolt and Spain was torn apart by the first of three "Carlist" civil wars in which governmental troops were unequipped to meet the Carlist attacks. Nathan Rothschild, to protect his interests in Spain's mercury mines (which were extremely profitable), knew full well that a Carlist victory would spell the end of his concessions, since Carlos was a man of integrity. He thus actively championed Franco-English armed intervention. His brother James came to see him at London with a view to subsidising the English military preparations in favour of the regent, thus bringing about a rise in Spanish bond prices. The Rothschild houses in London and Paris first speculated in these securities, then suddenly sold short. In a few days, the price of Spanish bonds fell from 70 to 37, after which the Rothschilds bought back at lower prices. Thousands of bond holders lost 2/3 of their investment. The loans granted to the Spanish government permitted them to win the war against Don Carlos, who went into exile. The House of Rothschild was thus destined to gain a worldwide monopoly of mercury for decades.[328]

Upon Nathan's death, in July 1836, James inherited from the business management, which he had managed from his headquarters in the Rue Lafitte, in Paris. In 1844, he negotiated a 200 million franc loan for the French government, but this time the new loan caused a scandal. The Minister of Finance was publicly accused of sacrificing



the interests of the country to those of the Rothschild Bank. As the scandal grew in importance, the banker transformed himself into a philanthropist. He withdrew a few coins from the millions extorted from the taxpayers and distributed them, ostensibly to charitable interests.

The Chamber of Deputies then decided that the railways would be built and operated by private interests. The northern railways contract was awarded to Rothschild, which created a scandal, since the adjudication procedure had not been respected. For the financiers, this was yet another excellent deal. They created belief in a catastrophe from one moment to the next, as a result of which the English government sold all its shares, causing a collapse in the share price. Small French shareholders sold out in haste, but, warned by his brother from London, the Rothschild of Paris purchased on the sly. When calm returned, the shares recovered their normal prices, and the banker made several million francs more.[329]

The international crisis of 1840 revealed once again the influence of Jewish bankers on European governments. That year, on the margin of the Turko-Egyptian dispute, an event occurred in Damas, a partly Christian city, that made a lot of noise. Father Thomas, a Capucin monk, mysteriously disappeared. His body was found in the month of March (after the feast of Purim),[330] in the sewers of the Jewish quarter. The French consul Ratti-Menton blamed his disappearance on members of the Jewish community, and supported the investigations underway against Jewish notables, accused of ritual murder. At Paris, Adolphe Thiers, who had just been appointed President of the Council by Louis Philippe, expressed support for the French consul. But the Jewish financiers Fould and Rothschild threw all their weight in the balance, and launched a campaign of defamation against Thiers, who was dragged through the mud by the newspapers which they controlled. The Minister responded to them in the tribune of the Chamber: "You demand in the name of the Jews, and I, I demand in the name of a Frenchman!"

The indicted Jews confessed to the murder one after the other. Ten of them were sentenced to death, but they were all saved thanks to the action of the international financiers and representatives of "the community". The Jewish historian Léon Poliakov writes here: "The Rothschilds finally won by threatening to short-sell the country's annuity bonds; President Thiers was compelled to resign. The Jews then began a struggle for the rehabilitation of the victims of this medieval calumny, and finished by winning their case after British intervention. But it had been a close call, and the matter led to the

founding of various Jewish defence organisations, beginning with the Alliance Israelite Universelle.[331]

Napoleon III rather favoured the Rothschilds' competitors, that is, the bankers Fould and Pereira, both of whom were Jews, too. But the Rothschild bank was always on the spot. In 1870, when the Prussian armies invaded France, Wilhelm I, Bismarck and Moltke moved into the Rothschild château at Ferrière to host Jules Favre and negotiate the indemnities to be imposed upon the vanquished French. Their "accountant" was the Jewish financier Bleichröder, who enjoyed Bismarck's confidence. On the French side, the negotiations were carried out by a friend of his, Alphonse Rothschild. They both agreed upon the figure of five billion francs, which France was to pay to Germany. The French Jew was strongly suspected of suggesting this figure to his fellow-Jew. The Rothschild profits from the loan which inevitably resulted were in fact proportional to the amount. Not a single member of the Reichstag or Chamber of Deputies stood up to protest this decision on either side. The lead mines in Spain, the nickel mines in New Caledonia, the diamond mines of South Africa, etc. remained in their hands. Thus, the Rothschilds kept their hegemony until the end of the century. Their power in Europe was only broken – temporarily – by Adolf Hitler.

119

France: Anti-Semitic Fumblings

Observers noted that Jewish financiers had acquired unbelievable power, but the political plan inherent in Judaism was not yet understood at that time. The French were undoubtedly not sufficiently familiar with the newcomers. France had approximately 70,000 Jews in 1840, two thirds of whom lived in Alsace and in Lorraine. This community grew from year to year, increased by Jews from Germany and Austria, much more numerous, and who came from the great "Pale", in Russia. The Jews flowed westwards towards the liberal paradise where everything was finally permitted to them. Liberalism, in politics as in economics, in fact favoured the Jews, who were better suited for banking, speculation and international trade, and who were, moreover, utterly lacking in scruples where the goyim were concerned.

In France, as in Germany, the socialist extreme-left was naturally impregnated with anti-Semitism at that time, since those who had eyes to see could confirm that, apparently, the supply of gold bullion and ducats was controlled chiefly by Jews. Charles Fourier (1772–1873) distinguished himself in this field.[332]

His disciple, Alphonse Toussenel, from Lorraine (1803–1885) went even further in this direction. He was thus the first to sound the alarm, with his book *Le Juifs rois de l'époque*, sub-titled *Histoire de la féodalité financière*, in 1844. The work no doubt enjoyed a certain success, since it was reprinted in 1846. It was a denunciation of the takeover of the economy by Jewish financiers. The text, one must say, has aged badly, and is hardly of any interest today, apart from the introduction cited above (in the chapter "The Conquest of Judea by the Romans"), which terminates with these words: "Ask these Jews, who earn a hundred million per year off the French people, whether they are really so anxious to see the walls of Zion which they weep and wail about so much! [...] What people has ever been so blood-thirsty in its acts of vengeance, more persevering in its hatred and contempt for the rest of humanity, than the Jew? [...] The religion of the Jews has made them a people who are the mortal enemy of humanity". And Toussenel concluded: "The Jews never become victim any longer than the time required for them to become persecutors. Whether the State which imprudently granted them civil rights, and thereby creates new masters,

and whether France, guilty of surrendering too quickly to the impulses of its generous charity, is already their slave".[333]

In October 1847, the *Archives Israelites* published an article by a certain Cahen, who said frankly: "The Messiah came for us on 28 February 1790, with the Declaration of Human Rights". This same year, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the principal theoretician of socialism, who opposed Karl Marx, wrote in his *Carnets*: "Rothschild, Crémieux, Marx and Fould are wicked, bilious, envious beasts who hate us. Whether by iron or fire, or by expulsion, the Jew must disappear." Like Voltaire, Proudhon forgot his anticlericalism when he found himself face to face with a Jew: "The Jew is the enemy of the human race. This race must be sent to Asia, or exterminated."

The revolution of 1848 obviously failed to solve the problem. "France has only changed its Jews", said Proudhon. Actually, James Rothschild didn't have to suffer much from the Parisian revolution. Only his villa at Suresne was pillaged and burnt, but he managed to obtain compensation. On the other hand, he had the satisfaction of seeing two of his Jewish friends appointed ministers in the republican government: Crémieux, in the Ministry of Justice, and Gouchaux, in the Ministry of Finance. The Alsatians, at least, took advantage of the opportunity, attacked the usurers, and took back their pledges and banknotes, weapons in hand. They were acquitted at Colmar in the midst of the crowd's applause, after a final pleading by M. de Sèze, which was an implacable summation against the Jews. This was the last "pogrom" in France.

"In 1790", writes Edouard Drumont in *La France juive*, "the Jew arrives; under the First Republic and first Empire, he enters, he creeps about, he looks for his place; under the Restoration and the July Monarchy, he sits in the salon; under the Second Empire, he sleeps in the bed; under the Third Republic, he begins to expel the French from their own homes or forces them to work for him".

Under the Second Empire, the Jews already had the power to censor or prohibit works or plays which they didn't like. Thus, in 1854, an attempt was made to produce the play *Le Juif de Venise*, an adaptation of Shakespear's *Merchant of Venice*, at the Ambigu-Comique theatre, but the horrible Jewish usurer had already become a banal Venetian usurer, and the play was produced under the original title, *Shylock ou le Marchand de Venise*. [334]

In 1867, Gustave Tridon, a follower of the famous Auguste Blanqui, composed his book entitled *Du Molochisme juif*, which was only published in 1884, at Brussels. Gustave Tridon, proclaimed the superiority of "Indo-Aryan" over "Semitic" culture. To Tridon,

Judaism was a survival of the blood worship of Moloch, an iron statue heated red hot into the mouth of which the Phoenicians threw living infants. For him, Christianity was contrary to the Aryan tradition; for his part, he professed atheism. "The Semites", he wrote, "are the shadow in the picture of civilisation, the evil genius of the earth. All their gifts are plagues. Fighting the Semitic spirit and ideas is the supreme task of the Indo-Aryan race".

Among "conservatives", anti-Semitic feeling was very weak. Louis Rupert, in *L'Église et la Synagogue*, in 1859, accused the Jews of being the principal receivers of stolen goods:

"The Jew will never engage in business dealings with Christians without being motivated by a desire to deceive. Dreaming only of dirty tricks, he receives from all hands and without scruple the fruit of sacrilegious thefts committed to their prejudice, and teaches criminals to perfect their art. In vain does one search for a sect more dishonest, more dangerous and more harmful to the Christian people than the filthy sect of the Jews. Night and day, these men only apply themselves to meditating on the means to destroy and overthrow the power of the Christians. They resort to every conceivable kind of fraud and insinuate themselves everywhere, with all the apparent signs of benevolence, friendship or a trade full of charms".[335]

Father Auguste Ratisbonne, a former Jew of Alsatian origin, having become a Catholic priest, wrote, in 1868, in *La Question juive*: "Naturally skilful, ingenious and possessed by the instinct of domination, the Jews have gradually invaded all the avenues leading to riches, dignities, and power. They direct the stock exchanges, the press, the theatre, literature, the administrations, the great pathways of communication on land and sea, and, due to the influence of their fortune and their genius, they've got Christian society completely locked up, like a prisoner in leg irons".[336]

It was not until 1869 that a book appeared informing the French people of the fearful crimes enabled by Jewish power. In his 550-page book, entitled *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, Roger Gougenot des Mousseaux, a *valet de chambre* of Charles X, analysed the Jewish problem in depth. This book contains numerous elements which the reader to grasp the nature of Judaism, but reading it is sometimes tedious. Gougenot, a witness to German and Italian unification, wrote, quite correctly: "Before our very eyes, from one end of the earth to the other, the political, economic and commercial work, led or dragged by societies from the hidden world of which the Jews are the princes, have set about to brew the project of great cosmopolitan unity everywhere, all at once, and with an

indefatigable ardour. This is the name, in modern jargon, for the system in which all borders are to be abolished, or, if you prefer, in which the concept of each particular nation associated with each individual people or nationality is to be replaced by one great universal nation of which all men are to be members. Now, this unity, which demands a head, is it not preparing for the formation, the prodigious advent, of one *sole and supreme master*?"[337]

The Jewish plan of worldwide unification was thus mentioned for the first time, although far too succinctly.

## 120

### The Romanian Interference Policy

Jewish power, comfortably installed in Europe, and particularly in Austria, in France and in England, was working inexorably to destabilise the countries in which the Jews no longer still enjoyed "equal rights", that is, for predators, the right to establish implacable domination. At that time, only Russia and Romania continued to resist them.

The Crimean War (1853–1856), led by England and the France of Napoleon III against Russia, was a war for "democracy". The pretext was the occupation of the Danubian Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, torn away from the Ottoman Empire, and the threat of control of the Black Sea straits by Russia. But first and foremost, it was a question of weakening an authoritarian monarchy in the name of "Human Rights" and the "emancipation" of the Jews. According to Duke Ernest of Coburg, who describes it in his *Mémoires*, Rothschild is said to have declared that any sums of money would be available for a war against Czarist Russia, which was resisting Jewish power at the time.

After the Crimean War, the Treaty of Paris of 1856 put an end to the Russian protectorate. In 1859, the Danubian Principalities established a unified Romanian state. In 1866, the crown of Romania was offered to the young German Prince Karl von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen (Carol I). The new state contained many Jews of Ukrainian and Galician origin who had no civil rights – as in neighbouring Russia – which never deterred them from exploiting, pillaging, and holding the peasantry and workers to ransom as they saw fit. But they wanted political domination, too. On the same day that members of Parliament began discussing the question of the emancipation of the Jews in July 1866, anti-Jewish riots broke out in Budapest and the new synagogue was demolished. The same thing happened in the city of Iasi, where there was a large Jewish population.

In the spring of 1867, the Minister of the Interior Ion Bratianu issued a decree prohibiting the Jews from residing in rural localities, from keeping hotels and cabarets and from renting immovable property. Jews were expelled from villages and others were sent over the Romanian border. These expulsions culminated in the drowning of two Jews in the Galati River on 30 June 1867.

This was all too much for Adolphe Crémieux, who was the head of the French Jewish community at the time. Adolphe Crémieux, real name Isaac-Jacob Crémieux, had been Minister of Justice in 1848. A lawyer and president of the Consistoire Israelite of Paris, Crémieux was a Frenchman "from the south", "perfectly-well integrated", as they always say. In 1860, Crémieux and his friends founded the Alliance Israelite Universelle at Paris, the object of which was to assist the Jews to obtain civil rights everywhere, in all countries. Crémieux used his great influence in political and financial circles to defend the interests of his Romanian fellow Jews. In 1866, he was already interfering in Czarist Russia: "At Saratov, a group of Jews were accused of ritual murder. Adolphe Crémieux went to Saratov and succeeded in obtaining their acquittal", writes Poliakov.[338]

In 1870, Crémieux was appointed Minister of Justice for the new French Republic. He immediately granted French nationality to his fellow Jews of Algeria, 40,000 of them, even while Prussian armies were still on the national soil. This decision rightfully awakened the tenacious rancour of the Moslems against the French.

Crémieux then went to occupy himself with his fellow Jews in Romania. In Western Europe, the great press, controlled by Jewish finance, waxed indignant, stamped its feet, and screamed its head off. At Vienna, Paris and London, many stories of Romanian "atrocities" were published in Vienna, Paris and London. There was a flood of articles taking the defence of these "poor Jews" being persecuted for "no reason at all". The Alliance Israelite organised meetings, contacted ministers. Compelling the Romanian government to give the Jews their "civil rights" was said to be an absolute necessity.

Crémieux left for Bucharest, accompanied by another indefatigable defender of the Jewish cause, "Sir" Moses Montefiore, a former mayor of London, elected in 1837, now aged 83. Queen Victoria, who had just ascended the throne of England, immediately knighted him, in 1837, making him a baron in 1846.

Crémieux arrived on the scene just as the Romanian constitution was being discussed in Bucharest. He proposed to the government that Romanian Jews be granted civil and political equality with Romanian non-Jews in exchange for a loan of 25 million francs at modest interest. The offer was so attractive that the cabinet hesitated. Quite fortunately, that very day, the people, galvanised by the great anti-Semitic journal *Trompeta Carpatilor*, invaded the court of the Palace and the Jewish quarter, and sacked a synagogue, which led to the withdrawal of the project. Romanians expressed an open hostility to the Jews from that day onwards, while the Jews watched and waited for another opportunity.



Crémieux and Montefiore received promises from King Carol I, but the riots and expulsions continued. A series of violent incidents, mostly beatings and expulsions by brute force – caused in particular by Jews stealing sacred vessels from Orthodox churches and throwing them into latrines – led to direct and forceful intervention by Napoleon III, very much influenced by the recriminations of the Alliance Israelite. From that time onwards, the Romanians also criticised the Jews for picking quarrels with its principal source of international support, France, while natural sympathies between the two nations were reciprocal. The trade treaty facilitating exports and imports with the European powers was only signed by Austria – France, England, and Italy, manipulated by Jewish finance, withdrew.

An anti-Jewish riot broke out again on 24 January 1872, at Ismail, after a theft committed by a Jew in a cathedral. Mob violence and looting broke out on 30 January in the city of Cahul and continued for several days. On 6 February 1872 and 14 April 1873, two new laws were voted: one relating to the sale of tobacco, and the other on spirits. The fact is that these two laws affected big Jewish merchants first of all, just like the law of 1867, since the provision regarding hotels and cabarets was obviously aimed at combating pimping and prostitution, which were, as usual, very largely controlled by Hebrew criminals. The Jew Léon Gambetta, who governed republican France, told the Romanian envoy at that time that France would not recognise Romania until the country recognised the civil rights of all Jews without distinction. In 1874, England was also ruled by a Jew, Benjamin Disraeli, who was at the head of the English government until April 1880. Disraeli belonged to the Conservative party, and was one of the intimate friends of Queen Victoria.

In 1878, Romania, which had participated in the Russo-Turkish war, gained its complete independence and became a kingdom. The International Congress of Berlin, the same year, discussed the fate of the Jews at great length. The recognition of the independence of Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania, now freed from the Turkish yoke, was then linked to the granting of “equality” to the Jews of the country! The Western powers, which sanctioned the “emancipation”, demanded, in fact, in return, the accession of the Jews to the quality of citizens. But the Romanian Minister Bratianu resisted, responding that there was no question of granting the rights of citizenship to the Jews, who kept the brothels and cabarets, supplied all the poisoned alcohol and ran the usury shops. The Romanians finally signed, taking all possible expedients to evade the law; by dint of diplomacy, they caused the system of individual naturalisation to prevail, which only benefited about a thousand Jews in the whole country, for a period of 10 years. It

was only in 1923 that a new constitution was introduced which extended Romanian nationality to all Jewish residents.

It is hard to believe, but true, that the Jews were attracted to living in Romania despite their past expulsions, but there were nearly 300,000 of them in the country by the end of the 19th century. In Moldavia, they owned the commercial houses to the tune of 70 to 94%, while most of the physicians at Iasi were Jews. This is what led to the governmental decision to restrict the number of places granted to Jews in schools and universities.[339]

In reply, in 1885, the Judeo-French government imposed a tax of 50% on all Romanian products – a veritable trade blockade.

On the other side of the Black Sea straits, in the Ottoman Empire, very influential Jews occupied positions at the Sultan's side, acting for the most part behind a Moslem mask.[340]

A few years before, in 1862, a great popular novel originally written in Greek appeared in London entitled *The Devil in Turkey*. The action takes place at Constantinople under the reign of Sultan Mahmud, in 1827. In chapter 26, entitled "The Communion of the Jews", the author, Stephane Xenos, shows the Sultan and his Greek advisor, Daniel Kokkalas, lost in the alleys of the Jewish quarter of Balat. They meet a group of angry Greeks, because the Jews had kidnapped a young Greek and were holding him captive in a synagogue. The sultan, who wished "to see with his own eyes these abominable things the Jews do", followed the Greeks and entered the synagogue by force. It was here that Mahmud had confirmation of the calumnies circulated against the Jews:

"As soon as they kidnap a child from his parents, they nourish it on pigeons, nuts and other things like that. When the unfortunate victim is big enough, they put him in a big barrel full of nails on the inside. They then roll the barrel to empty the child of his blood. They bury the body in secret and share the blood in the synagogues for their communion. They do this horrible and abominable thing for two reasons. They say, if Jesus is really the awaited Messiah, we will obey his commandment: 'Take and drink, this is my blood shed for you'. If not, we mock him as he deserves" (page 384).

Actually, the Sultan discovered the famous barrel with the body of a child in the cellar of the rabbi, Benvista.

Stephanos Xenos added the following dialogue between the Sultan and the rabbi: "Thus, therefore, you have had this horrible custom for centuries".

"For centuries, your Majesty", was the reply, "but not all Jews, only a heresy".[341]

## 121

### Criminality in Germany

As in previous times, the Jews were largely over-represented among criminals. A.F. Thiele, a high official, Royal Commissioner of Prussia, published a two-volume book in Berlin in 1841 entitled *Die jüdischen Gauner in Deutschland, ihre Taktik, ihre Eigenthümlichkeit, ihre Sprache* (*Jewish Criminals in Germany: Their Tactic, Their Particularities, Their Language*). Due to the nature of his functions, Thiele had simply observed that the Jewish community produced the biggest crooks and the most dangerous criminals.[342] Using police files and records, he describes the “underworld”, the mentality of the crooks, the nomadism of the Jews, their usurpation of identities, and the extensive scope of their criminal activities. His aim was to facilitate the task of the German police, to show how the organised gangs operated, to supply investigators with a working tool. He denied that he was anti-Jewish: his work was simply that of a criminologist. The first edition of the book “auf Kosten des Verfassers”, i.e., published at the author’s expense, was sold out in 2 months.[343]

“In Germany”, he writes, at the beginning of his work, “there are Jewish and Christian crooks, but there is an over-representation of Jews among delinquents [...] While they are less numerous, Jewish crooks are the most dangerous, both by reason of their intelligence and their skill, as well as by their agility in committing their crimes”. They also use a particular jargon, full of Hebrew expressions. One chapter of the book (pages 195–328 of volume I), analyses the language utilised by these crooks to avoid being understood by Christians. The author mentions the ancient books which speak of this language, particularly a small dictionary of thieves’ cant published in 1520, printed at Frankfurt, *Liber vagatorum*, containing 200 words. There was also the *Expertus in truphis*, dating back to 1623; *Die Rotwelsche Grammatic*, published in 1620, among others.[344]

Jewish crooks, we learn, have existed “for centuries, no doubt ever since there were Jews in Germany.” The *Liber vagatorum* of 1520 already spoke of their criminal activities. In the 18th century, two sources mentioned Jewish crooks: “Wherever they appear, they strut around like rich bankers or merchants, dressed with refinement, their fingers covered with gold rings, with gold watches in their pockets; it

was thus that they appeared in the cities; and always with the best passports and documents" (vol. I, p. 11).

The crooks always introduced themselves as "merchants", since, in their language, "handeln" (to trade) is synonymous with "steal" (stehlen). Their great meeting places were the fairs, the great markets of Leipzig and Frankfurt. "Much more than Christian crooks, the Jewish crooks are always in constant contact with each other." It was a Mafia, with its principles and its community links. "When they meet, even if they never saw each other before, they become *Chawern* (comrades) and steal together" (p. 16). All over Germany they recognise each other by name or by sight.

Jewish crooks formed a single large family. They marry each other, and the wife of a Jewish crook had her role to play. When her husband was arrested, she made an effort to wipe out all the evidence, going to see the judge and making "a scene, crying and lamenting and showing her children, explaining to the judge that her husband is innocent and the victim of a legal mistake".

"When they are arrested", writes Thiele, "they have one great rule which they never violate: always deny. They always deny everything in the most inflexible manner. The Jewish crook is unexcelled in skilfulness and effrontery and in the art of lying" (p. 17). Jewish crooks call "brav" one who always denies the facts before the authorities and who never denounces his accomplices.

They constitute a closed society and were the fiercest enemies of laws and institutions. "The word 'fellow-citizen' is unknown to them, since they have only 'comrades'. They have no 'neighbour' and therefore no obligation to him. Their aim is to harm third parties, whether Jews or Christians; attaining this aim is the sole purpose of their lives" (p. 19).[345]

At the beginning of the 19th century, justice was obviously not very strict. Defendants got out of prison rapidly, and were often pardoned or released for lack of proof. What is more, escapes were frequent. Sometimes crooks were simply conducted back to the border. They continued their activities elsewhere in Germany or returned to their favourite hunting grounds. It was all the police could do to interrupt their criminal activities from time to time by imprisoning them for a few years. There was no particular severity, therefore, towards Jewish crooks.

In 1807, Ruben Abraham, who had already been sentenced on numerous occasions, committed a burglary at Wolfenbüttel with his gang of burglars, during the course of which they mistreated and grievously wounded the owner. The leader of the gang, Rammelsberg, was executed by decapitation in 1815 (p. 55 of vol. II).

In 1808, Kirsch Abraham stole 1,500 thalers in gold from a merchant. He was arrested and received 90 lashes with a whip and 10 blows with a stick. Four years later, together with his gang (Gutkind, Rosenthal, Schwerin, Reinhardt, Manheim), he offended again and stole 2,500 thalers from a proprietor whom they beat up; the victim died of his injuries. They escaped from prison then continued their thefts, beating several victims to death. They were arrested and sentenced to 20 years in prison, but Kirsch Abraham succeeded in escaping again.

We are surprised by the number of these Jewish crooks and by the scope of their activities: they had all been arrested once, twice, three, four times, sentenced, imprisoned; and all offended again. Here we get the impression that the principal activity of the German or Polish Jews was theft; these crimes were committed every day. They were also accustomed to deserting when they were enrolled in the army. Here, the author presents the example of a Jew named Marcus Abraham, who preferred the life of a crook, or, again, Jacob Herz, a Dutch Jew.

Philipp Aron-Anhalt participated in the robbery of a jeweller in Magdeburg in 1810, during the Leipzig fair. His accomplices were two other Jews, Samuel Reiss and Magnus Aron Stein, and, together, they took away a fortune in diamonds. In 1811, they stole 11,000 ducats at the Leipzig fair, after which they were arrested and sentenced to 4 years imprisonment, not suspended (p. 82 of vol. II).

In 1810, a trial of a gang of criminal Jews was held at Mayence in 1810. In 1815, another trial was held at Munster, but the Jews had fled.

Here, again, is the case of Moses Levin Altenburger (p. 74): "He wears gold rings on his fingers. His face provides a glimpse of unimaginable ruse, malice, mendaciousness and trickery... In searching his body we found several gold pieces in his mouth". He had succeeded in stealing 2,500 thalers in gold during the Braunschweig fair in 1816. He was constantly being arrested, sentenced mildly or released for lack of evidence, then he reoffended a little while later. He was always changing cities: Breslau, Berlin, Braunschweig, etc. He admitted to 48 thefts with violence.

The author cites a study drawn up at Kassel between 1836 and 1818, based on police inquiries, and relating to 650 Jewish crooks. Many fled to Austria or Bohemia after escaping from German prisons. From there, they committed crimes in Prussia and Saxony. Many of them also committed crimes in Amsterdam or elsewhere in Holland.

The Moses Levin Löwenthal case attracted the particular attention of the Royal Commissioner (vol. I, pp. 21-69): At Berlin, in 1830, numerous merchants were burglarised, and the sums stolen were

“enormous”: 9,000 thalers stolen from a merchant, 2,500 thalers in gold stolen from another, etc. The guilty parties were arrested. They were Jewish crooks: the Nekly brothers, who had an accomplice in the person of the merchant Moses Levin Löwenthal, an expert swindler. The police found the loot in his house, hidden in pots of flowers and under the floorboards. Witnesses formally recognised him, which did not keep him from fiercely denying everything. Levin Löwenthal then offered to “trade” the names of a gang of Jewish crooks in Berlin, in exchange for the promise of a pardon. The judge accepted the bargain. Löwenthal then admitted to 37 other burglaries and denounced about 30 Jewish crooks, 14 of whom were immediately arrested. The Nelky brothers and another Jew, Samuel Moses Sachse, succeeded in taking flight.

Among those arrested, was a criminal, Samuel Jonas, who had committed several crimes in foreign countries and had been hiding in Berlin since 1816. He was married to a Jewess, with whom he had 8 children. Another was Joseph Adolph Rosenthal, nicknamed “Fats”. He was a robber who had already been arrested and imprisoned at Posen in 1820. He then worked for a police agency for a while, then lapsed back into crime.

All these fine people formed a gang, named *Chawrusse* or *Chawre* (Jewish mafia of Berlin). The Chawrusse was a criminal organisation, a mafia, with its rules, its functioning, its financing, its solidarity.

On 11 May 1831, Levin Löwenthal was freed after paying his bail. Before being released, he admitted to another 28 thefts with violence. Since he refused to betray any more of his accomplices, he was refused the promised pardon. In June 1831, 34 Jews were jailed. All denied the facts, which caused serious problems to the police, due to the fact that they hadn’t found anything compromising in the houses of many of them.

One of them, Hirsch Salomon Wohlauser, had already been arrested and imprisoned for swindling in the fall of 1830. Furious for having been “traded” by Löwenthal, he decided to tell the judge the truth, for the first time in his life. On 27 October 1831, he confessed to 54 thefts with violence, implicating in passing the one who had “traded” him, who was suddenly re-arrested.

On the other side, the testimonies were accumulating against Rosenthal (“Fats”), who finally cracked. In tears, he confessed to more than 200 thefts with violence, including burglaries, and 36 miscellaneous robberies between 1799 and 1812, between Berlin, Magdeburg and Posen (ex-Polish city formerly called Poznan, recently annexed by Prussia). The number of thefts and crimes was so high that

the Prussian Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior decided to set up a commission of inquiry to list all the criminal acts committed by this mafia. They then used Rosenthal, who was infiltrated into the Jewish criminal underworld.

Joseph Adolph Rosenthal was born in 1778. He began his career as a petty chicken thief, often arrested, and always reoffending. Between two burglaries and arrests, Rosenthal married a Christian, who converted to Judaism.

In November 1813, Rosenthal and his accomplices burglarised a priest, Abbot Friedrychowitsch, in the duchy of Posen. Rosenthal, Simon Reinhardt, Salomon Levin Altenburger, etc. broke into the presbytery, but the Abbot and his vicar were awakened by the noise, the noise of about ten burglars. Friedrychowitsch, who was young and strong, beat up the Jewish criminal Simon Reinhardt, who stayed down for the count. The other brigands arrived and the two men of the Church were beaten, tied up and tortured. The priest confessed where his savings were hidden: in the church, behind the altar. The Jews stole the money as well as the objects of worship. But the loot didn't seem enough to them, and they went back to their two victims to start torturing them again, but couldn't get any more confessions. The next day, the two clerics were found tied up and "close to death" (vol. I, p. 134). The priest died of his injuries some little time afterwards.

In 1816, Rosenthal was arrested at Memel in flagrante delicto while pillaging a shop, at night, with his Jewish accomplices. They were sentenced to 40 lashes with a whip and 6 months in prison. In November 1818, thefts were reported in Silesia, and Rosenthal was again implicated in the case. After this, the story is a whole succession of pillages, burglaries and robberies of peasants, with or without violence.

In the night of 31 March to 1 April 1823, the Gusow pension fund was looted, in the course of which Rosenthal and Wolff Strasburger stole 300 thalers. There were a great many other crimes, and we note here that these Jews always went after Christians: inn-keepers, peasants, royal customs offices, priests, funds, merchants, pig raisers, etc.

Thiele commented as follows: "He is the strangest man I ever met. His appearance didn't correspond to his record in any way. His face showed nothing wrong or twisted. He looked good-natured and without fault. Everywhere he went he made a good impression, since he was likeable" (vol. I, p. 131).

The lair of this mafia was located in the region of Posen, which had been infested for a long time: "In approximately 1800, an inquiry into a

large gang of Jewish gangsters had already been opened at Posen. At this time, the Prussian part of Poland, known as South Prussia, was filled with Jews who, without homeland or domicile, led the lives of nomads, living together in the middle of the fields, in the countryside. Their activities escaped all control by the authorities" (p. 43).

The consequence of this situation was the appearance of a governmental decree which prohibited any Jew from staying in the villages. Thus it was that the 16 families of criminals residing in a village named Groschov were driven into exile. The bandits then went to live at Betsche, a small town of 1,200 people, where police surveillance was less strict. In 1832, this small village of Betsche was therefore known to the police in Berlin and even all over Germany as the lair of Jewish criminals and their families.

Between 1806 and 1815, this region of Posen had been integrated into the new duchy of Warsaw, created by Napoleon, and criminal activities there exploded. We understand here that the Jews feared Prussian domination more than the Polish administration, which seemed less well-organised and less likely to disturb and repress their actions, with the result that about 40 additional Jewish families moved to Betsche. Jews represented a quarter of the population of the municipality, which had acquired a terrible reputation at the time: Betsche became "the capital, the central point, of criminal activities, not only in Prussia, but all over Germany". Fugitives were welcomed, concealed and protected.

It was difficult to cleanse the village, due to the fact that the evidence was difficult to gather and due to their clannish solidarity. But the Prussian police did their best:

On 19 January 1832, the German commissioners and policemen left Berlin with the legal documents required to conduct a search, and on 20 January 1832, at 4:00 A.M. – on the Sabbath (because the Jews were at home and easier to find) – they began their arrests. The entire village was sealed off by gendarmes, assisted by the local authorities, so as to keep the Jews from escaping: all the houses occupied by the criminals were searched, and the information obtained permitted other arrests, as far away as Frankfurt am Oder.

In all 59 persons were arrested in the duchy of Posen; 22 at Frankfurt am Oder; and all were sent to Berlin for questioning. At their homes, the police discovered large sums of money in cash (12,000 thalers, an astronomical sum) as well as innumerable valuables. Ten other Jewish criminals were later arrested. They had stolen 11,000 thalers all by themselves, during a robbery at Strehlen in 1830. The operation was therefore a great success.



That same year, during the great annual fair of Frankfurt am Oder, there was – for once – not a single theft! (p. 49).

Other identical commissions were then set up at Magdeburg and Austria, for there were “large numbers of Jews who had been sentenced to prison and who were there on the run”.

On 16 January 1833, a second police operation took place, on Rosenthal’s information, who continued to rat on his comrades. It finished on 15 March and permitted the recovery of a great number of stolen valuables. 23 Jews had been arrested.

Operations in Germany were snowballing in an unprecedented manner. More than 500 persons – almost all Jews – were arrested. Upon each arrest and search, the police discovered new clues still not yet exploited, leading to the discovery of yet more criminal associations. According to the records of the inquiry (pp. 132–192), Löwenthal, Rosenthal and their accomplices confessed to 800 thefts, burglaries, larcenies and various robberies over their career.

In total: 520 persons were sentenced, “most of them of the Jewish religion” (p. 50). Michel David Cohn, Wolf Cohn, Manasse Damit, Elias Dubsky, Engelmann, August Froehlich, Zaremba, Meyer Friedberg, Salomon Fürstenheim, Baruch Glanz, Christian Herbe, Julius Jacobi, Marcus Jael, Jette Klein, Loefer Meissner, etc. 29 of them succeeded in fleeing to a foreign country. Of these 520 criminals, there were only 19 Christians, and 3 baptised Jews. These Jews must have still had a great deal of gold and liquid cash hidden somewhere, since they succeeded in paying the heavy bail bonds required for their release.

“The chutzpah of these Jews”, writes the author, expressing himself in the Hebraic language of criminals, “was nearly infinite. They didn’t hesitate, during the interrogations, when they were in their cells, to exchange information on the progress of the inquiry by shouting and to fine-tune versions to tell the police. And that, under the nose of the investigators” (p. 62). But many of them received heavy prison terms.

The techniques practised by Jewish criminals were diverse and varied. There was theft with forced entry, at night, purse snatching, or traditional burglary. The last type of crime was “almost exclusively practised by Jews”. Using pick-pocketing techniques, they succeeded in stealing a few gold piece during an exchange, without the victim noticing anything. To do this, the Jewish crook arrived in a town, visited a rich merchant, a bank or bureau of exchange, and asked to change gold against local money. Using sleight-of-hand tricks, the Jew succeeded in recovering a few of the gold pieces. He then left town and the victim only realised he’d been robbed later. They have a

“monopoly” on this kind of crime, writes Thiele, and “by far exceed the skill of Christian criminals” (p. 90).

Another type of crime was classical with them: they criss-crossed the countryside swindling the peasants, selling them objects at prices far above their real value by making them believe that the object was gold when it was only plated; by selling fake silverware represented as real, etc.

Here is a classical technique: a Jew, elegantly dressed, arrives in a village. He assumes a foreign accent (French, Italian), and pretends to have lost all his money. He gives the impression of being in a hurry; he must return to his family very quickly, who live very far away. This rich traveller is therefore compelled to sell one of his objects (a vase or “gold” watch, which is simply gold-plated). The peasant thinks he is getting a bargain by buying the object for a modest sum and what’s more, he feels like he’s doing a good deed. The Jew, for his part, continues on his way to another village, where he swindles another peasant.

The Jewish criminals are born that way: “Their parents are thieves or crooks, as were their grand-parents, and their great-grandfathers as well, with the result that this characteristic is transmitted from generation to generation. At 14, the child leaves home, where he has only seen and learned evil ways. He then begins his career as a criminal. He feels he must be worthy of his masters and his ancestors” (vol. I, p. 99).

The problem was that these Jewish criminals all had children, and that therefore this criminal underworld is naturally perpetuated. It was necessary, as A.F. Thiele said, to break the links between the parents and their children, even if that seems “humanly painful”. The children of criminals would be taken in charge by an institution created by the government to re-educate them. The fact is that as adults, they were “absolutely incorrigible”. The sanctions of law never change them (p. 101). In fact, the repressive legal system was powerless to render them harmless. This is why the Prussian government reached an agreement with Russia in 1802, to deport these Jewish criminals to Siberia, where 58 criminals sentenced to life imprisonment had been sent.

One could also prevent the Jews from engaging in trade, as had already been done in Saxony. “Of 100 Jews, 90 dedicate themselves to trade”, Thiele explains, “and at least two thirds of them give themselves over to criminal activities”.

For them, trade was a pretext, a cover, a legal facade to conceal their racketeering. Hence the necessity to prohibit them from trading or travelling freely. “Any Jew who travels about Germany with his sack

on his back, who passes most of his time on the roads, in the markets and in the inns, is more or less in contact with the scum of the crooks and thieves" (vol. I, pp. 103–104). "They only bend under the yoke of public authority": they should be made "to break rocks, cut wood, or work in the fields".

Jewish criminals were also "incredibly bigoted". Some of them had been effected by the atheist movement of this century and considered that stealing on the Sabbath was not a sin, but those who felt this way were very rare. Most of them were highly orthodox, and never stole on the Sabbath; but they stole without scruple six days out of seven. Theft and brigandage were their profession. For them it was an activity like any other, and they couldn't even imagine living any other way. On the other hand, they had an infinite respect for the rabbis, the Sabbath, and the synagogue. On the Sabbath, they stayed home and didn't move. They went to the synagogue and prayed "the God of Israel to bless their commerce"! (vol. I, p. 118).

Alsace was one of the principal bases of the Jewish mafia at that time. In 1842, an inquiry was opened against two individuals in Switzerland, at Frauensfeld, in a swindling case. Starting there the investigators dismantled an entire gang of traffickers.

The Jewish gangsters had German and Swiss passports and used Alsace as their rear base for acts in Switzerland and various states of southern Germany. A.F. Thiele used a police report from the canton of Thurgau zu Frauenfeld in Switzerland to summarise this case (vol. II, pp. 1–9).

To start with, two Jews swindled a Swiss inn-keeper, taking all his savings. The inn-keeper brought a complaint, and the police identified the two thieves. They were Gabriel Leval (in reality, David Meier), Heinrich Moritz an Abraham Gottschauer, who were known for their swindles in money-changing transactions, and who were recognised by the police. Gottschauer's French passport indicated that he was born at Toul, in the department of la Meurthe. They told the police that they were travelling from Bavaria, through Basel and headed for Zurich, but their testimonies were contradictory. Finally, they denied everything, "wholesale".

Placed in preventive detention, Gottschauer and Moritz entrusted information to a young 14-year-old Jew, who shared their cell: Jakob Isak (real name: Jakob Lazarus), who lived at Rexheim near Mulhouse. The latter, interrogated, "traded" what the others had so imprudently told him. The crooks then asked their wives to supply them with an alibi, saying that they were home with their wives at the time the crime was committed, and six Jews from Altkirch (Alsace) offered to testify

in the same sense. There were also Nanette Levi von Hegenheim, Florette Mauss, Magdalena Joseph, who were ready to provide false testimony to clear Gottschauer and Moritz.

In April, Gottschauer finally confessed, "traded" names and described his life. He was a native of Baden named, in reality, Joseph Hirschberg, had had two illegitimate children with a Christian woman, Elisa Pikart, from Zurich. He then resolved to marry her, but her family were opposed, and kicked him out of the house. A rabbi from Bishofsheim married them (despite the strict prohibition against marrying a Christian), in return for "a large bribe" (p. 10). He then arranged with a French Jew from Toul, Abraham Gottschauer, to buy Gottschauer's passport for five francs. In Alsace, he met other Jews who were all gangsters. He was ready to talk, provided his family in Alsace were protected from the other criminals. This is how he came to confess to swindling the Swiss inn-keeper. A few days later, Moritz confessed in turn (his real name was Samuel Moses). These two Jews "traded" no fewer than 70 names of Jews who formed part of the same network of crooks.

They had had to flee Germany because they were wanted by the police and had holed up in Alsace. There they reorganised and planned their activities. This involved a community of approximately 100 individuals who shared the revenue from their crimes. There was no boss. In Alsace, these Jewish crooks behaved themselves, so as to avoid problems with the local authorities, and to be able to continue their affairs in the adjacent regions: Switzerland, Baden, Württemberg, Bavaria. They travelled in groups of two or three, with their families (wife and children) and were ostensibly honest hardware merchants, sleeping in inns. As soon as they sensed any danger, they holed up in Alsace to conceal themselves with their loot. The women were there to help them get out of prison, supplying them with imaginary alibis.

We see that the "human rights" ideologues had already asserted themselves, prohibiting any dissident thought, which was considered morally monstrous: "I know a fair town", Thiele writes, "in which the police prosecuted a Jew for swindling. They called him 'Jew' because they didn't know what other word to use. And what happened? The police were submerged by protests against their use of the word 'Jew', by Jews, who 'threatened to boycott the fair'" (vol. II, pp. 43–55). "They demand civil equality, they complain even more, and anybody who's against it is a barbarian, an obscurantist, which means anybody who can't recognise and appreciate the holy words *Human Rights* inscribed in gilded letters in the book of history".

122

**Austria-Hungary under the Boot**

Napoleon III's policy of favouring Italian unification was effected to the detriment of Austria, which was defeated at Magenta and Solferino (June 1859) and expelled from Northern Italy. Weakened, Catholic Austria would be once again defeated at Sadowa by Protestant Prussia, which was to play the preponderant role within the Germanic federation. The following year, in 1867, the Hungarian demands led the Austrians to compromise. The Hungarians would henceforth have their own constitution, parliament and government, while recognising the authority of the Emperor – in the case in question, Francis Joseph, who reigned until 1916.

Austria, excluded from the German states, was then the most worm-eaten country in Europe in any case. There were perhaps three million Jews in Austria-Hungary at that time, or 8 to 10 times as many as in France. In 50 years they had become masters of the country. Three generations had been enough for them to annihilate patriotism, degrade morality, ruin the family ideal and destroy the fragile peasant economy.

The "liberality" of the Empire was consecrated by patent of February 1861: since 1849, we are told, an era of "progress" and "fraternity" opened up for all the peoples of the Empire – Germanics, Slavs, Hungarians, Jews, Croats, Serbs, Romanians, Poles, "without distinction of race or religion".

An extraordinary eyewitness account of the Austria of Francis Joseph has been left by a French journalist named François Trocase, who spent 22 years at Vienna. His book, *Jewish Austria*, published in 1899, deserves to be better known.

Here is what François Trocase writes: "The Jews were nothing in Austria before 1848. They currently play a dominant role in the Habsburg Empire. One might say, without exaggeration, that they have conquered the country. They are the only ones who have profited from the revolution, which caused so much loss of life in the streets of Vienna; it seems that the noble victims were sacrificed and Human Rights proclaimed for the Jews alone... The Slavs, Hungarians, Romanians of Transylvania, just like the Germans of Austria, have become their prey, and bow down before their insolent domination. A half-century was all it took to annihilate the very idea of nationhood among the Austrians".[346]

From everywhere, Jews flooded into Vienna, where they cornered the industry, managing all financial companies: "The Jews are already the owners of more than half the houses in Vienna. Just by consulting the title deed records, they own 40% of all houses. But if one consults the condition of the mortgages, which can easily lead to expropriation, the Jews own 70% of them."

They also seized control over the lands and forests: "As to landed property, before 1849, they were prohibited from becoming landowners. Since then, they have singularly caught up for lost time. The Baron de Rothschild, all by himself, owns approximately one quarter of the grand Imperial property in Bohemia (seven times as much as the Imperial family), not to mention what he also owns in the other provinces, in Lower Austria, Moravia, Silesia, as well as in Hungary".

The prohibition against the Jews of Galicia (Austrian Poland) owning land lasted until 1867, at least as far as cultivable lands are concerned. As of this date in 1867, there were 38 Jewish landowners in all of Galicia. Now, three years after the abolition of this prohibition, there were already 68 large Jewish proprietors in the province with the right to vote in 1870. In 1873, there were 289 of them; in 1880, according to official data, there were 680 large Jewish landowners out of 3,700.

In the space of 18 years, from 1874 to 1892, it has been calculated that 43,000 small landed properties had passed into the hands of the Jews. They owned the most fertile lands in the country. "More than two million inhabitants who used to be landowners themselves are working as domestic servants of the Jews in estates that used to belong to their parents".[347]

In Hungary, the situation was similar: "A number of Hungarian landed estates, as such, do not yet belong to the Jews, but are rented by them, as is also done in Galicia; one can see the Jewish farmers, whip in hand, supervising the ploughmen or reapers, stalking them as soon as they seem inclined to take a minute's rest. During this time, the Jewish women assist their husbands riding up and down the roadway in a carriage with two horses, to see whether they're working; and their children, armed with long whips, trotting on horseback along the country paths. What a heart-breaking spectacle! You need to have contemplated them in the Hungarian *puszta* [a vast wilderness of shrubs and grassland in the Great Hungarian Plain]; you need to have seen the Polish peasant collapse from fatigue, a piece of black bread in his hand, sadly contemplating his children who have only a shirt as their sole garment. Anyone who has seen these harrowing scenes, unworthy of a

century with pretensions to civilisation, can understand the intensity of the hatred which gave rise to anti-Semitism".[348]

François Trocase also brought up a problem with which the Russians are quite familiar: "In Galicia and in certain cantons of Hungary, the Jew keeps the inns and the alcohol shops; he exploits a minor trade in foodstuffs and cloth. This is the greatest danger for the lower classes. These usurers, retail tradesmen, sell alcohol on credit to the peasants; they calculate in advance how much these same peasants will be paid on the product of the soil the following year. In this way, and through exceptionally high rates of interest, they deprive the people of their last resources, causing them to lose their reason through the abuse of spirits, and reducing the women and children to hopeless beggary. The ruined peasants become addicted to drink to forget their misery; and as always, it is the Jew alone who triumphs in the midst of this universal helplessness... The most terrifying form assumed by the cruelty of the Jews until the present time has been the exploitation of the human body. According to eyewitness accounts, the way the Jews treat the peasants of Galicia absolutely exceeds all powers of imagination. It would seem incredible if it were not attested to by witnesses worthy of belief. Cases have been cited in which Polish farmers, as interest on a relatively trivial debt, were forced to deliver their children to Jewish creditors, who had the right to keep them in their service without paying any salary pending extinguishment of the debt".[349]

Fluctuation in the price of wheat depended on speculation, and not on the abundance of the harvest; "There are times", writes Trocase, "in which the price of wheat falls to half what it was the year before; and nevertheless the population cannot buy bread any more cheaply; rather, it pays a higher price than ever. The Jews arrange things to profit both high and low. They seize control of all the grain available, and once in possession of the near totality, they regulate the prices as they wish, as dictated by their interests. No one gains but themselves... What he does to control the grain markets, the Jew also does for all other objects necessary to human life. Under the name of cartels, he organises monopolies in oil, sugar, coal, etc."[350]

The wholesale trade in butchery products, in the large cities, was also in the hands of the Jews. Ignace von Ephrussi was the king of wheat, Moses Ranger was the king of cotton, Bethel Henry Strousberg was the king of railways. In fact, all wholesale trade was in their hands.

In industry, the laws had somewhat lessened the fate of the workers. But previously, the exploitation of children, in particular, was taken to an extreme. In the centres of the textile industry, children had

to work even at night. These children often came from peasant families. They arrived every Monday from at the remotest villages, bringing a bag of food for the week; "They earned at most 2 florins (about 4 francs) per week; and when they collapsed from fatigue or fell asleep, the Jewish boss sprayed them with cold water to get them back on their feet".[351]

In the capital of Austria, there were a number of Jewish millionaires, almost all of whom had left their native villages without any more money than the price of a bunch of onions. Most of them were natives of Poland or Hungary. The three great fortunes – the "grand Jews" – were the Rothschilds, the Gutmanns and the Reitzes: "each one of them, all by himself, owned more property than the 1012 convents in the country put together. Mr. Gutmann accumulated considerable wealth by monopolising the coal trade in the capital city. The Jew Reitzes owes his fame exclusively to his smart tricks in the stock market. A fourth Austrian Jew, Baron Maurice von Hirsch (the 'Great'), is no longer of this world. The Viennese have indelible memories of him, for the losses he caused them in connection with some securities known as *Turkish lots*".[352]

Jewish speculators also aroused the hatred of small savers: "What we reproach them for, above all, is the stock-jobbing tricks which regularly cheat savers out of their small savings. More than a quarter of a century has passed since the terrible *krach* of 1873; and nevertheless, the appalling confidence swindles revealed by this catastrophe have not yet been forgotten".[353]

At Vienna and elsewhere, they lived in the most beautiful districts, lounging about in the most beautiful estates, occupying the centre of public life: "Society relations are everywhere dominated by the Jews", writes François Trocase. "Go to any park in the city, or the boulevards, the Prater; most of the people you see will be Jews. Open the newspapers to read the chronicle of celebrations, marriage or birth announcements; they will be Jews, always Jews. In the spas – Karlsbad, Baden, or any of 20 others – they are always Jews, everywhere. The most beautiful country holiday locations around the city of Vienna – Semmering, Kahlenberg, Brühl, were owned by Jews. The accumulation of fortunes in their hands, the thirst for enjoyments which devours them, produced a complete reversal of all social customs".[354]

Thanks to their gold, their political ascension was a foregone conclusion. "They slipped into the most highly paid public jobs and have gained entry into Parliament. They sit in the provincial and municipal assemblies. They participate in writing out laws".



The Jews also assured their security against the “reactionaries”, those “nervous” or “jealous” of their success: “They have laid their hands on everything. Public security, at Vienna, is entrusted to Jewish policemen. Not astonishing, then, that things happen in the Austrian capital, things that would be absolutely impossible anywhere else”.[355]

They became lawyers, journalists, physicians. These three professions were more or less their exclusive domain. “The belles-lettres, particularly journalism, are literally inundated with Jews. Of the 16 large daily papers published in Vienna, 10 are owned by Jews and are edited and administered by Jews. The others are party organs. They have also seized control of nearly the entire daily press”.

The Jewish press ridiculed Christianity, family values, patriotism. Jewish journalists poured torrents of insults on Czar Alexander III, never hesitating before false news or calumnious assertions: “They make and unmake literary, artistic and other reputations, with the aid of their newspapers... Everywhere, the Jewish element is pushing itself forward: everywhere, they exploit the situation to their exclusive advantage”.

And, in fact, the artists who benefit from the praises of the press were almost exclusively Jews: “In the arts, in music, in everything related to the theatre, they enjoy a dominant position. As they have monopolised the art of criticism, it is hopeless to attempt to focus public attention on any subject without the assistance – one could also say, almost the complicity – of the Jews”.

Nevertheless, as correctly noted by François Trocase, “despite the bitter complaints raised against them from all sides, the Jews continue to pose as the defenders of all freedoms”.[356]

In April 1882, a new ritual murder scandal exploded in Hungary, which François Trocase is very careful not to mention, no doubt to avoid hurting the credibility of his testimony, which is already sufficiently mind-boggling for most goyim. A young Christian girl, aged 14, Eszter Solymosi, employed as a servant in the village of Tiszaeszlar, disappeared on 1 April. During the month of May, the inquiry directed itself against the Jews, who had just finished celebrating Passover. The whole region was seized with emotion, and numerous acts of violence were committed. After placing the Jewish suspects under police surveillance, the investigating magistrate, Jozsef Bary began by interrogating Samuel, the 5-year-old son of Josef Scharf, beadle of the synagogue. Samuel acknowledged that his father had caused Eszter to enter his house, and that the *shohet* (ritual butcher) had cut her throat.

According to the child's tale, transcribed by Bary, the butcher made an incision in the girl's throat in the presence of his father and other men, while he and his father Moric caught the blood in a goblet.

On 19 May 1882, Schart and his wife were arrested, but denied all involvement. Moric nevertheless finished by confessing that after the Saturday service, his father had caused Eszter to enter his house on the pretext of asking her to change a few candles (an act prohibited to pious Jews on the Sabbath), and that a Jewish beggar who lived with them, Hermann Wollner, had taken the girl into the vestibule of the synagogue and attacked her. After undressing her, two butchers, Abraham Buxbaum and Leopold Braun, held her up while another butcher, Salomon Schwarz, cut her throat with a knife and emptied her blood into a cup. These three men, candidates for the vacant post of preceptor and *shohet*, had arrived in Tiszaeszlár to officiate at this particular Sabbath and had remained in the synagogue after the morning service.

According to his confession, Moric had observed the entire scene, spying through the door of the synagogue. For the 45 minutes during which he watched her, he had also seen that after bleeding the young girl, Samuel Lustig, Abraham Braun, Lazar Weisstein, and Adolf Junger had put a scarf around her neck and dressed her again.

Despite minute searches organised by Bary, no body and no trace of blood were found in the synagogue, nor in the houses of the Jewish suspects, nor in the tombs of the Jewish cemetery. 12 Jews were nonetheless arrested, as well as young Moric Scharf.

Exasperation against the Jews reached its peak and the case took on international proportions. On 29 July, formal accusations were brought against the following 15 persons: Salomon Schwarz, Abraham Buxbaum, Leopold Braun, and Hermann Wollner, for murder. József Scharf, Adolf Junger, Abraham Braun, Samuel Lustig, Lazar Weisstein, and Emmanuel Taub, for voluntary assistance in a crime; Anselm Vogel, Jankel Smilovics, David Hersko, Martin Gross, and Ignac Klein for complicity in a crime and concealment of the body.

On 17 June 1883, the last act of this affair was played out before the court of Nyiregyháza. The judge, Ferenc Korniss, presided, with Eduard Szeffert as prosecuting attorney. The court was to hold thirty hearings to examine the affair in all its details and hear the numerous witnesses.

Only the intervention of the Jewish financiers and the corruption of the judges were able to clear these "victims of anti-Semitism" on 3 August. The scandalous acquittals immediately caused riots in Presburg (Bratislava), Budapest, and other cities in Hungary. Geza Onody,

representative of Tiszeszlar at the Hungarian parliament, gave loud and clear voice to his indignation when the supreme court rejected the appeal and confirmed the verdict of the correctional tribunal. Gyoza Istoczy, a parliamentarian, founded the Anti-Semitic party at this time and demanded the expulsion of the Jews from Hungary.

123

**La Civiltà Cattolica, 1870–1903**

After the unification of northern Italy and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Victor Emmanuel II took the title of the King of Italy in March 1861. It only remained for Rome and the pontifical states to be annexed to the new kingdom, but French troops were still stationed there. In fact, in order to avoid alienating the Ultramontane Catholics of France, Napoleon III had not pursued his victorious campaign in 1859. In leaving French troops at Rome to protect the Pope's last vestiges of temporal power, he prevented the new kingdom of Italy from finalising its unity. Italian patriots profited from the invasion of France by the Prussians in 1870 to enter Rome weapons in hand and achieve full Italian unity.

The fall of the Pope's temporal power was painfully resented by the Catholics. The revolution seemed triumphant, so much so that the captivity of Pope Pius IX in the Vatican left the Jews free to indulge their hatred. The Lémann brothers, Jews converted to Catholicism, have left us a few interesting pages on this subject:

“When the sub-Alpine government forced open the gates of Rome with cannon shots on 20 September 1870, the breach was not even complete yet when a troop of Jews passed through it to congratulate General Cadorna. And the whole ghetto rigged itself out in Piedmontese colours... When the zouave defenders of Pius IX received the order to abandon the heroic struggle, the Jews were waiting on the Sant Angelo bridge to cover them with insults and even tear their clothes off. During the days of installation of the usurping government, we saw them run up, like jackals, from one barracks to another, to pillage them... Several times, they met in church doorways to mock and strike Christians who were coming to pray... Every time we asked for information on the disgraceful scenes occurring in the Corso, before the Quirinale and elsewhere, where all that which is holy was turned to ridicule – the priests insulted, the Madonnas besmirched, the holy images slashed and torn – the answer was always the same: the *buzzuri* and the Jews...”

At the Porte Pia, the zouaves defending Rome abandoned the ramparts. Their friends hastened to bring them civilian clothing. But at the end of the Sant Angelo bridge, “hordes of Jews, in the midst of

cries” tore open their suitcases, tore up the clothing and everything they could lay their hands on, and threw it all in the Tiber. “Below, there were sailors who gathered up in their vessels everything that had been thrown in the river”.

The three ministerial newspapers, *L'Opinione*, *La Libreria*, and *La Nuova Roma*, all had Jewish directors. “Oh, well”, say the Lémann brothers, “they never ceased, not one single day, since they became the masters of Rome, to pour calumny, insults and filth over the Catholic religion, its worship, its communities, its priests, over everything that was most respectable, even the august personage of the Pope. His Holiness himself has said: ‘They direct the whole revolutionary press against myself and against the Church’ ”.[357]

As at each triumph of the Jews at one place, they were seen to arrive from everywhere else: “Jews from abroad, who flowed into the new capital, fed the attacks against the church; Jews from Rome, who had just betrayed their own sovereign, joyously welcomed the ‘Piedmontesi’ and frequented places that were formerly forbidden to them. This is the true, the great scandal: the Jews of Rome, seat of St Peter, capital of Catholicism, are pushing Christians aside, purchasing properties and exercising the functions of government”.[358]

The Lémann brothers nevertheless explained that the Popes had “consistently protected the Israelites” of Rome. Pius IX had even been particularly benevolent to them, since he had destroyed the walls and gates of the ghetto. But they recalled the basic Church doctrine with regards to members of the Jewish sect: “Because the Church is the repository of Evangelical gentleness, she protects the lives of the Jews. Because she is the mother of the Christian nations, she preserves them from the Hebraic invasion which would mean their death”.[359]

After the events of 1870, Pius IX finally spoke out without ambiguity: “Unfortunately, there are too many of them in Rome today, and we hear them barking about in every street, and they hassle us everywhere... They write blasphemies and obscenities in the newspapers... but there will come a day, the terrible day of divine judgement, in which they will have to render an account of all the iniquities which they have committed.”

The Jewish question was then followed up by the Vatican with greater strictness. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the newspaper of the Secretariat of State, launched a counter-offensive. In an article published in 1872, Father Francesco Bernardinelli defined the persecutors of the Vatican in these words: “Renegades and apostates... gang of dogs... of the race of wormy beasts of Golgotha”.

Until the 1870s, the periodical only dealt with the Jewish question

episodically. But under Pope Leo XIII (1878), the growing influence of Judaism in Europe was analysed with great care.[360] Judaism was finally identified as the cradle of Masonry and the forces which had brought the revolution in Europe.

The solution to the Jewish problem consisted, for the *Civiltà Cattolica*, in replacing the liberal state which had opened the door to the Jews. The Jews should be protected from popular reaction, and Christians should be sheltered from the moral, political and commercial aggressiveness of the Jews.

In 1880, Father Giuseppe Oreglia, a Jesuit priest from San Stefano (1823–1895), wrote: “Catholics are not demanding the expulsion of the Jews, but are merely asking that their actions be restrained insofar as doing so prevents them from harming the commonweal. They wish to conserve the Christian character of the State, its legislation, and its teachings and social principles. They desire the extirpation of Jewish principles... rendered dominant by the liberal regime, but not the expulsion of a people who are, after all, of the blood of Abraham, and within which the Saviour was born. With a Christian organisation of the State, the Jews inspire no fear”.[361] Father Mario Barbera also promoted “charitable segregation”. It was necessary to have recourse to charitable segregation of the Jews, who must live apart, like the lepers placed in a leper asylum, for their own health and that of others.

After 1903, the *Civiltà Cattolica* no longer dealt with the Jewish problem with the same attention but directed his efforts towards the struggle against modernism within the Church without any fundamental changes as regards the Judeo-Masonic danger.

After Pius X, Pius XI condemned both Marxism and National Socialism. He died shortly before being able to promulgate an encyclical in which he reaffirmed the traditional thesis of the Church. Here is part of the text:

“The so-called Jewish question, in its essence, is not a question of race or nation or national territory, nor of civil rights within the State. It is a question of religion and, since the coming of Christ, a question of Christianity”.

Abbot Julio Meinvielle, whose book, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, published in 1936, has had a very broad distribution in the Catholic world, set forth the following as the sixth point of its conclusion: “The Christians, who cannot hate the Jews, who do not wish to persecute them nor prevent them from living, nor to disturb them in the fulfilment of their laws and customs, must nevertheless preserve themselves from the Judaic peril. They must preserve themselves from them as they protect themselves from leprosy. One

can neither hate them nor persecute them, nor molest the lepers, but one must take precautions against them, to keep them from infecting the social organism. Thus the Christians must not enter into commercial, social or political relations with this perverse race which hypocritically must seek our ruin. The Jews must live separated from Christians because this way, as their laws command them, and moreover because they are ‘infectious’ for other peoples. If other people reject these precautions, they must suffer the consequences, that is, to be the lackeys and pariahs of this race, in which they reign supreme in the kingdom of the carnal”.[362]

## 124

### **German Anti-Judaism in the 19th Century**

There were approximately 350,000 Jews in Germany in 1840, 200,000 of them in Prussia, in the north of the country. The Jews, who represented 3% of the population of Berlin, made up half of all the industrialists. As early as 1807, they owned 30 out of the 52 banks in the capital city; in 1862, 550 of the 662 banks in Prussia were Jewish-owned.[363] The Dresdener Bank was founded by the Jew Eugen Guttman. When Chancellor Otto von Bismarck needed a banker in 1859, he called upon a Jewish banker, as we have seen, Gerson Bleichröder, who was ennobled by Wilhelm I in 1872. In 1910, there were 600,000 Jews in Prussia. But the country was not, no doubt, as gangrenous as Austria and France, thanks, in particular, to the severity of recruitment of its officer corps and university professors.

Largely dominant in the finances of the country, the Jews invested in industry, particularly in the railways. Abraham Oppenheim, of Cologne, was the vice-president of the Rhenanian railway company in 1835. In 1869, Baron Maurice Hirsch founded the Orient Express, which linked Berlin, Vienna and Constantinople.

The Hamburg-America Line maritime company, which linked Germany and America, had at its head another Jew, Albert Ballin, personal friend of the Emperor Wilhelm I. The big department stores were more or less a Jewish monopoly. They sold cheaper, but ruined the small merchants, who then went to work for Jewish bosses.[364]

If the Jews had considered themselves to be German, their success wouldn't have caused any problems. But the very essence of Judaism is to destroy everything which is not Jewish, rather than to fit into any country whatsoever. Thus, through their indefatigable propaganda, through their newspapers, Jewish intellectuals exercise their brains to ridicule Christianity and mock German customs at all times. They burrow away surreptitiously, instilling the ideas of "tolerance", "equality", exalted "universal brotherhood" in all minds except their own. The Jewish writers Ludwig Börne and Heinrich Heine, who were the leaders of the Young Germany movement, criticised the "moral order", patriotism, and family values. It is not without reason that German nationalists called this movement "Young Palestine". In 1835, these cosmopolitan writers were soon restricted by a censorship decree.



The German spirit was still strong enough and structured enough to oppose Jewish propaganda effectively.

Friedrich-Wilhelm IV (1840–1861), King of Prussia, was trained by the historian Friedrich Carl de Savigny, and obviously understood the political plan of the Jews. He decided to dispense them from military service, keep them out of all public employment and constitute them as a “separate nation”, under his special protection. “In 1842”, he wrote, in a letter cited by Léon Poliakov: “Every day, through their speeches and writings, the ignoble Jewish clique is chopping away at the roots of the German being: it does not wish (like myself) to ennoble and confront the States openly, which can alone make up a German people, it wishes to mix up all the States in a mish-mash.” To our knowledge, this is the first mention denoting a comprehension of the Jewish plan to destroy the States.[365]

The most widely read author in Germany was Gustav Freytag, whose masterwork, *Soll und Haben* (1855), became a world-wide best-seller, selling millions of copies worldwide over a century, being found on all family bookshelves. Its two principal personages, the German Anton Wohlfart and the Jew Veitel Itzig, personify virtue and vice respectively. The half-dozen Jews surrounding Itzig are almost all repugnant.

It was at this time, in 1854, that the Grimm brothers, whose fairy tales still enchant children today, published their famous German dictionary. Under the word “Jew”, for example, they gave as an example: “Greasy as an old Jew”, “he stinks like a Jew”, “to have Jewish taste”. And, another example, “You’ve got to grease your throat first, otherwise this grub tastes of dead Jew”.[366]

But the anti-Judaic vengeance of a few German intellectuals was not enough to protect the government from the egalitarian ideology. A law passed in 1864 granting “civil equality to citizens of the Jewish faith” was confirmed by the law of 1869 on the equality of religion in civil and civic matters. This law was extended to all of Germany after the proclamation of the German Empire in 1871. Bismarck, who imposed a Judeo-Masonic republican regime on France, thus contributed to making Germany a paradise for Jews.

The German mass press fell into the hands of great Jewish bosses. Leopold Sonnemann founded the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in 1866 and built it up into an empire. Rudolf Mosse founded the *Berliner Tageblatt* in 1871; Leopold Ullstein founded the *Berliner Abendpost* in 1887 and the *Berliner Morgenpost* in 1898.

On the intellectual level, the anti-Semitic reaction in Germanic countries seemed rather slow in coming. But in 1871, the publication of

a book by a German Catholic priest, canon of the cathedral of Prague and professor of theology and Hebraic antiquities at the university of Prague, was destined to change all this.

August Rohling (1839–1931) learned Hebrew to be able to translate the Talmud. His book, *Der Talmudjude (The Jew of the Talmud)*, published in Munster, Westphalia, re-established all the censored passages from the Talmud, based on the work of his illustrious predecessor, Eisenmenger. This work, which met the expectations of the public, enjoyed considerable success, since it went through six editions by 1877.[367]

The Jews, naturally, denounced the work and the passages cited, its “absurd anti-Semitic vulgarities” and “insane remarks”, etc. The government, corrupted by their gold, prohibited Rohling from responding. The Jews thus silenced their adversary, but never ceased to scream about fanaticism and persecution, while swearing that they were being slaughtered. The affair caused quite a stir in Vienna and Germany, and observers simply noted that the Jews would never allow any light to be shed on the basis of their belief, morals and laws.

In his book, *My Response to the Rabbis, or Five Letters on Talmudism and the Blood Ritual among Jews*, published in 1883, August Rohling explained the importance of being able to identify the Jew behind the mask. “In the Middle Ages, the Jews wore a yellow hat to be recognised. If newspaper readers (at Vienna, for example, *Neue Freie Presse*, *Fremdenblatt*, *Tagblatt*, *Extrapost*, *Vorstadt-Zeitung*, *Wiener Allgemeine*, etc.) saw a yellow strip on the first page, with the following notice: ‘For Jewish Intellectuals’, we would understand what these literary hacks are fighting for”.[368]

When he was interrogated and insulted by a Jew answering to the name of Bloch, Rohling responded: “In the *Megilla*, a Talmudic treatise, the Goyim are referred to as dogs. The treatise *aboda zara* (46a) states that the face of a non-Jewish monarch is referred to as a ‘dog’s face’. If Bloch is of the opinion that I copied this, or anything else, without reading the Talmud myself, I wish to inform him that this quotation is found in the work mentioned, at the 7th line above (Venice printing). Rachi explained, exactly as I have maintained, starting with the 5th book of Moses (14:21) that a dog is even better than a non-Jew; Bloch will know perfectly well where to find this in the commentary on the Pentateuch. The Hebrew words are: *schehakkeleb nichbad nimmennu*”.[369]

Abbot Rohling also dealt with the question of ritual murder. Twelve trials of this kind were held in Germanic countries between 1867 and 1914. Contrary to events in earlier centuries, the Jews were always

cleared, but these acquittals simply reflected the power they had acquired over governments, as well as the power of Jewish bribery. All these trials, therefore, ended in acquittals, with just one exception.

Rohling had adepts all over Catholic Europe, to the point that in France, his book was translated by three different translators in 1889. A French edition augmented by A. Pontigny appeared under the title *Le Juif selon le Talmud*, with a magnificent preface by Edouard Drumont dated 2 July 1889, which we summarise below:

“The general crisis in the midst of which the world is debating at the moment can be summed up in one word: the Talmud’s revenge against the Gospels. That great philosophical phrase, ‘Human Rights’, the regeneration of humanity, which, during the first few years of this century, were used by the Jew as a screen to operate at his ease, didn’t fool anyone: it’s an old papier-maché decor which rips to pieces and soon falls in tatters... the Jew is now the master; he no longer even troubles to conceal his mastery; he holds all the peoples captive through finance, he amends the labour laws to suit himself, any way he likes, according to the interests of his trade unions; he purchases all the statesmen who are for sale, and deprives of employment all those who will not be corrupted. He is omnipresent and omnipotent everywhere he is, so powerful that no one dares attack him... What dominates among these people is the hatred and contempt for the goyim, the conviction that everything is permitted against the goy, the stranger, the non-Jew, the ‘seed of the beast’, the certainty, as well, that the Jew belongs to a privileged race destined to reduce all other peoples to bondage, to make them work for Israel... Thus armed, invested with a sort of mission, liberated by the very prescriptions of his religion from any annoying scruples, the Jew launches himself forwards to conquer capitals. He is the triumphant stock-jobber, the influential journalist.”

And to these Jews who might be tempted to retort that they have even “never read the Talmud”, Drumont responds: “What need is there for Jews today to study the Talmud? It is imprinted in their brain by the laws of heredity, bequeathed by innumerable generations which have grown pale studying its precepts, which have assimilated its doctrines. The Jews are saturated with the Talmud: to it, they owe not only this idea of a superiority over us which makes them so strong, but in addition this admirable subtlety, this absence of all moral sense, of all notion of Good and Evil, which almost disarms because it is inborn and spontaneous in the Hebrew”.

Even then, Drumont protested against the indefatigable Jewish propaganda campaign intended to make Europeans feel guilty, to make them bow their heads, to make them kneel down and implore Israel’s

pardon: "Try to rectify any historical lie", he writes, "risk, for example, a timid rehabilitation of your race and your ancestors; try to insinuate that you are descended from men who were – it's just possible – neither idiots, nor pillagers, nor murderers; they will say you are falsifying the historical record; that it is you who are lying, lying with effrontery; that ignorance and fanaticism are finding expression through your lying cake-hole.

"Dare to suspect the candour of the rabbis who fabricate the Talmud and the philanthropy of the Jews who made their code out of it, and you are a black persecutor, an insulter of innocent victims, an apostle of obscurantism, a creature of darkness and of blood. Dare to remark that the Jews of today are indeed the heirs of the Jews of yesterday, and that, as a result, certain security measures would not, perhaps, be excessively prudent: they will say that you are eaten up with envy, that you are burning with greed; that you are the shame of the age, the scum of humanity, the excrement of nature; you will receive on your head the steamy pot of filth which every polemicist of Israel carries full to the brim in his hands at all times".

We note here that the Jews, at this beginning of the 21st century, have not changed one iota; Edouard Drumont also repeatedly discussed the efforts of the Jews to prohibit Rohling's book:

"While all the other peoples march with their banners held high, revealing their gospel and their code to bright sunlight, only the Jew envelopes himself in darkness; the Jew alone seeks mystery, the Jew alone makes of his civil and religious law a secret which must at no price leave the Israelite family, and makes a sacred duty out of lying eternally to all men of all other races and other homelands.[370] It is a fact that the Talmud is the book of exclusivity, of separatism, of universal hatred par excellence, not only against all other religions, but against all the peoples of the human family, against their proprieties, against their social and national existence; we affirm, without any fear of contradiction whatever, that no one who takes the trouble to study the book will have any doubt in this regard."

In 1873, the bankruptcy of the Jewish magnate Henry Strousberg, who had founded a railway company to link Germany and Romania, caused a stock market crash, which led to a few other bankruptcies and the ruin of numerous small investors in Germany. Anti-Semitism was reinvigorated, but it took several years before this basic trend became a political current.

The nationalism of Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–1896) incarnated the active anti-Semitic resistance. A native of Dresden, he was a professor at the university of Berlin. From 1871 to 1884, he was

a deputy, hostile to the British empire. Starting in 1878, with even more urgency, he denounced the power of the Jews and the waves of immigration from Poland and Russia. In November 1879, he published a rather short text entitled *Our Perspectives*, in which he mentioned Jewish financial and cultural domination. His formula *Die Juden sind unser Unglück* (The Jews Are our Misfortune) was taken up by National Socialist militants under the Third Reich. His ideas met with great success and aroused innumerable polemics in the universities.

Towards 1880, a wave of anti-Semitism inundated Germany. Wilhelm Marr, one of the principal thinkers of the resistance, came from the extreme Left. Born at Magdeburg, he had been a journalist, a leftist militant for the Radical-Democrats. In 1848, he was elected deputy, opposed to the granting of equality to German Jews with all his strength. In 1879, at Berlin, he published his book, *Der Sieg der Judenthums über das Germanenthum* (The Victory of Jewry over Germanness). The book went through 12 editions in a few years. The same year, he founded the Anti-Semitic League (Antijüdischer Verein), the lifetime of which was rather short, and published a journal which only lasted a week, *Die neue deutsche Wacht* (The New German Guard), in which the word “anti-Semitism” appeared for the first time. Wilhelm Marr advocated the expulsion of all Jews to Palestine. Let us note that he had three wives, all three of them Jewish...

The famous Berlin philosopher and economist Eugene Dühring (1833–1921) was a socialist and anti-Christian theoretician. He also published numerous anti-Semitic works. In 1881, in his book entitled *Die Judenfrage als Frage der Racenschändlichkeit* (translated into French as *La Question juive*), he excluded the pathway of assimilation for the Jews, whom he considered to form part of a different race from the Germans.

Paul de Lagard, from Berlin, was also radically hostile to Judaism. A professor Oriental languages at the university of Göttingen, he published works of Semitic philology. He also exerted great influence through his nationalist and anti-Semitic writings, compiled in *Deutsche Schriften* (German Writings, 1878–1881). Some of his ideas were taken over by the National Socialists, such as the idea of “Lebensraum” in the East, or the aspiration towards a “German Christianity”, purged of its Jewish sentiments, which directly influenced Alfred Rosenberg in his book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (1930). The National Socialist party saluted Lagarde as one of its inspiring sources.

In 1880–1881, Berlin became the scene of violent disturbances. Agitators who were in no way Christian, such as Bernhard Förster, Nietzsche’s brother-in-law, or the young teacher Henrici, got mixed up

in these brawls. Organised bands attacked Jews in the streets, kicked them out of cafes, broke their shop windows.

The anti-Semitic resistance was organised to face the danger. In 1880, Bernhard Förster, inspired by a stay in Wagnerian Bayreuth, launched the idea of an anti-Semitic petition addressed to Chancellor Bismarck, which demanded a census of the Jews and their total exclusion from all public positions and education. In a few weeks, nearly 225,000 signatures were collected, including those of many students. Soon, the professorial corps got involved, with the master thinker of German nationalist youth, Heinrich von Treitschke.

Chancellor Bismarck gave no official response to the anti-Semitic petition, but the government took account of it. It was very rare at that time to see a state position in the universities or administrations granted to a Jew. Numerous student guilds did not admit Jews, either. An international anti-Semitic congress was held in Dresden in 1882, attended by 300 hundred German, Austrian and Russian delegates. Another such congress was held at Chemnitz the next year.

A poster reading *Eine deutsche Sieben (Seven Germans)* shows the portraits of the German anti-Semitic activists of this period. They are Otto Glasgau, Adolf König, Bernhard Förster, Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg, Fritsch, Paul Forster and Otto Böckel.

Max Liebermann von Sonnenberg, a former Prussian officer, was also at the origin of this petition. In 1881, he founded the Deutsche Volksverein with Bernhard Förster, and a journal with anti-Semitic overtones, the *Deutsche Volkszeitung*. He was also elected to the Reichstag, then, in 1894, merged his organisation with that of Otto Böckel. His program concerning Judaism was rather radical. Among his publications, we find *Die Judenfrage und Der Synagogenbrand in Neustettin* (1883) and *Die Schädigung des deutschen Nationalgeistes durch die jüdische Nation* (1892).

In 1887, the young Otto Böckel, a native of Frankfurt and a fervent defender of the small peasantry, had also gotten elected to the Reichstag. In the 1890 elections, his party, the Antisemitische Volkspartei, obtained 4 seats, thanks to the 48,000 votes which it received. But in 1893, it gathered the votes of 260,000 electors and obtained 16 seats.

As in France, with the rise of international tension, electoral anti-Semitism declined at the beginning of the 20th century. Here the radical anti-Semitic organisations crumbled into a multitude of mini-groups with esoteric or neo-pagan names.

The journalists Otto Glasgau, a native of Königsberg, also contributed to the anti-Semitic resistance with his magazine, *Der*

*Kulturkämpfer* (1880–1888). In April 1883, he was the principal organiser of the second international anti-Semitic congress, which was held in the city of Chemnitz.

The Saxon Theodor Fritsch, a disciple of Wilhelm Marr, was perhaps the writer who produced the biggest echo in German society. He published numerous works on the Jewish question, the first of which, in 1887, was a book entitled *Antisemiten-Katechismus* (Anti-Semitic Catechism). The book was published 49 times between 1887 to 1944 and distributed in the hundreds of thousands. Fritsch was also the first German translator of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. He wished to unite all the anti-Semitic organisations in Germany under the same banner. But in 1890, there were almost 200 such organisations, scattered all over the German territory. In 1902, Theodor Fritsch founded his newspaper, *Der Hammer*. In 1912, his adepts founded an anti-Jewish order, the Reichshammerbund, which gave rise, in turn, to the famous Thule Society, secretly linked to the National Socialist Party at its beginnings. His last work, *The True Nature of the Jews*, was published in 1926.

The pastor Adolf Stoecker, son of a blacksmith, took over from there, placing anti-Semitism in the centre of his political programme. He also largely contributed to propagating anti-Semitism in German Protestantism and the conservative parties. Stoecker, close to traditional Christian anti-Judaism, distanced himself from racial anti-Semitism. After Bismarck's dismissal in 1890, he gained more and more influence in conservative ranks. During the party congress, the Tivoli-Parteitag of 1892, he succeeded in anchoring anti-Semitism in the programme of the Deutschkonservative Partei.

In 1890, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, son-in-law of the composer Richard Wagner, published his famous work, *The Foundations of the 19th Century*, the French translation of which appeared in 1913. In one of the chapters of the book, entitled "The Advent of the Jews in Western History", he demonstrated that Christ was a racial Aryan.[371] Chamberlain was also one of the chief theoreticians of pan-Germanism and biological racism. Emperor Wilhelm II saluted him as a liberator, and Adolf Hitler acknowledged him as one of his inspiring sources.

One must also mention Richard Wagner himself, who, although he did not profess anti-Semitism, had as great an influence as that of any theoretician in this field. It is certain that he had read the books of Wilhelm Marr, Eugen Dühring, as well as *The Talmud Jew* by Father Rohling.

In the years 1830–1840, the Jewish composer Meyerbeer was the "King" of opera. Wagner, who was 20 years older, formed a friendship

with him. But in 1850, he published *Judaism in Music*, in which he demolished all the so-called Jewish “geniuses” fabricated by advertising. “The most urgent thing is to emancipate ourselves from Jewish oppression”, he wrote. In his autobiography, Wagner assures us that this pamphlet, all by itself, earned him the later hostility of the European press. “It is thus that the unprecedented hostility which was shown me, to this day, by the totality of the European press... Their fury took on the character of perfidy and calumny”.

We know, in fact, that Jewish intellectuals have a habit of publicly insulting and slandering their adversaries. The public press, as we see, was already in the hands of the Jewish billionaires.

While he rejected their talent as composers, Wagner recognised the talent of Jewish interpreters. He became closely associated, for example, with the Ukrainian Jewish pianist Joseph Rubinstein, who became Wagner’s “house pianist” and incidentally approved of everything Wagner ever wrote about the Jews. After Wagner’s death, Rubinstein became deeply depressed and committed suicide. The truth is that Rubinstein had left Judaism long before and was no longer a Jew at all. Wagner also entrusted the direction of *Parsifal*, his Germano-Christian masterpiece, to the orchestral conductor Hermann-Levi, in recognition of Levy’s talent. His anti-Semitism, however, was as strong as ever. Thus, in 1881, he wrote to king Ludwig II of Bavaria: “I consider the Jewish race as the born enemy of humanity and everything that is noble”.



## 125

### The Anti-Jewish Counter-Offensive in France

In republican France at the end of the century, the ministers were mostly Freemasons and Protestants, even when they weren't Jewish, since the two other minority categories were only slightly represented at the time, or not at all. The new regime began its work with the priority of priorities: the struggle against Catholicism. In 1879 and 1880, Jules Ferry's Schools Act expelled the Church from primary education. The new offensive which took place at the beginning of the century led to the closure of numerous congregations and to the law on the separation of Church and State.

The republican system and universal suffrage were to prove the ideal regime for financial oligarchy. It is in fact much easier to corrupt and manipulate parliamentarians than to destabilise a hereditary divine right monarchy, whose princes hardly have any need for gold to reach power. On the other hand, it has been found that after a few decades of "democracy", the electoral masses are easily manipulated, and that you can make them believe almost anything as soon as you control the entirety of the media system.

Dozens of works on the Jews were published at this time. In 1882, Abbot Chabeauty, honorary canon of Angoulême and Poitiers, published *Les Juifs, nos maîtres*:

"It is not possible for me to produce my quotations with the very text of the Talmud under my eyes: I do not have its enormous in-folio pages at hand", he wrote; "but I will delve into sources which, although secondary, are no less reliable; I take my first quotations from a Latin manuscript of the 13th century, which has as its title *Extractiones de Talmud* (*Extracts from the Talmud*, no. 10, Bi 8 of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, sheet 231). I take everything I'm going to say and quote from this manuscript, a very interesting work published by the *Revue des études juives*, 1880, no. 2, and 1881, no. 4 and 5, entitled: *The Controversy of 1240 on the Talmud*, and signed Isidore Loeb. This is a work composed after the controversy on the Talmud, held in 1240, at Paris, and according to the orders of *Études de Châteauroux*, chancellor of the University, in the design to enlighten the theologians on the errors, obscenities and blasphemies of the Talmud, so that they may not, out of ignorance, consider the Talmud a harmless book which ought to be tolerated".[372]

At the end of the manuscript are found, among other documents, 35 articles or accusations brought against the Talmud by Pope Gregory IX. At each article, the author (perhaps Nicholas Donin) added an indication of the places in the Talmud where these passages were to be found, as well as the words of the rabbis concerned. "I take my quotations from the manuscript, reproduced in its entirety by the *Revue des études juives*", explains Abbot Chabeauty. *The Revue des études juives* assures us that the translation of these passages from the *Gemara* of Babylon "is exact, precise, very scientific", and that the sense of the passages is "generally well-expressed".[373]

Here again are a few types of remarks which can be found in this Jewish code of conduct: "Rabbi Simeon said: The best of the Christians, kill him; the best of the serpents, crush his head. The best of the Christians may therefore be killed as a wicked person". And again: "A Christian may be tricked, by ruse or artifice, without sin". This, Abbot Chabeauty tells us, is found in *Yeschuot*, treatise *Baba-Kamma* (sheet 38-a), chapter "Schor".[374]

"Here are other extracts from the Talmud", writes Chabeauty, "analysed and summarised by Sixtus of Siena, a converted Jew in the 16th century, in his *Bibliothèque sainte*. Sixtus of Siena carefully indicates the corresponding places in the Talmud:[375]

"We order every Jew, three times a day, to curse the entire Christian people, and pray God to confound and exterminate them with their kings and princes. And that above all the priests of the Jews utter this prayer in hatred of Jesus of Nazareth three times a day, in the synagogue" (*Babylonian Talmud*, Ord. I, Treatise 1, chapter 4).

"God has ordered the Jews to appropriate unto themselves by any means, whether by ruse, violence, usury or theft, the property of the Christians" (*Ibid.*).

"It is prescribed to all the Jews to regard the Christians as brutes, and not to deal with them except as brute beasts" (Ord. 4, treatise 8).

"The churches of the Christians are houses of perdition and places of idolatry which the Jews are required to destroy" (Ord. I, treatise 1, dist. 2).

On the extreme Left, among the socialists, anti-Semitism was no less virulent at this time. In 1883, Auguste Comte, disciple of Proudhon and Toussenel, published *The Kings of the Republic, History of the Jewries*. The two first volumes contain monographs of the great Jews of the period: Rothschild, Léon Say, Mallet, Camondo, Baron Hirsch, Jacques Stern, Cahen of Antwerp, Bischoffheim, Erlanger, etc. The third volume appeared in 1885. In 1888, Auguste Chirac published *La haute Banque et les revolutions*, which incorporated in part a book

published in 1856, *Histoire des grande opérations financières*, published by a legitimist journalist from Marseilles, Jean-Baptiste Capefigue.[376]

The year 1886 remains the year of *La France juive*, the great success of its time. *La France juive* by Edouard Drumont, was, with *La Vie de Jesus* by Ernest Renan, the French best-seller of the second half of the 19th century: 114 editions in a year, 200 editions in total, not counting an abridged popular edition. The very famous Edouard Drumont deserved his success. His book, two 600-page volumes, contains a number of interesting remarks. "You could turn it into an admirable compendium of aphorisms", wrote Lucien Rabetet in the special edition on the Jews in the weekly *Je Suis Partout* of 17 February 1939. Here is one, among others:

"Very wicked priests, friends of greedy kings, amusing themselves by persecuting the poor Jews because of their religion – such is the legend".[377] But Lucien Rabetet expressed a reserve with regards to his admiration for the great polemicist: "By 1939, a third of *La France juive*, while retaining its documentary value, seems to have gotten old. It was a legacy of journalism, of immediate contemporary events: portraits of stooges of whom the future will remember nothing, short news items which inflame a generation and leave the following indifferent. Drumont, it must be said, is not strict enough about the source of his documents".

In 1889, Drumont published *La Fin d'un monde*. Then, in 1890, *La dernière Bataille*, and in 1891, *La Libre Parole*, the first issue of which was published on 20 April 1892, which was Charles Maurras' birthday, and which was to be Adolf Hitler's birthday as well. The circulation of the newspaper reached 300,000 copies during the "Panama affair". At this time, it was *La Libre Parole* which set the tone for the other papers. In May 1898, Drumont was elected deputy for Algiers, with three of his political friends.

In its wake, numerous anti-Jewish books were published, among the Catholics as on the extreme-Left; socialist anti-Semitism was more inclined towards antagonism on racial grounds.

The Breton socialist Augustin Hamon published *L'Agonie d'une société* in 1889, a book in which he attacked the Jews of high finance: "The Jews have invaded everything. Finance, like the press, belongs to them. In the administration of the States and cities, above all in our country, the *youdies* occupy high positions, those which give honours, money and preponderance. Go to any ministry, prefecture and you'll see a May, an Isaiah Levaillant, a Kahn, a Cohn, a Cahen, Dreyfus, a Meyer, an Alphand".[378]

Albert Regnard, another radical atheist socialist, was pleased to observe Edouard Drumont's success. At around the same time, he published a dozen books, including *Aryens et Sémites* in 1890.

The Ligue Antisémitique Nationale de France saw the light of day at this exact same time. Its vice-president, Jacques de Biez, called himself a "national-socialist". He too was convinced that Jesus was an Aryan, assigning him to the Celtic race. To the priests he met, Jacques de Biez said, a little concerned: "Are you quite sure that Jesus Christ was a Jew? Drumont made his accommodations, but that bothers me".[379] The league was also led by the adventurous Marquis de Morès and his famous "Butchers of la Villette".

As in Germany, a group was formed in the chamber of deputies. In November 1891, a draft law demanding the expulsion of the Jews got 32 votes.

The financial scandals which regularly besmirched political figures aroused popular anger. In 1892, in his newspaper, Drumont accused major political figures of using their influence and their votes to grant the Panama Canal Company the fraudulent right to issue a 700-million gold-franc bond issue, which had been the object of a favourable opinion in 1888. The Panama Canal scandal ensued. The Jewish Baron and banker Jacques de Reinach was implicated. He was the distributor of the funds which the Suez company used to bribe journalists, deputies and ministers. The checks confiscated by the judicial authorities revealed that the Baron had distributed about 4 million gold francs in bribes. Most of the big republican newspapers had been bribed. When he learned he was being prosecuted, Baron Reinach committed suicide, but the financier's death did not end the scandal.

The intermediaries charged with contacting politicians whose assistance the Company wished to obtain were two other Jews, Emile Arton and Cornelius Herz. Aaron, known as Arton, had been more particularly responsible for bribes going to the Palais-Bourbon. As soon as he was discovered, he fled to England, taking his list of 104 "chequards". His fellow Jew, Cornelius Herz, was higher class. The scion of a Jewish family from Besançon and of Bavarian origin, he was Grand-Officier of the Légion d'Honneur, a friend of presidents Grévy and Sadi Carnot, friend of Freycinet and Clémenceau, whose newspaper he sponsored. When the scandal broke out, he also fled to England. Arton was arrested in London in 1897 and extradited. He appeared before the judges, but was acquitted. Cornelius Herz, for his part, was sentenced in absentia, since his extradition was never granted by England. Dozens of parliamentarians and journalists had been bribed, but tens of thousands of small savers in particular were ruined by the bankruptcy of the company.

The Jewish historian Léon Poliakov encourages his readers to trivialise the supposed importance of the influence of the Jews in the France of this epoch: "Their total number did not perhaps exceed 80,000 (0.02% of the French population), more than half of whom lived in Paris".[380]

Léon Poliakov thus attempts to discredit the folly of the anti-Semites of the time in recalling that there were only 80,000 Jews in France. But in providing this figure, the Jewish historian only shows their very great virulence. In the same way, Jewish intellectuals often pretend that the 'anti-Semitic lunatics' often go so far as to create anti-Semitism where there haven't been any Jews many years, as in Poland, for example. They pretend to marvel at this "inexplicable" phenomenon, while the explanation is very simple: the Poles retain a fearful memory of the presence of the Jews on their soil, and to this day continue to hate them long after their departure.

In 1893, Mgr Meurin published his book, *La Franc-maçonnerie, synagogue de Satan*. Mgr Meurin, archbishop of Pont-Louis, near Lorient, was an expert on Hebrew and Sanscrit. His work contains a few passages concerning the Jews:

"It would suffice, we believe, to prohibit the Jews from being bankers, merchants, journalists, teachers, physicians, pharmacists. It does not seem unjust to declare the gigantic fortunes of certain bankers national property, because it is not permissible that a man may accumulate a more than royal fortune through financial manoeuvres in a short time and thus impoverish the country which has offered him hospitality."

Nor did it appear unfair, in his view, to reject the idea of expelling them: "The expulsion of Jews from a country", he writes, "is lack of charity, of justice towards neighbouring countries upon which these rodents are discharged".

But here he expressed the idea that only a minority of Jews are dangerous, while the majority are said to be men just like the others: "...It is also unfair to blame Jews for the crimes of an audacious handful who exploit the nation through Freemasonry."

Monsignor Meurin also quoted Abbot Kohn, grandson of converted Jews, who was a professor of theology who had been appointed archbishop of Olmütz, Austria, in 1892. In a passage from the course in canon law taught by Kohn in 1891-1892, we read: "Christians would not be complaining of their oppression by the Jews today if they had observed the prescriptions of the Church as regards their relations with them. The Church has always practised tolerance in their regard; it has even protected them; but it has never believed that Christians should

live with them on the basis of absolute equality and commonality".[381]

Mgr Kohn, a professor of canon law, recalled that these prescriptions – to which is added the prohibition for the Jews of occupying public functions giving them authority over Christians – are included in the *corpus juris canonici* and have never been abrogated.

Edouard Drumont had well depicted the influence of the Jews and their role in the destruction of traditional society, but at no time, neither in his *France juive* (1886), nor in *La Fin d'un Monde* (1889), did he ever provide the slightest outline or explanation of the universal "mission" which Jewish intellectuals never tire of proclaiming for themselves. Even Lucien Rebatet, author of a perceptive analysis of the Jewish question in the 1930s, never exposed the real objectives of Judaism.

The first book providing a true understanding of the secret motives behind worldwide Jewish actions and policies was *L'Americanisme et La Conjuraton antichrétienne*, published by Monsignor Henri Delassus in 1899. Mgr Henri Delassus, like Drumont, was a native of northern France. He was born at Estaires, and was later ordained priest at Cambrai, in 1862. A doctor in theology, he denounced the French Revolution, Christian democracy, Americanism and Freemasonry. His principal works on the Judeo-Masonic problem represent a veritable *summa* of counter-revolutionary thought. In 1904, Mgr Delassus was appointed the Pope's domestic prelate by Pius X. In 1910, he published *La Conjuraton antichrétienne* in 3 volumes.

To our knowledge, Mgr Delassus is the first French author to have correctly explained the "planetarian" project inherent in Judaism. Here we present the principal features of his work dealing with this fundamental question:

"The Jews", writes Mgr Delassus, "hope to see the realisation, soon – 'the time is near' – of the messianic prophecies in the sense in which they have always been understood, that is, their reign over the entire world, the subjugation of the entire human race to the race of Abraham and Judah [...] To accomplish all this, they now tell themselves, two things are required: 1. The nations must renounce all patriotism, and base themselves on a universal republic; 2. Men must also renounce all religious particularities and confound themselves in one same vague religiosity".

Mgr Delassus quotes here from an old 1867 edition of the revue *L'Univers israelite* (VIII, p. 357), which speaks of the objectives pursued by the Alliance Israelite Universelle, founded by "Joseph" Crémieux: "Destroying the barriers which separate that which must be

united one day, that's it, gentlemen, the beautiful, grand mission of our Alliance Israelite-Universelle". To unite all men, "whatever their current religion, or the country to which they belong... The programme of the Alliance does not consist of empty phrases. It is the great test of humanity... the union of human society into a solid and loyal fraternity".[382]

The Archives Israelites from the year 1886, once again, permit a comprehension of the unifying project of the Jews, through the words of an *Illuminatus* named Hippolyte Rodrigues (XIV, pp. 628–629): "Let temples be raised everywhere, receiving all men within their confines, without distinction of religious origin! That all hearts, filled with the same sentiments of love, unburden themselves before the same God, Father of all beings. Let all be fed by the same principles of virtue, morals and religion, and the hatreds of the sects disappear; harmony will then reign on earth, and the messianic times, predicted by the prophets of Israel, will be realised".[383]

"Let us remark in passing", writes Mgr Delassus, "that Freemasonry has the same pretensions and expresses it in the same words. It also never ceases to speak of humanitarian work and universal fraternity" (p. 27).

"Profiting from their dispersion and their presence at all points of the globe, the Jews wish to act like a sort of yeast of humanity, turning human society, presently divided into various nations and religions, into 'one single solid fraternity'.

"All power must disappear to make way for the universal domination of Judah, which will substitute itself for all presently existing powers, in both the spiritual and temporal order" (p. 29).

In this totalitarian vision of the future of humanity, the peoples and nations must therefore unify themselves to form a single universal republic: "This universal republic will be infallibly governed by the Jewish people, the only truly cosmopolitan people, the only people possessing the gold – the nerve centre of all power, the instrument of all domination" (pp. 33, 34).

"The overthrow of all borders, the abolition of all nationalities, starting with the smallest ones, for the purpose of forming a single State on their ruins; the erasure of all idea of homeland, rendering the entire earth, which belongs to all, common to all, breaking, by ruse, by force, all treaties, preparing everything for a vast democracy in which the various races, rendered base by all sort of immoralities, will be mere departments administered by high grades and by the Anti-Christ, a supreme dictator having become the one God: such is the objective of secret societies" (p. 42).

As for the "mission which Israel pretends to have received", Mgr Delassus writes, quite correctly, "This mission, with which we are already familiar, is to prepare the way for Him whom they call upon in their supplications, their Messiah. The Talmudists continue to await a Messiah in flesh and blood who will make them masters of the universe; the liberals say that there is no other Messiah to wait for, except the Revolution, the principles of which are designed to dissolve all societies and prepare for their universal empire" (p. 54). "What they have in view is domination. To establish this domination, it is not enough to annihilate patriotism from people's hearts, one must also, and above all, extinguish religious faith, since nothing gives man as much dignity and independence as his union with God through faith and charity" (p. 56).

Mgr Delassus quoted Mgr Léon Meurin, who wrote in *La Franc-maçonnerie, synagogue de Satan*: "They believe themselves to be the people destined by Jehovah to dominate all nations. The riches of the earth belong to them, and the crowns of the kings must be only the emanations, the dependencies of their *Kether-Malkhuth*... for the Jews, the idea of universal domination has become their religion; it is rooted in their spirit, it is as if it were petrified there, and it is indestructible" (pp. 19, 20). And he rendered homage to his predecessor, Mgr Meurin, who understood that the attacks on the Catholic Church, throughout the Middle Ages and until the present age, all originated from the Judaic matrix: "Mgr Meurin's achievement", he wrote, "was that he was the first researcher backed up by a serious study of the documents, an approach only incompletely followed by others. According to him, the agent of transmission of the antique errors through the ages down to the modern world, the true founder of heresies, their secret inspiration, in other ages as well as today, from the Gnostics to the Free-Masons, is the Jew" (p. 50).

Henri Delassus observed that the press, at the end of the 19th century, was then very largely in the hands of the Jews: "Those who currently manufacture opinion are the Jews above all: they occupy the principal chairs of higher education and they direct the press" (p. 69). "In France, in Europe, in all parts of the world, the Jews have created or acquired the most influential newspapers, they have men of their race in all the editorial offices; and by one means or another, they too often plant in Catholic newspapers facts, ideas and appraisals favouring the fulfilment of their plans" (p. 80). They have "made themselves the worldwide masters of the two most powerful bodies of modern life, the banks and the press".[384]

There was an urgent need to face facts and see things as they are:



“The Jews hold all of Christian society captive at the present time, like a vice. You could almost say: the whole world” (p. 212). Thanks to Jewish subversion, “as general as it is incessant, religious indifference is gaining ground every day and causing the world to drift towards this ‘New Order of Jerusalem’ which its adepts call for as their fondest hope. To arrive at this goal, they work to annihilate all patriotism on the one hand, and to destroy all religious conviction on the other hand. Under Jewish direction, the press applies itself to this task, everyday, all over the world, with indefatigable ardour”.[385]

In his 1910 work, *La Conjuración antichrétienne*, Mgr Delassus observed the growth of the public debt in all the States under Jewish domination, and which would experience an exponential increase in the following century: “Today”, he writes, “the Jews have succeeded in hollowing out the abyss of debt in all States. It is a modern principle that states, provinces, cities, may mortgage the future for the benefit of the present. Jewish capitalists supply the means. Senseless borrowings which will never be amortised increase the crushing load of tax to perpetuity and place all governments at the mercy of Jewry. Any ‘modern’ government would be destroyed the moment it was foolish enough to come to the parting of the ways with the owners of big capital. How could it resist the coalition of Jews closing their coffers all at the same time?”[386]

“For a century, with the aid of the Revolution, the Jews started with a new ardour to pursue the ideal of their race, and to seize control for this purpose of all the living forces of the peoples who have been imprudent enough to admit them into their countries on the basis of equality, using Christian morality in their regard while the Jews know only Talmudic morality. It was thus that they arrived in France to dominate us, or rather, to tyrannise us into accepting the point of view of policy and government, the top banks, industry and trade, the press and opinion”.[387]

“As for the Jews, whose power has become so formidable in such a short time, are they going to see their hopes realised? Are they going to succeed in ripping what patriotism remains from their hearts? [...] And then, when the terrain has been prepared, is this Messiah they have been dreaming about for thousands of years going to arise from their midst to reduce humanity to servitude? It is certain that at no time in history have the times been so favourable to their domination. The political world, the economic and commercial world, the secret societies and the Jews, are working with an indefatigable ardour for cosmopolitan unity... There is no mistaking it”, writes Mgr Delassus, a few pages further along: “the characters of the Talmudic Messiah are

indeed the characters of the anti-Christ. It is the same sinister personage who is announced on both sides".[388]

But we must not, according to him, deviate from the traditional doctrine and legislation of the Church. He recognised that the Church had "always protected the Jews against the legitimate but excessive indignation of the peoples whom they had exploited, deceived or betrayed". It was because it expected "the promised conversion of this people", in which it was necessary to honour "despite everything, the debris of what was the chosen nation, the people of God". They must be secure in their lives and property, but measures must be taken to prevent them from exercising any influence over Christians. "If this legislation, so wise, had not been repudiated by the modern governments, the Jewish question would not exist".

Despite all their misdeeds, there, "every good Christian must have something of the sentiments for the Jews which were in the heart of Saint Paul".[389]

Mgr Meurin, in turn, observed the fabulous power acquired by the Jews since their emancipation: "Today", he wrote, "we find that these new citizens, after seizing control of the greater part of all national riches, tend to take over the government and oppress those whom they have not ceased to regard as impure beings, gentiles, uncircumcised Philistines. All the measures proposed, apart from those taken by the Church, will be in vain, and those of the Church, to be effective, must be applied in unison by the State and by each of us, personally, as this results from the teachings of Mgr Kohn. As long as the Jews are Jews, that is, until the end of the world at least, the only policy to follow in their regard will be to keep them apart and not mistreat them, associating with them as little as possible while preventing them from doing harm. *Iudaeos subiacere christianis oportet et ab eis pro sola humanitate foveri*".

For Mgr Meurin, the Jewish question will only be regulated at the "end of time", at the time of the triumph of Christ over the Jewish Messiah (the anti-Christ). The Catholics may also be encouraged to allow their enemies to act, to allow them to work to cause the coming of their Messiah, assured as they are that they will triumph in the end. In reality, it is indeed the Jew who triumphs down here. The Christians are disarmed here, faced with the Jewish messianism, which permanently encourages the activism of the members of the sect and bends their will and their hopes towards final deliverance. But if one regards Jewish messianism with a mirror, a light appears, and the truth imposes itself upon men, quite naturally: the Messiah will only come after the disappearance, the apostasy, of the last Jew.

## 126

### Austria-Hungary at the End of the 19th Century

In 1899, in Bohemia, a ritual murder was committed which aroused a new wave of anti-Semitism. Anezka Hruzova, a young Czech Catholic woman, aged 19, lived at KleinVeznic (today Veznicka), near Polna. She visited the village every day to work as a seamstress. On 29 March 1899, in the afternoon, she left her workplace for the last time. Three days later, on 1 April, her body was found in a forest: her throat had been cut and her clothing was torn. Police suspicion was first directed against 4 vagabonds who had been seen in the area of the forest during the afternoon of the day of the murder. Among them was Leopold Hilsner, a 23-year-old Jew. He stated that he had left the forest in the afternoon, long after the time of the supposed crime, but he failed to produce a verifiable alibi. Hilsner was arrested and tried at Kuttenberg (Kutna Hora) on 12–16 September. He denied all responsibility, despite the bloodstains on his pants and the various witnesses, one of whom stated that she had seen him leave the forest in a state of particular agitation. His death sentence re-awakened the screams of indignation of the international (Jewish) community.

Tomáš Masaryk, professor at the university of Prague and future president of Czechoslovakia, filed an appeal before the Supreme Court, and a new trial was held at Písek. In several regions, sometimes-violent demonstrations against the Jews were held, as at Holleschau and Nachod.

The officials of the Jewish community of Vienna intrigued before the government and organised a great conference on 7 October. On 11 December, August Schreiber, one of the editors of the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, was sentenced to 4 months imprisonment for anti-Jewish defamation, which only aggravated the tension. Two weeks later, Dr. Baxa, the family lawyer, accused the government of partiality in favour of the Jews in a speech before the Diet of Bohemia.

In the meantime, Hilsner was accused of another murder, that of Marie Klimova, a servant who disappeared on 17 July 1898, and whose body was found on 27 October 1899 in the same forest as Anezka Hruzova's body. Hilsner was tried for this second crime at Písek between 25 October and 14 November 1900. The last day, the court pronounced the verdict: Hilsner was found guilty of both crimes and

sentenced to the death penalty. On 11 June 1901, however, the Emperor commuted the sentence to life imprisonment.

At this time, at Vienna as at Berlin, or London or Paris, the mass press was entirely under Jewish control. The most famous artists, those who benefited from the greatest praise from the newspapers, were mostly Jews. In the Austrian capital at the end of the 19th century, everybody was talking about Stefan Zweig, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler, the composers Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schönberg. The cosmopolitan spirit was triumphing everywhere, and everywhere, religion, patriotism, family values, were ridiculed. Pornography was distributed more and more widely, and soon, under the influence of Sigmund Freud, who worked in the Viennese ghetto, homosexuality began to be trivialised.

Adolf Hitler noted, in *Mein Kampf*, that pimping was particularly visible in the Austrian capital. Numerous women were also literally kidnapped and sent to foreign countries to prostitute themselves.

The white slave trade was just beginning to scandalise European public opinion starting in the very early 1880s. The journalist François Trocase left a few interesting comments on this subject: "The Jews", he writes, "have inculcated dissolute morals, deplorable habits, and unprecedented demoralisation in Austrian female youth. The inborn baseness of their feelings, money and the absolute lack of conscience, singularly predispose them to the role of seducers. Also, prostitution lies in ambush at every doorway for young girls who, in the big city, are becoming servants of the Jews in such great numbers. One can hardly go wrong in saying that the greatest number of unhappy girls who are corrupted and turn to prostitution owe their first fall to the Jews. One must remember, in fact, that most of those who come from the provinces every day are compelled to enter the service of Jewish families, since many Christian families are no longer in a position to pay them. We may consider it a certainty that the two and a half million Jews living in Austria and Hungary have in their service as many, if not more, servants than the 38 million Austrians and Hungarians of the Christian faith put together. Let us add that 9/10ths of the young girls in service are Christians. Now, the constant and well-known habits of Jewish families as regards their servants all too often only exert a harmful influence over these servants. It is not rare to see Jewish mothers take, as 'maids of all work', to borrow a common expression, young girls who have the special mission, besides their ordinary work, of satisfying the caprices of the sons of the house. Not only does the mother know this and tolerate it, but she most often wants it this way. In her mind, it is a question of preventing their sons from catching diseases before they get married. We are, of course, only speaking of

Jewish mothers and Jewish families. Despite this special responsibility, the maid's salary is not increased. It is generally 10 florins (21 francs) per month, and too often, when the young girl is sent away to make way for another, she is compelled by the habits she has acquired to take refuge in the hospitals which are so numerous in the two capitals of the monarchy, and which are run by Jews, just like their former employers."

François Trocase added: "Relations between Jewish patrons and Christian employees much resemble the relations of young Jews with their mothers' servants. They are unfortunately stained by the same character of immorality".

An inquiry into young working women revealed the actions of a big Jewish boss who employed numerous apprentices aged 14–16 in his workshops. "When they finished their two-years apprenticeships without the slightest salary", writes Trocase, "they could not obtain the worker's booklet from him to which they had a right and which they needed, except on the condition of sacrificing to him what Dumas called their 'capital'. The exploits accomplished in this type by another Jew are no less typical. All by himself he exploited 1,400 weaving jobs in various localities of Austrian Silesia. This same Jew bragged publicly of having received in his office, over the years, the 'intimate visits' of more than 1,000 of his female workers, women or young girls, married or unmarried, whom he invited, one after the other, to come personally to ask for work. He referred to these 'intimate visits' as 'commissions', to be withheld from their salaries."

The misery which reigned in the working classes explains these proceedings of a very common custom, to the point, as a Viennese deputy named Josef Gregorig publicly put it, that "we have arrived at the point of admitting as proven fact that Austrian workers generally only marry girls who have first been deflowered by the Jews."

But Christian women remained the prey of Jews even after they were married. We know, in fact, that in the Talmud, the prohibition against adultery does not apply to sex with the wife of a Christian. We know the formula: "Only the Jews are men, the goyim are only the seed of the beast". Adultery with a goyische woman is not prohibited.

In the countryside, the Jews exploited in the same manner the misery of the people, particularly in the poorest provinces, in Bukovina and Galicia. When a ruined peasant could not pay the interest on his debt, his daughters gave their bodies in payment. Only the forced surrender of their virginity could prevent the father from being thrown out on the street.[390]

Numerous young girls, at Vienna and Budapest, disappeared after falling into prostitution networks. Poor Jews, as always, acted as

go-betweens. They knew how to find young girls for Turkish harems and brothels all over the world. The Jewish mafia has no scruples when it came to sending young Christian girls to prostitute themselves in Istanbul or Buenos Aires: "This shameful specialty, which dishonours our century", writes Trocase, "belongs to the Jews alone and in an exclusive fashion. We must leave them with the infamy of it. For a long time, the details were unknown. They saw large numbers of young girls disappear mysteriously, without knowing what happened to them".

In 1892, the Lemberg Trial (Lemberg = present-day Lvov) in Galicia, was tremendous. In this trial, 28 Jews were accused of pimping. The network consisted of recruiters in Europe and local agents in turkey. The girls were sent to Constantinople, Egypt, South Africa, India and South America.[391]

"These miserable creatures, most of them schoolgirls, had fallen into a cleverly-prepared trap which deceived many Christian girls.

"They were promised the most brilliant conditions to persuade them to leave for a foreign country. As soon as they crossed the border, they were treated like slaves and any attempt at escape was severely punished. Upon arrival in Turkey they were sold to houses of prostitution at a thousand marks each, on average. Now, who owned these houses in Turkey? The Jews alone; no one else. Victims who resisted were locked up in subterranean dungeons and softened up by mistreatment. When the police decided to intervene, 60 of these girls were freed. They were torn from the clutches of the barbarians. But alas, they were ruined, body and soul."

During the six days that the trial lasted, it was clearly established that hundreds of young girls had been dragged into prostitution by Jewish pimps. And nevertheless, the guilty persons were only sentenced to insignificant penalties. The leader of the gang, Schafenstein, received only a year's imprisonment; the others, without exception, received just a few months.[392]

In 1918, anti-Jewish incidents were still taking place in the city, which proves that trafficking in women had not stopped. At the very same time, in the Austrian parliament, they were still debating the disappearance of Christian servants smuggled to brothels in foreign countries.

The Lemberg trial was naturally exploited by the anti-Semitic resistance. The abuses committed against women by the Jews obviously powerfully contributed to the explosion of anger by the populations. "Just in talking about it, the hatred became indescribable", writes Trocase.[393] The demoralisation of the masses made way for hatred; the legitimate hatred of the victim faced with his oppressor.

The resistance organised itself under the leadership of Dr. Karl Lüger and his Christian-Socialist Party, which attacked the big capitalist Jews. He then published all sorts of anti-Semitic writings in the capital. At Vienna, the anti-Semites gained ground, and, in 1897, Lüger was elected mayor of the city. He only remained mayor until 1910.

The most prominent figures of Austrian anti-Semitism were then Prince Alois Lichtenstein, Doctor Pattal (deputy for Styria), Gessmann, Psenner, Vergani, deputy for Lower Austria, founded the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, an anti-Semitic journal published twice a day, in 1881. The journal was the target of unscrupulous attacks by Jewish journalists. There was also the canon Scheicher, as well as the scholar Deckert. Deputy Schneider wished to employ radical means to put an end to the Jewish question.

Georg von Schönerer formed the Pan-German Party, which distinguished itself by its anti-Catholicism and the desire to be joined to Germany. In 1888, von Schönerer was temporarily imprisoned for sacking the offices of a journal whose owner was a Jew, and for assaulting the employees with a team of militants. But his imprisonment only increased his popularity. In 1897, he entered Parliament, and in 1901, 21 members of his party were elected.

Over the course of the year 1898, Polish peasants, exasperated by the rise in the price of bread, began to attack the Jews. Martial law was proclaimed in 33 districts and the peasants were warned, to the beat of a drum, that any attack on Jews would be punished by death. Nevertheless, the entire region of Neu-Sandec (Nowy Sącz) was on fire. The houses, farms, and above all, the shops kept by Jews were systematically pillaged and demolished. The army and the gendarmerie made vain efforts to put an end to the popular uprising. When order was finally re-established, numerous insurgents were dead. Others were condemned to forced labour by the courts, but not one Jew had been killed.

François Trocase correctly observed the mentality of Jewish intellectuals. "The strangest thing about this situation is that the Jews, despite their incontestable domination over all of Austria, despite the monopolies over which they have gained control, are still complaining, in their newspapers and public statements, of the persecution of which they claim to be the victims".

And he added: "In the struggle which began 20 years ago, the dilemma arises as follows: either the Aryans must lock up their oppressors in ghettos as they did during the Middle Ages, or it is the Aryans who must be locked up by the Jews".[394]

127

**The Collapse of Russia**

Russia, which administered the greater part of the former territory of Poland since the 18th century, inherited the large Jewish population which had moved into this territory over the course of the Middle Ages. The country had previously been *Judenrein*, Jew-free, since Ivan the Terrible had decreed that no Jew would henceforth be allowed to set foot on Russian soil. After him, all the Czars remained loyal to this principle, including Peter the Great.

The Jews in the annexed territories had to remain in the Pale, or zone of residence, which extended from the shores of the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea. Anti-Semitism there was obviously just as alive and well as elsewhere. Under Nicholas I (1825–1855), the Jews of the Pale were ordered to evacuate all localities less than 50 km from the border for fear they might spy for Germany.

In his highly-documented book *Two Hundred Years Together*, published in Russian in 2001–2002, the great Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn quoted the testimony of Senator Gabriel Romanovich Derzhavin, who was made responsible by the Czar for inquiring into the causes of the famine which struck Byelorussia at the end of the 18th century. This statesman, later Minister of Justice under Alexander I, reported in his memorandum that, in the campaigns in Byelorussia, the Jews dedicated themselves principally to the production of cheap alcohol. In the autumn, in particular, during the harvests, they swarmed through the villages, “making the peasants and their loved ones drink alcohol”, writes Derzhavin, “collecting their debts and depriving them of their last halfpenny... They deceive the drunkards, strip them of everything they have, and plunge them into complete penury”.

These excesses were facilitated by the presence in the villages of numerous taverns rented by the Jews. “They sell vodka night and day... in the same way, the Jews succeed in depriving the peasants not only of their daily bread, but of the products of the soil and their agricultural tools, as well as their goods, their time, their health, even their lives”, resorting to “all sorts of ruses and subterfuges,” “reducing the poor and stupid villagers to famine”. [395]

This situation explained the regulations of 1804 and 1835 which prohibited the Jews from residing in the countryside. In the Ukraine,



they could live anywhere, with the exception of Kiev and certain villages; but nowhere in Russia were there any compulsory ghettos in the cities. In the second half of the century, under Alexander II, the restrictions affecting the Jews were abolished one after another and they could engage in the sale of alcohol and the renting of distilleries in their two places of residence, so much so that, in the south-west, they rented 89% of all distilleries in 1872.[396]

The mass of Jews, of course, lived meanly, but some of them were immensely rich. Thus the famous Israel Brodski possessed 17 sugar refineries. Huge Jewish fortunes were also built up from the exploitation of Russian natural resources, particularly the foreign exportation of lumber and the extraction of gold. They played a major role in the exportation of agricultural products: starting in 1878, 60% of all cereals exports transited the Jews; soon, this would be almost 100%. The Ginzberg family distinguished itself here particularly. They also invested in the construction of railways. The "King of Railways" in 1880 was Samuel Polyakov, but in 1890, the Russian state became the biggest constructor.

Their real domain, naturally, was banking: more than half of all mutual credit societies, savings and loan societies were located in the Pale, and 86% of their members, in 1911, were Jews.[397]

By the beginning of the 20th century, the Jews had acquired solid positions in the vital sectors of the Russian economy and were active in all large cities despite any regulations; there were 16,000 of them in Moscow in 1880, 30 to 40 thousand in Saint Petersburg in 1900, 81,000 in Kiev in 1913, and the number of Jews living outside the Pale of Settlement regularly increased from year to year. Alexander II permitted Jews with university diplomas to live anywhere in Russia. The same measure was passed in 1879 for pharmacists, nurses and dentists.

With the coming of Alexander II in 1855, the regime was effectively liberalised, and an assimilation policy was to prepare the Jews for citizenship. The Jews were thus able to attend lycées and universities. Starting in 1874, they flooded into the establishments of general education – a real privilege, since, in 1914, only 55% of the Russian population had any education. In 1881, the Jews represented nearly 9% of all students; in 1887, this figure rose to 14.5%, while in certain universities, this percentage was even higher. At the faculty of medicine of Kharkov, 42% were Jews, and 41% at the faculty of law at Odessa.[398] In the last decades of the 19th century, this Jewish intelligentsia, which mastered the Russian language, would play a fundamental role in the intellectual and political movements which

would undermine traditional Russian society. Czarist power therefore contributed to train in its universities those who would be the principal protagonists in its collapse.

The rise of anti-Jewish resistance at the beginning of the century was first and foremost the achievement of an Italian priest from Tuscany who had obtained the chair of oriental languages at the University of Warsaw, at that time under Russian domination. Luigi Chiarini (1789–1832), an Orientalist with a good knowledge of Hebrew, obtained this post thanks to Potocki, the Minister of Education. In 1830, Chiarini published his *Theory of Judaism* in two volumes, in which he showed that the evils of Judaism found their principal origin in the teachings of the Talmud. The Jews, according to him, should return to the simple Mosaic faith, and the State should assist them in freeing themselves through the foundation of schools offering the teachings of the Bible and in which one would study Hebraic grammar. Luigi Chiarini also worked on a French translation of the Babylonian Talmud, containing explanatory notes and refutations. Encouraged by Czar Nicholas I, he published this study the next year, but only the first two volumes could be published. As it turned out, he was compelled to abandon his project due to the Polish insurrection of 1830.[399]

The ideologist Ivan Aksakov, the indefatigable leader of the Slavophile movement, also stood up against Jewish power. In 1867, he paraphrased Karl Marx: “The real question is not the emancipation of the Jews, but the emancipation of the Russian population from the Jews, to liberate Russian men of the south-west from the Jewish yoke”.

Aksakov found an ally in the person of Jacob Brafman. This convert, professor of Hebrew at the Orthodox seminary of Minsk, was the Holy Synod expert on the problems of the Church’s mission to the Jews. Starting in 1867, in the *Courrier de Vilna*, he began to publish articles on the life and customs of the Jewish communities, which supplied him with the material for two large works, *Le Livre du Kahal* (the institution which governed the Jewish community of Eastern Europe), and *Les Confréries juives locales et universelles*, both published in 1869. These books were distributed by the government in the administrative services. In the *Livre du Kahal*, Jacob Brafman, supported by the archives of the Jewish community of Minsk, denounced the means employed by the Jews to expel the goyim from trade and industry and concentrate all capital and immovable assets in their hands. All the ordinances of the *Kahal* published by Jacob Brafman in his book date from 1794 to 1833. Their authenticity, he said, was confirmed by the age of the paper. The *Kahal* was officially

eliminated in 1844, but the Jewish communities nevertheless remained highly structured. This publication, in any case, greatly displeased the Jews who bought all the copies they could find and burned or concealed them.[400]

In 1873, Dostoyevsky, in his *Journal of a Writer*, speaking out against the “yids”, criticised the financiers. Later he accused the Jew Disraeli, Prime Minister of Great Britain, of using the Turks against Russia. In 1877, the British Prime Minister sent the British navy to the Marmara Sea to protect Istanbul, threatened by the Russian army. Dostoyevsky, for his part, preached a crusade to deliver Constantinople. In 1880, shortly before his death, he even praised the “great Aryan race”.

As for Tolstoy, while he was not an anti-Semite, he recognised the Aryan nature of Christ: “I would like to write something to demonstrate how the teachings of Christ, who was not a Jew, have been replaced by the very different teachings of the apostle Paul, who, for his part, was a Jew; and then I have other important tasks. But it is an admirable and important subject”.[401]

In 1879, a ritual murder was committed at Kutaisi, in the Caucasus. At the same time, the Polish ex-priest Ippolit Iosifovich Lyutostansky, who had converted to Orthodoxy, drew up a long treatise on this subject (*On the Use of Christian Blood by the Jews*, 1876) and a public debate began. The most important Russian daily, the *Novoye Vremya*, published a study of the historian Nikolay Kostomarov. The *Novoye Vremya* also published large extracts of the book by Wilhelm Marr, *Victory of Judaism over Germanism*. One must reread the book by Neophytos, a former rabbi who had converted and become a monk, and who had published a study dealing with ritual murder entitled *Refutation of the Religion of the Jews* in Moldavia in 1803. The book was published under the patronage of Metropolitan Iacob Stamati.[402] Neophytos swore on the crucifix that these crimes had indeed occurred, and that he himself had participated in them. Encouraged by his success, Lyutostansky published another work in 1879 called *The Talmud and the Jews*. [403]

The assassination of Alexander II, on 1 March 1881, had the effect of braking the liberalisation process of the regime, causing repression and radicalising the revolutionary groups. The assassination, which led to a whole series of failed assassinations prepared by the *Narodnaya Volya* (*Will of the People*), gave substance to all these fears with regards to the Jews. In Russia, as elsewhere, the socialist movement was very largely the creation of doctrinaire Jews, and the accusations relate directly to them.

The Jewish historian Léon Poliakov attempted to demonstrate the “myth” of Jewish control over the revolutionary movement: “The terrorist who threw the bomb, Ignaty Grinevitsky, was described in the official report as a rather typical Russian, ‘with a full, round face and large nose’, but the day after the attack, the *Novoye Vremya* spoke of an ‘individual of the eastern type, with a crook nose’”. As for the *Narodnaya Volya*, according to Poliakov, it was a small organisation “made up almost exclusively, perhaps it is not needless to say, of authentic Russians”. Thus does the Jewish historian attempt to destroy the “legend”.

Solzhenitsyn noted however in his book that the Czar was killed on the evening before Purim, an annual feast of vengeance, in which the Jews celebrate a victory over their enemies, and that the assassination was prepared in the house of a certain Gesya Gelfman.[404] This remark is moreover confirmed by a Jewish historian, Henri Minczeles: “Among the revolutionaries arrested was one Gesya Gelfman, a young Jewish woman who had stored dynamite in her garret”.[405]

The assassination of the Czar triggered an explosion, and numerous pogroms exploded, mainly in the Ukraine. Shortly before, over the course of Holy Week, on 24 April 1881 – a week of anti-Jewish excesses – a pogrom exploded at Yelisavetgrad, followed by others, more serious, at Kiev and Odessa, and in several dozens of other localities. The pogroms always and exclusively exploded in south-western Russia, Solzhenitsyn notes. There was extensive destruction, but no deaths.

The laws of May 1882 nevertheless restricted the extent of Jewish economic influence. They were prohibited from living in the countryside, where they exploited the peasants, or in certain cities, including Kiev and Yalta, the imperial residence in Crimea. The acquisition of lands and buildings was forbidden to them. Outside the Pale, particularly the two capitals, Moscow and Saint Petersburg, the few dozen privileged Jews who had been permitted to move there were asked to leave. The Jews were forbidden to Russify their first names, and their true nationality was printed in red on their passport. But these measures were tempered by the corruption of Russian bureaucrats, who frequently took bribes.

In 1891, a measure was passed limiting their access to establishments of secondary education: 10% in the Pale, 3% in the capitals, and 5% elsewhere. Public employment, teaching, the bar and many other careers were made inaccessible for them.

In 1891, the regime encouraged conversions: a married convert was released from the bonds uniting him to his spouse and children, and

received, upon his abjuration, a sum of fifteen to thirty roubles. The number of synagogues was also limited. The synagogue of Moscow was closed for indecency in 1892.

In 1892, the academy of sciences of Saint Petersburg published the best and most meticulous anthology of Talmudic maxims dealing with Christ and the Christians: *Christianus in talmude judaeorum, sive rabbinicae doctrinae de christianis secreta* (The Christian in the Jewish Talmud, or The Secrets of Rabbinical Teaching on the Subject of the Christians). The book was published with the imprimatur of the metropolitan archbishop of Mogilev. Its author, Father Justinas Bonaventura Pranaitis, was a Catholic priest of Lithuanian origin, holder of the chair of Hebrew at the Imperial Ecclesiastical Academy of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint Petersburg. The book provided the Hebrew text of the rabbinical prescriptions with their translation into Latin. But the copies disappeared almost completely and only a small number were saved. An edition of one of them with the corresponding Italian translations was published at Milan in 1939; Abbot Julio Meinvielle used it.[406] The work was later translated into English, Italian, Spanish, etc. under the title *The Talmud Unmasked*.

Pranaitis wrote: "Since the word *Jeshua* means 'Saviour', the name of Jesus rarely appears in Jewish books. It is almost always abridged as *Jeschu*, which is maliciously taken as if it were composed of the initial letters of the words *immach schemo vezikro* – 'may his name and memory be erased'.

"The Talmud teaches that Jesus Christ was an illegitimate son conceived during menstruation; that he has the soul of Esau, that he is crazy, that he is a plotter and seducer, that he was crucified, is buried in hell, and was later taken as an idol by those who followed. *The Book of Zohar*, iii (282), tells us that Jesus is dead like a beast and was buried in a great pile of manure... where one throws the carrion of dogs and asses and where the sons of Esau [the Christians] and Ismael [the Turks] including Jesus and Mohammed, the uncircumcised and impure, are buried like dead dogs".[407]

Pranaitis died in 1917, during the "Russian" revolution, probably tortured to death by the Jewish militants who were the spearhead of Bolshevism. Let us note here that the Orthodox clergy has not yet produced a great expert on Judaism, like Pastor Steucker in Germany, or the Jesuits of the *Civiltà Cattolica* at Rome.

After the founding of the S.R. (Socialist-Revolutionary) party, the Jews made up a solid majority within the leadership of the movement. The members of the restricted circle of leaders were Jews: Mendel, Vittenberg, Levin, Levit and Azef. The party decided from the

beginning to resort to armed struggle to achieve the overthrow of Czarism, and a combat organisation was immediately created to spread terror. This organisation was directed by a certain Gershuni (1901–1903). Of Jewish origins, ex-pharmaceutical preparer, he was 30 years old at the time when he drew up the statutes of the organisation. Under his leadership, men of the Combat Organisation killed the Minister of the Interior Sipyagin, shot at Prince Obolensky, and killed governor Bogdanovich in 1903. Sipyagin's successor, Plehve, was appointed Minister of the Interior in 1902.

When Gershuni was captured by the police at Kiev, he was replaced by another Jew, the engineer Evno Azef, who led the organisation until 1906. On 15 July 1904, Plehve was killed by a bomb. Grand-Duke Serge was assassinated in turn. Another Jewish terrorist, Zilberberg, took over after Evno Azef.

The combat organisation suffered heavy losses and was dissolved after disagreements within the central committee. A new terrorist group was then formed by Zilberberg under the name of the "Combat Detachment", but Zilberberg fell in February 1907. A little while later, Stolypin, the Czar's Minister of the Interior who had set up a major agricultural reform between 1906 and 1910, was assassinated at Kiev by the Jewish extremist Bogrov, during the ceremonies of the 300th anniversary of the dynasty on 2 September 1911.[408]

After 1881, the most important pogrom occurred at Kishinev, the capital of Bessarabia, during the Easter feasts in 1903. The city was 45% peopled by Jews. Pavel Krushevan, the owner of the local daily, and who was also the first editor of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, denounced Judaism for years, but the murder of an adolescent in February 1903 really set things off. With the approach of Easter, the whole world knew that something was going to happen. On Easter Sunday, 6 April, the pogrom exploded. The Jews were assaulted by mobs, who burnt their houses. There were only 2 deaths on the first day; on the second day there were 47 deaths, including 2 Christians, and 500 injured. The army only went into action on Monday evening to restore calm. Nearly one third of the houses in the city were destroyed or damaged. Once again, the "International (Jewish) Community" was indignant. The entire foreign press screamed about Russian barbarism, and expressed the need to for "True Democracy" in Russia, so as to give the "poor Jews" their "Equal Rights" and ensure respect for "Human Rights".[409]

In 1904, there were no further disturbances, but in 1905, during the Russo-Japanese war, there was a great wave of pogroms against the Jews, who did not conceal their sympathy for Japan.[410] At Kiev,

Odessa and a few other cities in the Ukraine, clashes occurred between the Ukrainians and the Jews. The Jews, for their part, were made up of paramilitary groups consisting of thousands of combatants. Violent incidents multiplied in number in hundreds of localities, no doubt encouraged by the authorities. There were about 50 of these large pogroms in the last 10 days of October 1905, and nearly 600 small pogroms, causing 810 deaths in total and 1770 wounded. The international (Jewish) community was once again indignant, and the Rothschilds refused to subscribe to Russian government loans. In 1906, two more big pogroms took place at Bialystok and Siedlice (110 deaths in total).

More than 2.5 million Jews left Russia between 1880 and 1910. Jewish historians always forget to explain the causes for this exodus, and content themselves with pointing the finger at "persecution". In reality, the immigration of Jews was principally motivated by the instauration of a state monopoly over the distillation of alcohol and the abolition of all private debts in 1896. This measure, intended to protect the peasantry and force the Jews to leave the rural areas, had the principal effect, as Alexander Solzhenitsyn explains, of "inflicting a heavy blow to the economic activity of the Jews in Russia". It is therefore virtually certain that large-scale Jewish emigration from Russia started at this time, and for this reason.[411]

Anti-Semitic pamphlets were circulating everywhere. 2,837 different ones appeared over the 10-year period of 1906–1916. The writings of the German Eugen Dühring were very well known in Russia at the time. At Saint Petersburg, Pyotr Ivanovich Rachkovsky, appointed adjutant director of the police department, took official charge of anti-Semitic propaganda.

In 1905, Sergei Nilus, a Russian magistrate of Swiss origin, prosecuting attorney for the provincial court of the Caucasus, published the first edition of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, acquired in 1901. The document is presented as the record of an alleged elder of Israel speaking before other Jews of a plan to rule the world. These are the records of secret meetings, 27 in total, according to the version of Georgy Vasilyevich Butmi, published in 1903. A world government, a universal super-government, was to bring about the reign of peace on earth, a peace which would be universal and definitive, says Protocol 22. Here are a few extracts from *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*:

Second session: "When we have accomplished our coup d'état we shall say then to the various peoples: 'Everything has gone terribly badly, all have been worn out with sufferings. We are destroying the causes of your torment — nationalities, frontiers, differences of

coinages. You are at liberty, of course, to pronounce sentence upon us, but can it possibly be a just one if it is confirmed by you before you make any trial of what we are offering you.' ... Then will the mob exalt us and bear us up in their hands in a unanimous triumph of hopes and expectations. Voting, which we have made the instrument which will set us on the throne of the world by teaching even the very smallest units of members of the human race to vote by means of meetings and agreements by groups, will then have served its purposes and will play its part then for the last time by a unanimity of desire to make close acquaintance with us before condemning us. To secure this we must have everybody vote without distinction of classes and qualifications, in order to establish an absolute majority, which cannot be obtained from the educated propertied classes."

Eleventh session: "The peoples, exasperated by the disorders and moral bankruptcy of their governments, whatever they are, will cry: 'Overthrow them all, and give us one single leader, a King of the Universe, as long as he is of Jewish blood, who will unite us and abolish the causes of our disorders, that is: borders, nationalities, religions and national debts: a king, in sum, who will bring us back calm and peace'".

In 1911, a new ritual murder case exploded, creating great excitement. On 12 March, a 13-year-old Ukrainian boy from Kiev, Andrei Yushchinsky, disappeared on the road to school. Eight days later, on 20 March, his mutilated body was discovered in a cave near a brick factory. A certain Menahem Beilis, a Jewish foreman of the brick factory, was arrested on 21 July 1911, after a witness attested that the boy was kidnapped by Beilis. Beilis spent more than two years in prison waiting for trial, which was held in Kiev from 23 September to 28 October 1913. One of the witnesses for the prosecution, an expert on ritual murders, was none other than the Catholic priest Justinas Pranaitis, having come especially from Tashkent. Pranaitis spoke for twelve hours without stopping, attesting that the murder of the little Yushchinsky was a sacrifice, a religious ritual. Another expert, I.A. Sikorsky, Professor of Psychiatry at Kiev University, also considered it a ritual murder. The Russian scholar Vladimir Ivanovich Dal, a trained physician, famous for caring for Pushkin in his long agony, was the author of a study of ritual murders entitled *A Memorandum on Ritual Murders: A Study of the Murders of Christian Babies and the Use of Their Blood by the Jews*. This work, published in 1844 at Saint Petersburg, was utilised by the prosecution in the Beilis case.

It was not a question of the trial of a Jew, but a general battle between world Jewry and the Russian government. O.Yu. Vipper, a



prosecuting attorney, gave an idea of the situation of the Jews in Russia: "The Russian press is only Russian in appearance; in reality, almost all our publications are in the hands of the Jews... Legally, the Jews live under our laws of exception, but in fact, they are the masters of our world, and in this regard, the Biblical promises are being fulfilled before our eyes".[412]

The foreign press harassed the Russian government in an unprecedented manner. In December 1911, the United States unilaterally annulled the Russo-American trade treaty. Beilis was represented by the most famous lawyers in Moscow, Saint Petersburg and Kiev. For them, the defendant was innocent. Moreover, ritual murder accusations against the Jews, as everyone knows, are only "ridiculous legends", the product of the weak minds of anti-Semites or the mind of obscurantist monks right out of the Middle Ages. The Beilis trial was followed all over the world, and indignation and insults against the Czarist legal system poured in from all over the world. It was in this context that Beilis was acquitted.

The Beilis case is often compared to the Leo Frank case. A native of Brooklyn, Frank managed a pencil factory in Atlanta in 1915, he was accused of the rape and murder of a young employee, Mary Phagan, then aged 12. At his trial he was found guilty and sentenced to death, but the governor of the state of Georgia commuted his death sentence to life imprisonment. It was then that the crowd proceeded with a lynching, and Leo Frank was hanged to a tree. The Jews as usual, screamed through the press that Frank was innocent. The Jew, in fact, is always "accused", but never guilty.

We know however that this sort of case is frequent within the "incestuous community"; since paedophilia is one of the psychic disorders caused by sexual abuse, which are common in Jewish families, and which is transmitted from generation to generation. Psychiatrists speak here of "incestuous generations".[413]

## 128

### **Jewish Messianism**

The revolution that broke out in Russia during the month of February 1917 raised the hopes of Jews all over the world. From New York to Paris, from London to Buenos Aires, from Istanbul to Vilnius, they congratulated each other, kissed each other, and drank champagne. The Czar was overthrown at last, and the Jews of Russia reached the pinnacles of power. In October, with the Bolshevik coup d'état, their triumph was complete.

It was not just a question, at first, of "Liberating the Proletariat", but of building a perfect world: a world without borders, where equality and harmony would reign supreme. To achieve this would require a "Tabula Rasa" approach, permitting the appearance of "The New Man".

In reality, the egalitarian fanaticism of Communism gave rise to an immediate succession of massacres. In total, in thirty years, more than 30 million Russians and Ukrainians were liquidated by the criminal folly of the new masters. Next to the Maoist experience in China, the Russian revolution was the second biggest tragedy in world history.

While it is permitted, at the beginning of the 21st century, to denounce the horrors of communism, it is still strictly prohibited, in democratic countries, to insist on the identity of its principal instigators. We know however that communism was essentially a Jewish affair: Karl Marx was the grandson of a rabbi; Lenin had Jewish origins on his mother's side; Trotsky, the head of the Red Army, was really named Bronstein; Kamenev, the president of the Moscow city administration, was really named Rozenfeld; Zinoviev, the master of Leningrad, was really named Apfelbaum; the first head of state of Bolshevik Russia was a Jew named Yakov Sverdlov, etc.

The list of Jewish Bolshevik dignitaries is interminable. The revolution which broke out in Berlin in 1918 was led by other Jews: Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg. In Hungary, at the same time, Bela Kun took over as head of a revolutionary government composed almost exclusively of Jews, and of course it is well known that after 1945, it was the Jews who became heads of state in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania. The famous writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, after many others, showed the involvement of very many Jewish officials in this history; in actual fact, Jewish doctrines, Jewish

bureaucrats and torturers have a very particular responsibility for the atrocities committed in the name of this blood-stained utopia between 1917 and 1947.[414]

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Jewish intellectuals all over the world, to a man, placed all their hopes on western democracies and encouraged the coming of the multicultural society with all their strength, becoming the most ardent defenders of immigration and race-mixing. Obviously, it was always the same: a world of “peace” (*shalom*); a world without borders, in which all men would be free and equal, and in which all identities will have disappeared – except theirs. At this point, and only then – they believe – will the Messiah arrive and cause the Jews to be recognised at last as God’s Chosen, masters of the Earth.

In 1999, the Grand Rabbi of France, Joseph Sitruk, gave us an idea of the form their utopianism might take. For example, 10 September 1999 was in the year 5760 of their calendar. Listen to this:

“The Talmud”, writes the rabbi, “speaks of messianic times, which will extend over 2,000 years, between the year 4000 and the year 6000 of the Hebraic calendar, beyond which the world as we know it cannot endure. We are approaching maturity... we are, so to speak, in the approach phase. A few of the signs of the advent of the Messiah have been observed by all rabbinical authorities – such as the return of the Jews to the land of Israel, or the Gulf War, which has been interpreted as one of the phases of the famous war between Gog and Magog.”

The Talmud thus symbolically compares the 6,000 years of the world to a week, which consists of 6 days and the Sabbath: “If we follow the metaphor”, Rabbi Sitruk continues, “we find ourselves today in the second half of Friday afternoon, and the Sabbath is approaching. This is the moment in which the rhythm accelerates in all Jewish families. We close our shops, we arrange our things, we run to wash”.[415] He’s coming this time, you better believe it!

In the October 2001 issue of *Israel Magazine*, Rav Haimdinovicz expressed this idea: “The countdown of deliverance has already commenced”, he writes. And in the December issue: “Soon, we will have no other choice but to assume our role in History and once again become the guiding light which the peoples need so badly”.

In Judaism, there is a conviction that the coming of the Messiah – “the birth of the Messiah” – will occur in the midst of dreadful sufferings. Terrible catastrophes, terrifying wars, will destroy a large part of humanity.

Isaac Abravanel, who headed the Spanish Jewish community at the time of the expulsion from Spain in 1492, wrote: “The times of the

Messiah will be preceded by a great war, in which two thirds of humanity will perish" (*Masmia Jesua*, 49a).

This is when the Messiah, "Son of David", will arrive – when the world will be completely pacified. We have already explained the characteristics of Jewish messianism in our preceding books, supported by numerous quotations.[416]

As to where the Messiah – the "Son of David" – will come from, Rabbi Sitruk explained, "The Messiah is the descendant of the tribe of Yehuda through his father and the tribe of Dan through his mother. Tradition adds, moreover, that he is a descendant of King David, himself the son of Ruth, who converted to Judaism. In a way, the messianic message integrates all of humanity".[417]

After the great war against the last enemies of Israel, the messianic times will be a blessed time for the Jews. All the earth will be unified, and the Jews will be recognised by all as "God's Chosen people". The Pesachim and Sanhedrin treatises of the Babylonian Talmud assure us, on the other hand, that, in the times of the Messiah, the treasures of the Jews will be so immense that "it will take 300 she-asses to carry the keys".[418]

We see therefore that the Jews do indeed have a plan for all of humanity, a plan they have followed for centuries, through thick and thin, against all odds, and despite everything. In the introduction to his monumental *Histoire des juifs*, the historian Heinrich Graetz confirmed that the Jewish sect was pursuing a very particular kind of vision:

"Why did the Greeks succumb, those who, besides the profession of arms, also lived for ideas? It is because they never gave their lives a goal, a definite and premeditated goal. This objective, this vital task, was possessed by the Hebrew people! A people which knows its mission is strong, because its life is not spent dreaming and groping about".[419]

To succeed in reaching this universal peace (*Pax Judaica*), and "hasten the coming of the Messiah", as they say, the Jews must therefore work unceasingly to destroy all the differences between men: nations, races, religions and local particularities. It is this messianic tension which motivates their acts and multiplies their energy. They must, as Heinrich Graetz writes, "work to strike down and pulverise the pompous divinities of paganism". At the end of his introduction, the historian expresses – in his own way – the fanaticism of the Jew, who, he writes, "does not bow down under fatigue and in no way aspires for the rest of the tomb!"

It is on the ruins of the nations that the long-awaited world government will be erected, which will impose a grandiose definitive peace upon humanity.

All borders must disappear. In this perspective, the liberal model has obviously succeeded where Communism so lamentably failed. It is therefore necessary to take all steps to set up democratic regimes all over the world, and impose upon the peoples the model of a mercantile society, open and multicultural, which permits the dissolution of all feelings of belonging. In 1997, the famous philosopher Emmanuel Levinas already spoke explicitly of the “need, in a planetary West, for the coming of the Messiah”.[420]

Judaism, as we see, works frenetically for the destruction of the peoples and the nations. All civilisations must be crushed, everything must be torn down, leaving only the human dust which will then coagulate into a vast planetary ensemble. Thus, the very essence of Judaism is to destroy everything which is not Jewish. Their project naturally makes the Jews the “enemies of mankind”, as the Greek and Roman thinkers called them. For 2,000 years, all the great thinkers of the Church, through history, have warned Christians against the *detestanda secta* – the abhorred sect.

The ultra-famous Elie Wiesel admitted that Judaism stood in opposition to the rest of humanity: “Drowned in suffering, but anchored in defiance”, he wrote, “the Jewish historian describes a permanent conflict between us and the others. Since Abraham, we have been on one side and the entire world on the other”.[421]

In the April 2003 edition of *Israel Magazine*, Dr. Itzhak Attia, Director of the École Internationale de l’Institut Yad Vashem, made the following highly explicit remarks, with a degree of clarity uncommon among Jewish intellectuals, probably because he was writing for a magazine reserved exclusively for the Jewish community:

“Even if our reason cries out with all its force of the absurdity of this confrontation between a little people as insignificant as the people of Israel and the rest of humanity... no matter how absurd, how incoherent, how monstrous it may seem, we are indeed engaged in an intimate combat between Israel and the Nations, which can only be genocidal and total, because it is a matter of our respective identities”.[422]

Read that again: the combat between the Jewish people and the rest of humanity can only be “*genocidal and total*”.

Judaism, as we see, is a military machine aimed at humanity. Under these conditions, anti-Semitism is a form of humanism: combating Jewish nihilism is a duty for all human beings, to free humanity.

“Anti-Semitism”, Grand Rabbi Joseph Sitruk tells us, “is inherent in the very foundation of the Jewish people”. The fundamental text on this subject is found in the Talmud (*Shabbat*, p. 89), and speaks of the word *Sinai*, which means “hatred”. In answer to the question of why

the Torah was given to Moses on Mount Sinai, the answer is: "As soon as the Jews received the Torah, the world began to hate them". Like all other Jewish intellectuals, Rabbi Sitruk loves to play with paradoxes, a very useful intellectual process for people who wish to avoid facing reality: "It is a law of love which arouses hatred! Paradoxical, *non?*"[423]

For him, as for other Jewish intellectuals, trained in the same school, anti-Semitism is simply *inexplicable*. It is an "irrational hatred", he writes.[424] The remarks of Jewish intellectuals are similar at all times and in all places.

André Neher confirmed that the Jews were innocent by nature: "Innocent of all fault, except that of being Jews".[425] "Why does God hound the innocent?", the psychoanalyst Rudolph Loewenstein wondered.[426]

The French philosopher André Glucksmann, for his part, declared: "The hatred of the Jews is the enigma of all enigmas..: The Jew is in no way the source of anti-Semitism; one must think of this passion as existing in itself and by itself alone, as if this Jew which it pursues, without knowing him, did not exist".[427]

And Stéphane Zagdanski does not even hesitate a moment in writing: "It is even precisely because they are not the cause of any of the things people accuse the Jews of, that the Jews have found themselves detested for so long and in so many places".[428]

The remarks on this subject are innumerable, and we refer the reader here to our previous books.

Jewish intellectuals are thus led to say absolutely anything to attempt to justify their law and the actions of members of their sect. We have seen that Jewish criminals and delinquents impudently deny their crimes, even in the face of all the evidence. In our past papers, we observed that Jewish intellectuals similarly issue wholesale denials of the horrible crimes of their fellow Jews during the Bolshevik revolution. It is because historical reality has no real importance in their eyes, for anyone who really wants to think about the fabulous destiny of this "Jewish People", chosen by God to rule the world. What counts for them is the myth that corresponds to the idea which they form of their role and their historical mission based solely on the interests of Judaism. Their great thinker Maimonides even considered the study of history a waste of time. Later, in the 16th century, Joseph Caro, author of the *Shulkan Aruch* (The Dressed Table), major codifier of rabbinical law, prohibited the study of history, not only on the Sabbath but also during the week.[429]

In a letter to his fellow Jew James Darmeister, at the end of the

19th century, Theodore Reinach wrote, quite correctly: "Properly speaking, the Talmud is not concerned with history; in it, reality and dream are all mixed up in a vague cloud; it does not appear to have a real concept of time... Edom, Nebuchadnezzar, Vespasian, Titus, Hadrian – all enemies of the Jewish race – are confused in an identical individuality, and are equally exchangeable in the long martyrology of History".

The 600,000 Hebrews who crossed the Red Sea with their feet dry are confused with the 6,000 years of the Jewish calendar or the "Six Million" during the Second World War. Their whole history is manipulated to fit the myth which they have built up of the destiny which they have fabricated for themselves. It is useless to attempt to prove to them that they are not the descendants of the Hebrews, but the descendants of Khazars, a tribe which converted to Judaism in the 9th century; it is useless to attempt to prove to them that they could never have travelled through Canaan, since archaeological diggings have discovered no trace of their passage; it is useless to attempt to prove to them scientifically that the gas chambers can never have existed, or that the figure of six million deaths is very greatly exaggerated, since this new collective tragedy simply corresponds to their manner of envisaging their unique destiny in this nether world.

In everyday life, Jewish intellectuals also know how to promote their ideas and deck their arguments out in the most extravagant trappings. The Talmud and rabbinical teachings also teach the Jews to handle their "projections" and accusatory inversions, processes we have studied in *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*. Rabbi Sitruk knew how to use them. He projected the guilt feelings of the Jews onto the rest of humanity, thus inverting reality: "The relationship of the nations with the Jews is not serene," he writes. "There exists, in my view, a feeling of guilt with regards to the Jews".[430]

Emmanuel Levinas also very classically projected the problem of the Jews onto a universal plane, in an attempt to eliminate the problem: "The dead end of Israel", he writes, "is probably the dead end of humanity. All men are of Israel. I would say in my way: 'We are all Israeli Jews'. We, all men. This interiority is the suffering of Israel as universal suffering".[431]

In the November 2004 issue of *Israel Magazine*, pages 33–37, Ilan Saada also used accusatory inversion very classically to exorcise anti-Semitism: "Anti-Semitism is a plague for all of humanity", he wrote. "The world must not continue to lose its way in this ignoble sentiment, to pursue this quest for destruction of the Jewish people, since its own religious conscience would risk being affected and then disappear,

buried under the mountains of shame and dishonour". All one need do here is invert the words "Jew" and "anti-Semite" to understand the depth of the problem – their problem.

See once again what one finds in the October 2001 issue, from the pen of Léon Rozenbaum: "The folly of anti-Jewish hatred obscures even the most elementary reason of an overly great number of people in this world." The very famous Jewish historian Simon Dubnow also mentioned "the chronic illness of anti-Semitism". And the famous Hannah Arendt, in her study *On Anti-Semitism* (1951), similarly writes that anti-Semitism is the "prerogative of eccentrics in general and a few madmen in particular".

In November 2008, Claude Barouch, the very serious President of the Union of Jewish Employers in France, expressed himself on the theme of "the illness of the soul and spirit which is anti-Semitism", which reveals a mentality inclined to accuse others of one's own faults. Readers of our previous works know that here, once again, there are innumerable remarks on this subject.

This "illness of the soul", is something we are very familiar with, ever since Sigmund Freud: "It is hysteria, which is very present in Judaism, for the good and simple reason that incest, which is at its source, seems much more widespread in this community than anywhere else". It is obviously not by accident that psychoanalysis and the so-called "Oedipus Complex" were born in the brain of a son of Israel.

Moses himself was the fruit of incest. He was the son of Yokhabed, the daughter of Levi. Yokhabed, who had had incestuous relations with her father, was also the mother of the latter's son. What is more, she married Amram, who was her grand-son, and committed incest with her grand-son, who was also her nephew. Moses was therefore the son of Yokhabed, who was his grand-nephew and great grand-nephew; while Moses' mother was also his great grand-mother, as the wife of Levi, and his grand-mother, as the daughter of Levi. Moses was thus the fruit of a double incest: that committed by his mother with her own father and that committed between his mother and his great-grand-father.[432]

The idea of the coming of the Messiah with the Jewish people is itself typically hysterical in nature: according to psychoanalysts, it corresponds to the nervous pregnancy of the hysterical woman who wants a child – whether by her psychoanalyst or by her father – so much that she exhibits all the symptoms of pregnancy.[433]

Jewish intellectuals always mention the same things using the same terms: the "birth of the Messiah", they say, as if the Jewish community were to give birth to the Messiah, Jewish tradition, confirms Grand Rabbi of France Joseph Sitruk, describes the coming of the Messiah as



a childbirth: "At the moment of birth", he writes, "the contractions accelerate. The pains increase, the Talmud assures us, and at the moment when they are the most unbearable, the child comes into the world".[434]

"The Messiah will come into a world that has lost hope", writes the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas, using an image derived from the Talmud: "...during the nine months in which it must give birth to a child", says our text. Nine months, or nine years, or nine centuries, of preparation for the coming of the Messiah. A big world with a new future![435]

Let us recall here that which we have already seen in *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*: every misfortune that strikes the Jewish community; every cataclysm, is pregnant with new hopes and is assimilated by the rabbis and Jewish intellectuals to the "birth pains of the Messiah" – the *Hevlei Mashiah*, in Hebrew.

In one of his books, Elie Wiesel depicts a Hassidic Jew from Poland who lived at the time of the French Revolution: "Why not seize the initiative and hasten the delivery?... The Jews need the Messiah more now than ever. Since it is near, why wait for it passively? Why not hurry to go and meet it? For it is indisputable: the times are ripe, and the epoch is propitious. These wars, these convulsions, are indeed the *Hevlei Mashiah*, the torments of messianic deliverance. All the symptoms, all the signs are there".[436]

The famous rabbi Yosssef Yish'aq Schneerson analysed the situation since the end of the Second World War: "The sufferings of Israel have arrived to a terrifying degree", he said; "the people of Israel are seized by the pains of childbirth. The time of imminent deliverance is here. It is there, the only veritable response to the destruction of the world and to the sufferings which have poured down over our people... Be ready for the redemption which will surely not be late in coming! ... The liberator of justice is waiting behind our walls, and the time in which to prepare ourselves to receive him is very short!"[437]

You've understood that correctly, we are on the eve of terrible upheavals: "It is impossible", continues Rabbi Schneerson, "for consolation not to be coming, since the sufferings are intolerable".[438]

The philosopher Alain Finkielkraut, who observed the triumph of his fellow Jews all over the Western world at the end of the 20th century, used this metaphor to speak of the contemporary world: "We were pregnant with the new world: and it is this happy pregnancy which we call modernity".[439]

The journalist François Trocase, whom we cited in our chapter on the situation in Austria-Hungary in the 19th century, well understood

that the Jews of Western Europe exhibited very particular defects: "The Jewish race", he wrote, "which has survived so many peoples who have disappeared from the surface of the earth without leaving any trace, consists, today, for the near totality, of real degenerates who are fundamentally sick. Their moral state is characterised quite especially by an exclusive constant obsession with the same things. The spirit of gain, the desire of domination, drives any other thought, any other affection, from their minds, something which is, as we know, the characteristic sign of an obsessive idea. The resulting secondary problems, like the obscene passion for young Christian girls, cruelty towards the poor, the vindictive spirit, are episodic symptoms of this sick condition. The efforts expended with a view to getting their hands on the whole world, of becoming the masters of Europe, originate from this same pit, perfecting the ensemble of moral degeneration".[440]

In an article in the journal *L'Univers*, of 27 January 1881, entitled *L'Aliénation mentale en Italie*, we find the following remarks: "A strange thing, the Jews have five times more mental cases than the other social classes. The fact of the Jewish predisposition to madness is not peculiar to Italy; it is reported in other countries".[441]

At this time, the French nationalist Edouard Drumont correctly perceived that the permanent and frenetic agitation of the Jews was a manifestation of a neurosis more than anything else: this so-specific "neurosis" corresponded very exactly to the hysterical pathology being studied by Charcot and later Freud. The famous Professor Charcot remarked in fact that hysteria affected Jews most particularly.[442]

Zionism, born at the Congress of Basel in 1897 under the leadership of Theodore Herzl, was essentially an attempt to cure the Jewish people of their neurosis. This is what we attempted to show at the end of the *Miroir du Judaïsme*. The October 2001 issue of Israel Magazine provides us with another testimony on this topic. Here is what a certain David Catarivas has to say: "Zionism gives the alienated Jew the possibility of becoming a real Jew... Zionism is an attempt at normalisation... Zionism remakes the Jewish people into a normal people, with their own land, speaking their own language, living according to their own law... Zionism permits the Jews to be normal. In Israel, to be a Jew is normal. In the rest of the world, it is normal not to be a Jew". And he adds: "Zionism is a psychoanalytic cure on a national level"[443]

The religious faith which has sublimated this neurosis also seems to sanctify an obvious disposition to masochism. Isaac Cardoso, an Italian Jew in the 17th century, wrote a plea in favour of his fellow Jews which he entitled *The Superiority of the Hebrews*, in which he set forth the

greatness of the Jewish mission. It is quoted here by the historian Heinrich Graetz: "The people of Israel", he says, "loved by God and men, has been scattered among the nations for 2,000 years in expiation for its sins and those of its ancestors. Oppressed by the ones, struck by the others, despised by all, he has been mistreated and persecuted in all countries". "But", added Cardoso, "if Israel underwent all these sufferings, it is because it is the Chosen People, having as its mission the spreading of knowledge of the One God".

Another Jewish intellectual, Manès Sperber, suggested this idea, which permits a better understanding of the particular mental universe of the Jews: "God was just", wrote Sperber, "for he condemned their enemies to transform themselves into assassins, and granted them the grace of being victims only. From John Chrysostom right down to the last *muzhik*, the persecutors never suspected how much their passing triumph confirmed the persecuted in the certainty of being the Chosen People".[444]

As we have seen, Heinrich Graetz doesn't contradict him concerning the expulsion of the Jews from Spain: "In the spirit of the Sephardim there existed, more or less clearly, this idea that they must be particularly well-beloved of God for Him to have tried them so severely".

It is thus that the persecutions which they have had to suffer throughout their history have been integrated into the process of Redemption. As the Talmud says, "Jews only become good if they are well-beaten".[445]

We now have a better understanding of why the Jews, who have always aroused universal hatred everywhere they have ever been, have also been considered poor sick wretches, throughout history, inspiring not only disgust and hatred but mockery, farces and wisecracks at the same time. The history of this obstinate "people", if one really wishes to be objective, is in fact as ridiculous as it is tragic.

"At the moment in which the pains are the most intolerable", Rabbi Sitruk tells us, "the child comes into the world!"

But it has been clear for some time that the Jews will never succeed in bringing about the advent of the Messiah all by themselves: it is the responsibility of the goyim to take matters in hand and ensure the coming of the Messiah all by themselves. In the hour of deliverance, humanity will finally be freed from the interminable jeremiads and deafening cries of the "Jewish community", and a great peace will reign in the world.

Paris, April 2010

## Notes

[1] Jacques Attali, *Les Juifs, le monde et l'argent*, Editions Feyard, 2002, p. 29.

[2] Inscription of Aahmes, cited by Ledrain, *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, I, p. 53, in Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894.

[3] "Was Moses the fruit of incest?" This was the question raised by a Jewish intellectual, Gilles Dorival, in a 2005 article (Leuven University Press, pp. 97–108). Cf. the last chapter of this book.

[4] Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden (History of the Jews)*, 11 volumes published in German between 1853 and 1875.

[5] The story of the Jewess Esther and the Persian king Assuerus ("Xerxes I") is retold in *Le Miroir de Judaïsme*, pp. 233–237.

[6] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, chapter on anti-Judaism in antiquity: "The Jews Themselves Wanted the Ghettos", cf. *La Mafia juive*, pp. 384–385; *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 48–51.

[7] Frag. Hist. Didot II, 391, after Diodorus, XL, 3, in Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, Berg International, 2001, p. 55.

[8] Alphonse Toussenel, *Les Juifs rois de l'époque*, 1845, introduction.

[9] Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, p. 58.

[10] Frag. Hist. Grac. Didot II, 391, after Diodorus, XL, 3, in George Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, Berg International, 2001, p. 55.

[11] Flavius Josephus, *Against Apion*, I, 34, in Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, p. 60.

[12] Suidas, C. Muller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, IV, 377, in Georges Nataf, p. 61.

[13] Cited by Diodorus of Sicily, XXXIV, fr. 1, in Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, Berg International, 2001, p. 66.

[14] Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, XXXIV-XXXV, Loeb Classical Library, 12 vols., Harvard University Press, in Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, Lattès, 1999, p. 42.

[15] Elie Wiesel, *Célébration talmudique*, Seuil, 1991, p. 337.

[16] Strabo, cited by the Jewish historian Josephus in his *Antiquities of the Jews*.

[17] Ernest Renan in *L'Antéchrist*, 1873, chapter 11.

[18] According to Valerius Maximus, a contemporary of Emperor Augustus, Jews and astrologists were expelled from Rome in 139 B.C., and sent home because they were “trying to infect Roman customs with their worship of Jupiter Sabazios”. In another summary of Valerius Maximus’ words, it states: “This same Hispalus exiled the Jews from Rome because they attempted to transmit their secret rites to the Romans, and he ordered the destruction of their private altars erected in public places”. See Menahem Stern (Ed.), *Greek and Latin Authors*, Israel, 1980. In Schlomo Sand, *Comment le peuple juif fut inventé*, Fayard, 2008, pp. 235–236.

[19] Marie-France Rouart, *L'Antisémitisme dans la littérature populaire*, Paris, Berg Int., 2001.

[20] Victoribus victi legem dederunt. Senèque, *de Superstitione*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale.

[21] Seneca, *De la Superstition*, Fragment XXXVI. The remark is also cited in Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, Berg Int., 2001, p. 77.

[22] Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de l'antisémitisme*, JC Lattès, 1999, p. 98.

[23] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie Royale.

[24] Dio Cassius, *Histoire romaine*, cited by Xiphilin, LXVIII, in Georges Nataf, *Les Sources païennes de L'antisémitisme*, Berg International, 2001, p. 97.

[25] Augustin Lemann, *L'Avenir de Jerusalem, Espérances et chimères*, 1901.

[26] Monsignor Henri Delassus, *La Conjuraton antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, p. 691.

[27] Beatus Rhenatus, in Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de l'antisémitisme*, vol. I, P. Seuil, 1981, pp. 232, 361.

[28] The Jews are obviously obsessed by this tale of the infants with their skulls bashed in. There are numerous “testimonies” from the Second World War in this regard, accusing the SS of these crimes, an obvious reflection of the guilty conscience of Jewish intellectuals themselves, accustomed to accusatory inversion. In this regard, read *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*. [See also Psalm 137:9 (*Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones*) – Translator’s Note.]

[29] *Histoire romaine*, IX, 43. The entire population of Judea at the time must have amounted to approximately two and a half million people. In Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, J.C. Lattès, 1999, p. 103.

[30] Elie Wiesel, *Célébration talmudique*, pp. 182–191.

[31] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[32] Cf. *Les Espérances planétaires*, 2005.

[33] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[34] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, 1910, p. 683.

[35] Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles, d'après les documents originaux*, 1870, Paris, 1914.

[36] *Traité de l'Incarnation*, 40.7, in Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[37] Elie Wiesel, *Célébration talmudique*, Seuil, 1991, p. 336.

[38] Epis. 29. Sozomène hist. trip. L. 7, c 8 and L. 9, c. 30, in *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893, article by Charles Auzias-Turenne.

[39] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[40] In Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[41] Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel*, Paris, 1948, p. 255. In Maurice Pinay.

[42] Joan Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos homilia*: in Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884. "In the 14th century", writes Abraham Léon, "the Jews belonged to the leisured, rich classes of the population. Chrysostom says of the Jews that they possessed large sums of money and that the patriarchs accumulated immense treasures. He speaks of the riches of the Jews as a fact of which his contemporaries were very well aware" (Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de la Question juive*, Études et Documentation internationales, 1942, Paris, 1968, p. 63). A. Léon cites here a rabbi L. Lucas, *Zur Geschichte der Juden im vierten Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1910.

[43] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[44] Saint John Chrysostome, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II, 1865, Gaume frères, pp. 358–362, cited by Gougenot des Mousseaux, in *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, p. 535. On Jewish pimping and the white slave trade, see *La Mafia juive*, 2008.

[45] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[46] Codex Theodosianus, XVI, 8, 10, 11 and 15, cited by James Parkes, in *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, Hermon

Press, New York, 1974. Cited by Gerald Messadié, in *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, JC Lattès, 1999, p. 155. The book also contains a discussion of Jewish false testimonies.

[47] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[48] Constitutions of Sirmon IV and VI and *Nouvelles* by Thediosius II nov. III, in Claudio Jannet, *L'Église and the constitution sociale*, 1884.

[49] Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884.

[50] Socrates Hist. Ecclesiastica lib. VII c. 16. See the Code Justinien de Judaeis et Caelicolis, laws 3, 11, 13, and 14, which punished similar acts, and Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884.

[51] On the festival of Purim, see *Le Miroir du Judaïsme* (2009), pp. 233–237.

[52] During the “Enlightenment”, Edward Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1766–1788), expressed the idea that Christianity was at the origin of Roman decadence. Pagan authors of the 20th century took up this theme, vituperating against Christianity while concealing the dissolving role of Judaism, which they could have verified for themselves on a daily basis, particularly through media propaganda (advocacy of homosexuality, tolerance, race-mixing, immigration, world government, etc.). Cf. *Les Espérances planétaires*, 2005.

[53] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, Depping (born Münster, 1784 – died Paris, 1853), established himself in France in 1803 and obtained French nationality in 1827. Depping was a serious historian, favourable to the Jews. All his information is precisely referenced.

[54] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893. The Councils were collated in the Labbe compendium, as well as in Mercator, Yves de Chartres, the *Compendium Lacensis* and in *L'Histoire des Conciles* by Mgr Héfélé; the bulls in the Bullaire, finally the letters in Labbe, the publications of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, or in the Patrologie de Migne. The author states as follows: “We have thought it useless to refer to the sources each time since we give the dates and since the compendia in which they are contained list the councils and other documents in chronological order”.

[55] Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles*, 1870, Paris, 1914.

[56] Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles*.

[57] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[58] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, book V, chapter XI, "Venantius Fortunatus", in vol. III of *Biblioth. Palrum*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[59] Readers of *La Mafia juive* are aware that these accusations are still made today, in the 21st century.

[60] Gregor. Turon. *Historia Francor.* IV, 12, 35; VI, 5; VII, 23. S. Gregor. Magni *Epistolae* I. 68, in Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884.

[61] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, ch. V.

[62] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[63] Mgr Carl-Joseph Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles*, 1870, Paris, 1914. *Decretum*, p. 2 a. c. 28, quaest. 1 cap. 10 and s. Decretal. I. v., t. 6. In Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[64] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[65] L.7, 24. Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[66] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823.

[67] *Epistol.* III 38; VI. 33. 9 *Epistol.* IX. 36; IV. 21, VI. 7, IX. 109, IV, in Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884.

[68] S. Gregor. Magn. *Epistolae* I. 25; III. 1; IX. 55, IX. 6; I. 47; IX. 56, in Claudio Jannet, *L'Église et la constitution sociale*, 1884.

[69] The act is reproduced in the *Fortalitium fidei*, book III, at which point the author assures us of his having taken them from the *Fuero juzgo*, or *Code of the Visigoths*.

[70] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[71] Cardinal Ximénès, *Les affaires religieuses in Espagne*, Tournai, Casterman et fils editeurs, 1856.

[72] *Chronique de Frédégaire*, Aimon, *Histoire de France*.

[73] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 51.

[74] Hadith 2026, *L'Authentique d'Al Bukhari*, Maison d'Ennour, Paris, 2007, vol. 2, chapter 94, p. 449.

[75] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.



[76] Chronique de l'évêque de Tuy.

[77] Cecil Roth, is, by far, the most dishonest of all Jewish historians. In his *Histoire du peuple juif* (1936, Stock 1980), he has written: "Malevolent later ecclesiastical chroniclers attributed the debacle of the Visigoths to the Jews, who, it is claimed, invited and assisted the conquerors" (p. 183). In Cecil Roth, nothing – not the slightest fault – ever provides an understanding of why the Jews are the target of goyische hostility.

[78] Jacques Attali, *Les Juifs, le monde et l'argent*, Fayard, 2002, p. 238. Cf. *Psychoanalyse du Judaïsme*, p. 20.

[79] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire des crises d'identité juives*, Austral 1994, p. 22.

[80] In the East, a new "Messiah" appeared. In 723, a certain Zonaria, in Syria, became known and moreover accepted as the new Messiah. Their illusion was of short duration: the caliph of Córdoba, Ambisa-Behim-Zon, confiscated the goods of all those who had followed him (Conde, *Histoire de la domination des Arabes et Maures en Espagne*, vol. I).

[81] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, ch. V.

[82] Charta Ludov., no. 32, 33, 34, in volume IV of *Les Historiens de France*.

[83] Mas. L. Margolis et Alexandre Marx, *Histoire du peuple juif*, Payot, Paris, 1930, p. 323, in Abbot Julio Mienvielle, *De la Cabale au progressisme*, Éditions Saint-Rémi, p. 143.

[84] B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental*, Paris, 1960.

[85] Cf. *La Mafia juive*, 2008, pp. 302–307. Let us recall that 800 children disappear without a trace every year in France. Cf. *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*.

[86] According to Monsignor Bressoles, honorary vice-president of the Catholic Institute, in 1949, *Doctrine et action politique d'Agobard*, Paris, Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1949.

[87] Charles-Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[88] Letter from Charles the Bald, reproduced in *l'Histoire des comtes de Barcelone*, by Diaco. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 53–55.

[89] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale.

[90] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 56.

- [91] Catel, *Histoire du Languedoc*.
- [92] S. Schwarzfuchs, *The World History of the Jewish People*, Massadah Publishing, Tel-Aviv, 1966.
- [93] See the charters for the years 899, 914, 928, in volume IX of *Les Historiens de France*. G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, pp. 56–57.
- [94] In the year 848, the Jews of Bordeaux betrayed the city at the moment of the invasion of the Vikings.
- [95] The birth pains of the Messiah: cf. the last chapter of the present book, as well as the *Pyschanalyse du Judaïsme*, pp. 80–82, 377, *Le Fanatisme juif*, p. 111, *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, p. 388.
- [96] Léon Poliakov, *Les Juifs et notre histoire*, Science Flammarion, 1973, p. 48.
- [97] André Chédeville, *La France au Moyen Age*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, p. 28.
- [98] See testimony of historian and diplomat Luitprand of Cremona (died around 972), who held several ambassadorships under the Eastern Roman Empire, Antwerp, 1640. With regards to slavery, see *La Mafia juive*, pp. 302–307.
- [99] S. Schwarzfuchs, *The World Illustrated History of the Jewish People*, Massadah Publishing, Tel Aviv, 1966.
- [100] Robert Strauss-Feuerlicht, *The Fate of the Jews*, New York, Time Books, 1983, p. 39.
- [101] Jacques Heers, *Les Negriers en terre d'Islam*, Perrin, 2003, Poche, 2007, p. 17.
- [102] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme I*, 1981, Points Seuil, 1990, p. 104. Cf. *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, p. 123.
- [103] Edouard Drumont, *La France juive*, 1886, vol. I, pp. 153–154.
- [104] Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question juive*, Études et Documentation internationales, 1942, Paris, 1968, p. 113.
- [105] Giberti abbat. Monodiarum lib. I, et Chron. Richard Pictav, ad ann. 1096, in volume XII of *Les Historiens de France*.
- [106] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, p. 126.
- [107] Cited by V. Duruy, *Histoire de l'Europe et de La France au Moyen Age*, 1875.
- [108] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.
- [109] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 173.
- [110] Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question*

*juive*, Études et Documentation internationales, 1942, Paris, 1968, p. 83.

[111] A. Léon, p. 84. A. Léon is referring here to Henri Pirenne, *Les Villes au Moyen Age*.

[112] Abraham Léon, p. 84. On the slave trade and white slave trade, see the corresponding chapter in *La Mafia juive* (2008).

[113] Patrologie de Migne (T. 189, IV, epist. 36). See also *L'Église et la Synagogue* (Paris, 1859). The letter is reproduced in part in *Le Juif*, by Gougenot des Mousseaux (1869).

[114] Epist. Petri Venerab. ad Ludovicum, regem Francor. *Sutirn Bernardt Epist.*, in volume XV of *Les Historiens de France*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 132.

[115] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[116] Letter from the Pope, from the year 1179, reproduced in volume XV of *Les Historiens de France*, page 768, in G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, op cit., p. 132.

[117] Saint Bernard, Epist. 363 and 365. Migne 182.

[118] Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, third edition, 1959, Éditions DFT, 1965, pp. 98–99.

[119] According to Depping (*Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, p. 331), the Jews possessed half the lands of Manosque in the 13th century.

[120] Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question juive*, 1942, Paris, 1968, p. 84.

[121] In this regard, see also, *Le Diable pour père*, articles taken from the magazine *Sodalitium*, which lists approximately 60 of these cases.

[122] These are the figures cited by Heinrich Graetz. According to the chronicle of Robert de Torigny, Abbot of Mont Saint-Michel, 21 men and 17 women were sent to the stake for this crime. This figure is repeated by the historian Jean Delumeau: 38 Jews in total. That same year, the Jews were expelled from the city of Bologna, due to their abusive practice of usury.

[123] Rigord, *Gestis Philippi Aug.* in volume XVII of *Les Historiens de France*.

[124] Abbot Claude Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, volume four, 73rd book, paragraph 41, 1856 edition, p. 769.

[125] Abbot Claude Fleury, *Moeurs des Israelites et des Chrétiens*, Tours, 1867, part 3, chapter 33, “Les Moeurs des Juifs des Derniers Temps”, p. 109.

[126] Abbot Claude Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, op. cit., p. 769.

[127] Vincent de Beauvais, *Specul. Histor.* lib. XXX, chapter VIII.

[128] *Histoire des ducs et comtes de Champagne*, vol. IV, p. 72; Paris, 1865 by M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, edited according to the charters and awarded the Grand Gobert Prize from the Académie des Inscriptions; cited in Roger Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, Plon, Paris, 1869, 2nd edition 1886.

[129] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, pp. 1153–1156.

[130] Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question juive*, 1942, Paris, 1968, pp. 81–82, Abraham Léon was a Marxist with Trotskyist tendencies.

[131] Guil. Neubrignensis, de Rebus anglicis, lib. IV,; Radulphi Coggeschale Chron. anglic.; Annal. Waverly.; Chronicon anonymi Laudun. canonici, in volume XVIII of *Les Historiens de France*.

[132] In Michèle Brossard-Dandré et Gisele Besson, *Richard Coeur de Lion, Histoire et légende*, Christian Bourgeois, 1989, cited by Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, Lattès, 1999, p. 197.

[133] Matthew Paris, Hist. Angl. Tovey, Anglia judaica. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 147–148.

[134] Itinerarum D. Benjamisis cum versione et notis. Constant. L'Empereur: Lugd. Batavorum, 1733, p. 41.

[135] *Tour de monde ou voyage du rabbi Pétachia*, by Carmoly; Paris, 1831, p. 98. In Augustin Lehmann, *L'Avenir de Jerusalem, Espérance et chimères*, 1901, Part One, chapter III.

[136] Cecil Roth, *Histoire du peuple juif*, 1936, Stock 1980, p. 204. All those who oppose their influence are systematically dismissed as “crazy” by Jewish intellectuals.

[137] Cecil Roth, *Histoire du peuple juif*, 1936, Stock, 1980, p. 205.

[138] See his treatise *Hilkolh avarlah sarah*, chapter X, in G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 82. Read in this regard Israek Shahak's book, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion*, London, 1994, published in France in 1996 in the editions of La Vieille Taupe.

[139] Abd al Qadir al Jilani in al Fath ar Rab-bani wal-Faid ar-Rahmani, Mag. 37, Cf. radioislam.org.

[140] On the role of the Donmehs (crypto-Jews) in Turkey, see *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, pp. 158–163, as well as *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 104–105.

[141] Regesta L. VIII, 121, reproduced in the *Décrétales* (L.V vol. 6, "De Iudeis", ch. 3).

[142] Letter from Innocent III, from the year 1205, in volume II of *Les Diplomata*, de Brequigny et Duthel; Charte 186, in Georges-Bernard Depping, op. cit., pp. 183–184.

[143] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893. Abbot Julio Meinville, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, third edition, 1959, Éditions DFT, 1965, p. 44.

[144] Charles Auzias-Turenne, op. cit., October 1893.

[145] Letter of 1208, Epistol. Innocent. III, lib. XI, in G.-B. Depping, p. 185.

[146] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, 1893.

[147] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue-Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, 1893.

[148] Charter of the year 1223, in Brussels, *Usage général des fiefs*, vol. I, book II, chapter XXXIX, in G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, pp. 185–186.

[149] Gilbert Dahan, *Les juifs dans les miracles de Gautier de Coincy*, *Archives juives*, no. 16, 1980. See also the studies on Gautier de Coincy's works available on Gallica.bnf.fr.

[150] Elie Wiesel, *Célébration talmudique*, Seuil, 1991, p. 275.

[151] Proclamation of Duke John of Brittany, dated at Ploërmel and included among the documents in vol. II of *l'Histoire de Bretagne* by D. Lobineau, and volume I of the *Mémoires pour service de preuves a l'histoire de Bretagne*, by D. Morice, in G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 200.

[152] Bertrand d'Argentré, *Histoire de Bretagne – des roys, contes et princes dicelle*, Paris, 1588, p. 245.

[153] Dom Pierre-Hyacinthe Morice, *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne*, Paris, 1716, 1974 edition, vol. I, p. 174, cited by Alain Guionnet.

[154] Arthur le Moyne de la Borderie, *Histoire de la Bretagne*, Rennes, vol. 3, 1899, p. 337; cited by Alain Guionnet. La Borderie appears anxious to point out, immediately after the above-mentioned dating: "(20 April 1240 new style)". In 1240, Easter fell on the 15th of April, the Tuesday preceding being the 13th of April (note of la Borderie, p. 339).

[155] Joinville, by R.P. Bruckberger, in *Tableau de la littérature française*, volume I, Gallimard, 1962, pp. 125–127. The original text in old French can be retrieved from archives.org.

- [156] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.
- [157] Auguste-Arthur Beugnot, *Les Juifs d'Occident*, 1824, p. 94. Beugnot was a Catholic scholar, a native of Picardy, a philo-Semite, and a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.
- [158] Public act of Thibaud, King of Navarre, year 1268. Trésor des Chartes, box J, 613. Letters of patent for the year 1268. Brussels, *Usage general des fiefs*, volume I, book II, chapter XXXIX. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 194.
- [159] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, 1893.
- [160] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, pp. 217–219.
- [161] Diago, *Histor. provinc. Aragoniae*, book I, chapter XI.
- [162] Raymundi Martini, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, cum observationibus Jos. de Voison, et introductione J.B. Carpovii. Lipsiae, 1687. On this latter work, see Wolf, *Bibliotheca hebraea*, vol. I, Basnage, *Histoire des juifs*, vol. IX, part 3. Chiarini, *Theorie du Judaïsme*, vol. I, page 96.
- [163] Alphonse de Spina, *Fortalitium fidei*, book III, chapter XVI, “Crudelitas Judaeorum”. In George-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 379–383.
- [164] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, p. 240.
- [165] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, pp. 241–242.
- [166] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893. The Jews, for their part, applied strict rules of their own: “Blasphemers were to have their tongues cut out, while Jewish women who had relations with Christians were to be disfigured, chiefly through the amputation of the nose” (Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, chapter V).
- [167] Daniel Tollet, *Les Textes judéophobes et judéophiles dans l'Europe chrétienne à l'époque moderne*, Presses universitaires de France, 2000, p. 156.
- [168] In Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.
- [169] Mathieu Paris, *Histor. Angl. and ann.* 1255. Alph. de Spina, *Fortalitium fidei*, ch. “Tertia expulsio Judaeorum”.
- [170] See the Anglo-Norman ballade on the murder of Hugh of Lincoln, published with notes by François Michel, in vol. X of *Mémoires de Société royale des antiquaires de France*. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 207.

- [171] G.-B. Depping, op. cit., p. 346.
- [172] Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, Oxford, 1964, p. 82.
- [173] The readers of our previous works know that this salutary measure would break the chain of incestuous generations.
- [174] Charter of the bailiff Jacques de Kienbourg, from the year 1294. Jean de Muller, *Geschichten schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft*, in Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 221.
- [175] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuraton antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, pp. 1153–1156.
- [176] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 228.
- [177] Decree of the year 1288, cited by Brussel, *Usage des fiefs*, vol. I. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 230.
- [178] Ordinance of Saint-Ouen. Volume I of the *Ordonnances des rois de France*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 245–246.
- [179] *Chronique d'Ottocar*, cited by Menzel, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, volume IV. In G.-B. Depping, op. cit., p. 231.
- [180] Letter from Edward to the seneschal of Gascony, from the year 1314, at the Tower of London. In Georges-Bernard Depping, op. cit., p. 199.
- [181] Interpretation of Robert Fawtier, *L'Europe Occidentale de 1270 à 1380*, Paris, P.U.F., 1940, p. 429.
- [182] For the full text of the ordinance, see Auguste-Arthur Beugnot, *Les Juifs d'Occident*, 1824, pp. 107–109.
- [183] *Treaté de la police*, by Delamarre, published in 1705 (4 vol. in folio, volume I, pp. 282–284), in Roger Gougenet des Mousseaux, *Le juif, Le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, Plon, Paris, 1869, 2nd edition, 1886, p. 86. Gougenet invited his readers to read “Baronius’ monumental work”, *Annales ecclesiasticae*, etc, In Angliam Judeaei... ut ob graviora scelera... 1286.
- [184] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, p. 252.
- [185] R. Anchel, *Les Juifs de France*, Paris, J.B. Janin, 1946, pp. 82–83).
- [186] Devic-Vaissete, *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, vol. IX, Toulouse, 1885, p. 411.
- [187] Letter from Edward II, archives of the Tower of London. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 260–261.

[188] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, volume I, Point Seuil, 1981, pp. 288–289. We recall that, in 1945, Jewish commandos poisoned the bread in the German POW camps. In May 2006, again, an Amnesty International report accused the Jews of poisoning the water tanks in Palestine. But all that is no doubt just another “legend”. On this subject, see *Le Fanatisme juif*, pp. 205–209.

[189] *Mathaei Analecta*, volume II.

[190] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., pp. 362–363.

[191] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 374–375.

[192] Durante, *Histoire de Nice*, III, p. 3, in Jacques Decourcelles, *La Condition des Juifs de Nice in the 17th and 18th centuries*, Paris, 1923, p. 12.

[193] It is known that in 1945, groups of Jewish “revengers” planned to poison the water in several cities, including Munich, Nuremberg and Hamburg. Cf. *Le Fanatisme juif*, 207, pp. 205–209.

[194] Marie-France Rouart, *L'antisémitisme dans la littérature populaire*, Berg International, p. 63.

[195] Valbonais, *Histoire du Dauphine*, vol. II.

[196] Fragment of the *Humberti Memorabilia*. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 270.

[197] *Chronique de Koenigshoven*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, op. cit.

[198] Alberti Argent. Chronic., page 149. In Georges-Bernard Depping, op. cit.

[199] Graf, *Histoire de Mulhouse*, vol. I, ch. VII. In G.-B. Depping, op. cit.

[200] *Chronique de Saint-Thiebaut*. In Georges-Bernard Depping, op. cit.

[201] J.G. Schelhorn, *Beyträge zur Erläuterung der Geschichte*, Memmingen, 1774.

[202] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 272.

[203] The Jews are subject to numerous skin diseases. On Jewish genetic diseases, see the related chapter in *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*.

[204] See the various ordinances in volume III of *Les Ordonnances des rois de France*, and volume V of the *Recueil des anciennes lois françaises*. Paris, 1824.

[205] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, pp. 281–286. Depping repeatedly expresses his compassion for the Jews, but acknowledges that the interest rates charged were excessive.



[206] Edit des rois sur les juifs, October 1363, in volume IV of the *Ordonnances des rois de France*, and volume V of the *Recueil générale des anciennes lois françaises*.

[207] Edict or ordinance of 5 December 1363, in volume III of *Les Ordonnances des rois de France*, and volume V of the *Recueil des anciennes lois*. G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, pp. 287–288.

[208] In the Jewish magazine *Yod*, we read: “An inscription engraved in the synagogue of Toledo testifies to the support provided to him by the Jews.” (*Yod, Revue des études modernes and contemporaines hébraïques et juives*, Number 35, 1992, p. 11.)

[209] *Collection complète des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France depuis le règne de Philippe-Auguste jusqu'au commencement du 17th siècle*, volume IV, Paris, Foucault, libraire, 1819.

[210] Le Febvre, *Anciens Mémoires du quatorzième siècle*, in *Collection complète des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France depuis le règne de Philippe-Auguste jusqu'au commencement du 17th siècle*, vol. IV, Paris, Foucault, Book Seller, 1819, pp. 306–320.

[211] Sander, Chorograph, sacra Brabant. Cafmeier, Vénérable histoire du très-saint Sacrament, etc. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 276–277.

[212] Privileges accorded by Charles V, Vincennes, 1372; letter from the same, dated 1374, in volume V of the *Recueil des Ordonnances*. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 293–294.

[213] *Livre du Verger*, 1376, Book One.

[214] Archives de L'Église de Puy, cited in volume IV of *L'Histoire générale du Languedoc*.

[215] Toll notice of the Count of Lesmont, reproduced in volume I of the *Ephémérides* de Grosley, p. 162, 1811 edition.

[216] George-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, p. 257.

[217] Chronique de Charles VI. Sauval, *Antiquités de Paris*, vol. II, book X. In G.-B. Depping, op. cit., p. 297.

[218] *Chronique des Quatre premiers Valois*, pages 294–295 – Year 1381. Here we see that the Jews have been perceived as “sodomites” for a very long time, and correctly so. The film industry has makes it perfectly obvious that they are absolutely obsessed with the subject. Cf. *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme* (2006). *Le Fanatisme juif* (2007) and *Le Miroir du Judaïsme* (2009).

[219] Graf, *Geschichte der Stadt Mulhousen*, vol. I. Mulhouse, 1819, book IV, chapter V. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 273, 275.

[220] Yod, *Revue des études modernes et contemporaines hébraïques et juives*, number 35, 1992.

[221] M. Kriegel, *Les Juifs à la fin du moyen âge*, p. 249; in Georges Valensin, *La Vie sexuelle juive*, pp. 65–66.

[222] Yod, *Revue des études modérés et contemporaines hébraïques et juives*, Number 35, 1992, pp. 15–22.

[223] "Let us grant that for a period of up to ten years, provosts, prosecutors and officials shall no longer have jurisdiction over the Jews, and shall not approach them to collect fines for abuse of the said *montes*, nor to make or have made any *montes montes* or other abuses, so that they shall be prohibited from accusing them of anything, etc." Volume VII of *Les Ordinances*, in George-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 299–301.

[224] Sauval, *Antiquités de Paris*, vol. II, book X.

[225] Ordinance of Charles VI, from the year 1394, in volume VII of *Les Ordinances*, in Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 308.

[226] Jean Gullas, cited by Sauval, *Antiquités de Paris*, volume II, book X.

[227] Ordonnance royale of 17 September 1394, in volume VII of *Les Ordonnances*.

[228] *Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denis*, volume II, Paris, 1839, pp. 118–123, translated from Latin.

[229] *Archives juives*, number I, 1973.

[230] *Archives juives*, number 1, 1973.

[231] H. Pflaum, *Les Scènes de juifs dans la littérature dramatique du Moyen Age*, *Revue des études juives*, 1930, pp. 111–134, in Jean Delumeau, *La Peur en Occident*.

[232] Muratori, *Dissert. de Judaeis*.

[233] *Rocchi Pirri Sicil. sacra.*, volume II, p. 907. Acte de Catane, dated 1395.

[234] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 472.

[235] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, pp. 516–518.

[236] Enguerrand de Monstrelet, *Choix de chroniques*, ed. Buchon, Panthéon litté., 1836, p. 170, in *Archives juives*, 1973, number 1. Also cited by Jules Michelet in his *Histoire de France*, volume III.

[237] See Rodrig. de Castro, *Bibl. espan.* vol. I.

[238] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Paris, Imprimerie royale, pp. 388–393.

[239] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823,

pp. 523–524. Let us recall that in the 1990s, after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, tens of millions of young Russian, Moldovan and Ukrainian women were literally kidnapped through mendacious small ads and forced to prostitute themselves in the brothels of Israel. See the chapter on this subject in *La Mafia juive* (2016).

[240] Marie-France Rouart, *L'antisémitisme dans la littérature populaire*, Berg International, p. 87.

[241] Please see the film *The Merchant of Venice*, by Michael Radford, 2003, with Al Pacino. At least the trial scene.

[242] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, 1893.

[243] Manès Sperber does not hesitate to write: “Within the breast of the backward peoples they set out to create an exemplary civilisation in its humanitarian and religious values”, *Être Juif*, Odile Jacob, 1994, pp. 115, 116).

[244] Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question juive*, Études et Documentation internationales, 1942, Paris, 1968, pp. 114–117.

[245] Simon Doubnov, in his *Précis d'histoire juive, des origines à 1934*.

[246] The Jews of Poland were expelled by Grand-Duke Alexander in 1495, but they were recalled by the new king of Poland, Alexander I, in 1501. Only Holland had not expelled the Jews.

[247] Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 421.

[248] *Fortalitium fidei*, book III, chapter “Quinta Crudelitas Judaeorum”. In G.-B. Depping.

[249] Ibid., chapter “Nova Crudelitas Judaeorum”. In G.-B. Depping, op. cit., pp. 405–406.

[250] Alfonso de Spina, *Fortalitium fidei*, book III, ch. “De venenis”. In George-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 420.

[251] This would, in fact, be the best way to break the chain of “incestuous generations” (c.f. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, 2009).

[252] Daniel Tollet, *Les Textes judéophobes et judéophiles dans l'Europe chrétienne à l'époque moderne*, Presses universitaires de France, 2000, pp. 30, 34. Et quot vereor calamo scribere... ceciderunt in passionis ignominiae laudantes se per vicos et plateas crimen pessimum commisisse (*Fortalitium fidei*, book III, ch. “De statu Judaeorum in regno Castellae”. In G.-B. Depping, op. cit., pp. 405–406.

[253] The French term comes from a bad translation of the Italian “monte di pietà”, from “monte” (value, amount) and “pietà” (pity, charity). It should have been translated as “charity lending”.

[254] Saint Bernardi de Feltre, sermon at Cremona, near Milan, in 1487.

[255] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., pp. 475–480.

[256] In February 2007, a very painful affair exploded and made a great deal of noise in Italy. Professor Ariel Toaff, son of the former Great Rabbi of Rome, published a 374-page book entitled *Pasque di Sangue* (*Blood Passover: The Jews of Europe and Ritual Murder*). Professor Toaff, who taught at Bar-Ilan University in Jerusalem, caused a huge uproar by acknowledging that ritual murder was practised by certain Ashkenazi Jews in northern Italy. Cf. *Le Fanatisme juif*, p. 212.

[257] Heinrich Graetz implies that the expulsion of the Jews from Spain (31 July 1492, or 7 Av of the Jewish calendar) coincided with the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple, on 9 Av: “Instead of asking the Jews to leave on 31 July, as originally decided, Ferdinand and Isabella authorised them to stay until the next day. By a striking coincidence, their definitive exodus from Spain occurred on the 9th of the month of Av, a painful date in Jewish history, since it reminded the Jews of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem”.

[258] Llorente, *Histoire de l’Inquisition d’Espagne*, vol. I, ch. X. See also Georges-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 431.

[259] André de la Vigne, *Histoire du voyage de Naples du Roy Charles VIII*, éditions Godefroy, Paris, 1684, p. 124; in *Archives juives*, no. 1, 1973.

[260] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, op. cit., p. 490.

[261] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L’antisémitisme*, vol. I, Point Seuil, 1981, p. 327. The historian Bernard Lazare does not hesitate to speak of “Talmudic tyranny” and “abominable oppression”. (*L’antisémitisme*, 1894, ch. VI).

[262] Charter of Ladislaus of Prague of 25 and 27 July 1454, and at Vienna, of 22 March 1455, in *Archiv für Geschichte*, etc. year 1820. In George-Bernard Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 533.

[263] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 523.

[264] Gerken, *Codex diplomatie*, Brandenburg, Stendal, 1775, vol. V.

[265] There are numerous diseases which affect Jews in particular, as a result of their endogamy, which is carried to an extreme, added to incestuous relationships practised for centuries. Skin diseases are very

common. On the other hand, it is known that the profession of match-maker is a speciality of the Jews. No one knew better than a Jew how to exploit to the fullest the advantages and qualities of a young man or woman whom he was responsible for matching as mates. A facetious preacher from Provence at the time, Marini, recalled from the pulpit that a Jew responsible for requesting the hand of a young girl in marriage kept raising his prices in favour of his client in response to everything the young girl's father said to be advantageous about her. Nevertheless, at the end, being informed that his daughter suffered from a skin disease which was in no way appealing, the Jewish matchmaker, long habituated to everything, cried: "Oh! my young man has got ringworm up to his ears and suffers from leprosy!". In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, op. cit., 321. On match-makers (*shadkhen*) in the Jewish community, cf. *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, pp. 148, 350.

[266] Nulius in infirmitate vocare debeat medicum judaeum, etc. *Statuta Bajuliae Forojuliensis*, from the year 1235, manuscript from the Bibliothèque du roi, no. 4768.

[267] Columby, *De Manuasca urbe*, book III.

[268] Jacques Decourcelles, *La Condition des Juifs de Nice aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, Paris, 1923.

[269] Valbelle, *Journal manuscrit*, cited by P. Bougerel.

[270] Gaufredy, *Histoire de Provence*. — Bouche, *Histoire de Provence*. — Colomby, *De Manuasca urbe*, book III. In G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, op. cit., pp. 338–340.

[271] Victor de Karben was the author of three treatises against the Jews: *Judeorum erroris et moris* (Cologne, 1509), *Propugnaculum fidei christiana* (1510), and *De vita et moribus Judaeorum* (1511, with Ortwin).

[272] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme*, 1894, chaps. VI and XII, in Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, Desclée De Brouwer, 1910, p. 684.

[273] James Darmesteter, *Coup d'oeil sur l'Histoire du peuple juif*, Paris 1881, Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, 3rd edition, Editions DFT, 1965, p. 54. The quotation is already found in the book by Monsignor Henri Saint-Augustin, D. de Brouwer et Cie., Paris 1899, p. 48.

[274] Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, op. cit., p. 54. At the end of the 2nd century, the philosopher Celsius, known for his disdain for Christians, showed the greatest indulgence regarding the Jews.

[275] Werner Sombart, *Les juifs et la vie économique*, 1911, Payot, 1923, pp. 320–322.

[276] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, D. De Brouwever, 1910, p. 688.

[277] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, pp. 1118–1119.

[278] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, ch. VI.

[279] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, vol. I, Point Seuil, 1981, p. 182.

[280] Martin Luther, *On the Jews and Their Lies*, translation by Martin H. Bertram, in *Luther's Works*, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971.

[281] Luther, *Les juifs et leurs mensonges*, 1543, quoted by Joseph Lemann, *L'entrée des Israélites dans la société française*, 1886, second book, ch. IV.

[282] Luther also translated the *Toledot Jeshu*, a 2nd-century pamphlet insulting Christ, into German, which had been republished by Raymond Martin.

[283] Cf. our five previous books.

[284] Roger Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, Plon, Paris, 1869, 2nd edition, 1886, p. 100.

[285] Roger Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le juif*, op. cit., p. 100.

[286] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, Octobre 1893. See also: *La Question juive*, by A. Bechaux, Correspondant, August 1893, Rohrbacher, vol. XV, p. 481.

[287] I.B. Pranaitis, *The Talmud Unmasked*, Martino Fine Books, 2009. Available online at: <https://archive.org/details/TheTalmudUnmasked>

[288] Bernard Lazare, *L'antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes*, 1894, ch. V. On the ghettos, cf. *La Mafia juive*, 384, 385; *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 48–51.

[289] *Sixti Saenensi, ord. Praed., Bibliotheca sancta*, 3rd edition, Cologne, 1586, in folio, page 125 et sis. See Depping, p. 527.

[290] Alexandre Soljénitsyne, *Deux Siècles ensemble*, vol. 1, Fayard, 2002, p. 21.

[291] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, vol. I, Point Seuil, 1981, p. 429. The remark is also cited by the great Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in *Deux Siècles ensemble*, vol. I, Fayard, 2002, pp. 26–27.

[292] Léon Poliakov, *Les Juifs et notre histoire*, Science Flammarion, 1973, p. 84.

[293] See the chapter on this subject in *La Mafia juive* (2008).

[294] Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, third edition, 1959, Editions DFT, 1965, p. 44.

[295] Maurice Pinay, *Complots contre l'Église*, 1962.

[296] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[297] G.-B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1823, Imprimerie royale, p. 523.

[298] Simon Majol, in Roger Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*. Plon, Paris, 1869, 2nd edition, 1886, p. 106.

[299] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[300] Cf. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 233–237. The authenticity of this story is dubious, but the Jews celebrate the massacre every year during the feast of Purim.

[301] *Causes célèbres et intéressantes, avec les jugements qui les ont décidées*, compiled by Mr. François Gayot de Pitaval, lawyer at the Parliament of Paris, volume 19. Available on the Internet.

[302] “In the first half of the 17th century, all the great sugar plantations are said to have been in the hands of Brazilian Jews” (Abraham Léon, *La Conception matérialiste de La Question juive*, Études et Documentation internationales, 1942, Paris, 1968, p. 106). See the chapter on this subject in *La Mafia juive*.

[303] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, vol. 1, Point Seuil, 1981, p. 212. Cf. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 99–101.

[304] On Spinoza: Cf. *Les Espérances planétaires*, pp. 194–196; *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, pp. 202–248.

[305] On Uriel da Costa, cf. *Le Fanatisme juif*, pp. 301–303.

[306] In the 12th century, at Paris and Montpellier, the adversaries of Maimonides burnt his books. In the 18th century, the books of the Jewish philosopher Mendelsohn were declared anathema and burnt in several Polish cities. In Israel, the Gospels were burnt on 20 May 2008 by Jewish students. Cf. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, p. 136.

[307] Daniel Tollet, *Les Textes judéophobes et judéophobes dans l'Europe chrétienne à l'époque moderne*, Presses universitaires de France, 2000, pp. 39, 45.

[308] Léon Poliakov, *Les Juifs et notre histoire*, Science Flammarion, 1973, p. 57. In the 19th century, Houston Stewart Chamberlain took up this theme again in his work *The Foundations of the 19th Century*.

[309] The number of Jewish victims was estimated at 500,000 until

they were divided by 10 by the modern Jewish researcher Jonathon Israel (*European Jewry*, Oxford, 1985), cited by Israel Shamir in *L'autre visage d'Israel*, Editions Al Qalam, 2004. Shamir added: "Such a reduction already existed at the time of the pogrom of Kishinev [in 1903]. First, the Jewish organisations and witnesses claimed 500 dead. The number then fell to 48, a tenth as much".

[310] M. Yarden, in *Les Chrétiens devant le fait juif*, Ed. Beauchesne, Paris, 1929, p. 131, in Georges Valensin, *La Vie sexuelle juive*, op. cit, pp. 65–66.

[311] Daniel Tollet, *Les Textes judéophobes et judeophile dans l'Europe chrétienne à l'époque moderne*, Presses universitaires de France, 2000, p. 172.

[312] To understand the typically hysterical nature of Judaism, it is helpful to read our past books.

[313] In reality, the Jewish identity is much more fragile than claimed by Torrejoncillo. Only the rabbis pretend that a Jew can only remain Jewish.

[314] Jean Delumeau, *La Peur en Occident*, Fayard, 1978.

[315] Johannes Eisenmenger, vol. 2 of his book *Entdecktes Judentum*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1700, ch. 11, p. 577.

[316] Johannes Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum*, vol. 2, p. 578.

[317] Johann Jakob Schmidt, born at Frankfurt-am-Main in 1664, was also an Orientalist. His most important work is *Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten*, which was published in 3 volumes, in 1714. The book takes up themes raised by Eisenmenger. It also contains anecdotes on the life of the Jews of Frankfurt.

[318] In Léon de Poncins, *La mystérieuse Internationale juive*, 1936, pp. 188–189. On *Jud Süß* by Lion Feuchtwanger, see our book *Les Millions d'Israel*, 2014, pp. 298–300.

[319] Charles Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, 1893.

[320] Louis Rebatet, in *Je Suis Partout*, special edition of 17 February 1939.

[321] Louis de Bonald, *Sur les Juifs*, Mercure de France, February 1806.

[322] Louis de Bonald, *Sur les Juifs*, Mercure de France, February 1806.

[323] Lucien Rebatet, in *Je Suis Partout*, special edition of 17 February 1939.

[324] Lucien Rebatet, in *Je Suis Partout*, special edition of 17 February 1939.

[325] Louis de Bonald, *Sur les Juifs*, Mercure de France, February 1806.



[326] Cited by Abbot Chabeauty, *Les Juifs, nos maîtres*, 1882.

[327] Drach, *De l'harmonie entre l'Église et la Synagogue*, 1844, in Charbeauty, *Les Juifs, nos maîtres*, 1882, pp. 167–170.

[328] Henry Coston, *L'Europe des banquiers*, 1963.

[329] Henry Coston, *Les Financiers qui mènent le monde*, 1955, 1989 edition, p. 69.

[330] Purim is a joyous Jewish feast celebrating the massacre of 75,000 goyim in Persia, under the reign of Assuerus. Cf. *Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 233–236.

[331] Léon Poliakov, *Les Samaritains*, Seuil, 1991, pp. 109–110. A book on the subject published in 2005, *Le Sang chrétien*, describes the confessions of Neophytos, a repentant former rabbi from Moldavia (*Refutation of the Religion of the Jews*, 1803). Neophytos claims that a few drops were enough.

[332] On this subject, read Marc Crapez's book *L'antisémitisme de gauche au XIXe siècle*, Berg International, 124 pages, 2002.

[333] Alphonse Toussenel, *Les Juifs rois de l'époque*, 1845, introduction.

[334] Edouard Drumont, *La France juive*, 1886, vol. 1, p. 195.

[335] Louis Rupert, *L'Église et la Synagogue*, Paris, 1859, pp. 208–211, in Abbot Chaubeauty.

[336] R. P. Ratisbonne, *La Question juive*, Paris, 1868, p. 9, in Abbot Chabeauty, *Les Juifs, no maîtres*, 1882, p. 167. In Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, pp. 1153–1156.

[337] Roger Gouguenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, Le Judaïsme et le judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, 1869, 2nd edition, 1886, p. 485.

[338] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire des crises d'identité juives*, Austral, 1994, p. 67.

[339] Lucien Robert, *Je Suis Partout*, 15 April 1938.

[340] On the role of the Donmehs (crypto-Jews) in Turkey, see *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, pp. 158–163, as well as *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 104–105.

[341] This was confirmed by Professor Ariel Toaff in February 2007 (cf. p. 240, in a footnote). Quotation extracted from the Jewish magazine *Yod, Revue des modernes et contemporaines hebraïques et juives*, number 35, 1992, p. 79.

[342] Our own work *La Mafia juive*, published in 2008, opens the eyes of the most sceptical.

[343] At this point we should thank Marc, a former Alsatian, for the translation into French of the principal passages of A.F. Thiele's book. Another important book on the criminal world is that of J. Keller and

Hanns Anderson, *Der Jude als Verbrecher*, published in Berlin and Leipzig in 1937. The author derives part of his book from Thiele. We learn that *Gauner* is not a German word. It was originally pronounced Jauner, which is the transformation of the Hebrew word *Janah* (cheat, swindle). Anderson cites another German author, W. Giese, who studied criminology at the end of the century.

[344] A study of the language and vocabulary of crooks had already been conducted by the Berlin police in 1831. A.F. Thiele seems to have inspired by it.

[345] See at this point the chapter on the Sabbatean Jews and the doctrine of evil, in *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*.

[346] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, pp. 12, 124.

[347] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1809, Samizdat, 2000, pp. 131–132.

[348] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, p. 141.

[349] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, pp. 142, 145.

[350] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, pp. 14, 42.

[351] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, p. 142.

[352] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, pp. 163–164.

[353] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, p. 143.

[354] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, p. 138.

[355] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, pp. 131–133.

[356] Françoise Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, pp. 133–139.

[357] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuraton antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, p. 1169.

[358] G. Miccoli, *Santa Sede, questione ebraica e antisemitismo*, in *Storia d'Italia*, Annali vol. 11 bis, *Gli ebrei in Italia*, Einaudi, Torino, 1997. In *Sodalitium* No. 50, June-July 2000.

[359] A. and J. Lémann, *Lettres aux israelites dispersés, sur la conduite de leurs coreligionnaires de Rome durant la captivité de Pie IX au Vatican*, Rome 1873, Libreria et Cartoleria romana, pp. 5–14. In *Sodalitium* No. 50, June-July 2000. Joseph (1836–1915) and Augustin (1836–1909) Levy, born Lémann, were two twins, natives of Lyon. They were sincerely converted to Catholicism in 1854 and became priests. Augustin was a professor at the Catholic university of Lyon. Joseph was consecrated a bishop. They denounced Judaism in

numerous works, including *L'Entrée des juifs dans la Société Française* (1886).

[360] Cf. R. Taradel – b. Raggi, *La segregazione amichevole. La Civiltà Cattolica e la questione ebraica 1850–1945*, Editori Riuniti, Roma 2000, p. 27. In *Sodalitium No. 50*, June-July 2000.

[361] *Civiltà Cattolica* 35 (1884), III, pp. 101 et seq. In *Sodalitium No. 50*, June-July 2000.

[362] Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, 3rd edition, 1959, Editions DFT, 1965, p. 25.

[363] Ruth Gay, *Jews of Germany: A Historical Portrait*, cited in Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, Lattès, 1999, p. 353.

[364] Jewish employers of multinational corporations preferentially hire immigrants, while a French employer has no right to hire his fellow Frenchmen as a priority matter.

[365] We are not, however, familiar with the German anti-Semitic literature of the 19th century, which has never been translated into French.

[366] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, vol. I, Point Seuil, 1981, p. 383.

[367] An edition of Eisenmenger's book was published in England by J.P. Stehelin, under the title *The Traditions of the Jews, with the Expositions and Doctrines of the Rabbins*, etc., 2 volumes, 1732–34. A new edition of *Entdecktes Judentum* appeared at Dresden in 1893, edited by F.X. Schieferl.

[368] August Rohling, *Ma Réponse aux Rabbins, ou cinq lettres sur le Talmudisme et le rituel du sang chez les Juifs*. Fourth letter, Prague, January 1883, see German edition, Luhe-Verlag.

[369] The Talmud is also a manual for daily living: According to a decree of the Grand Rabbi of Israel, practising Jews may kill fleas on the Sabbath without transgressing the weekly holy day of rest, but only if the flea is found on the head of a human being. It is nevertheless prohibited to comb one's hair to isolate the fleas, since the law formally proscribes all work from Friday evening to Saturday evening. On the other hand, if the flea is found in clothing, it must be removed "without injuring it". The same with rats: the Talmud formally prohibits killing them on the Sabbath. They must be seized by the tail and "thrown further away".

[370] We personally wrote the following on our Internet site in 2009: "It requires a great many films and reports to make an anti-racist, even if you keep up the pressure all year round. But it requires only a single book to make a man an anti-Semite to the end of his days".

[371] Jesus of Galilee was a native of a territory particularly rebellious to the clergy of Jerusalem. The first gospel, that of Matthew, takes care, from the very first few lines, to establish Jesus' Davidic ancestry, which makes him a Jew par excellence, and a Jew predestined to royalty. But the other gospels, particularly that of John, unceasingly speak of the Jews as strangers and enemies (Gerald Messadié, *Histoire générale de L'antisémitisme*, JC Lattès, 1999, p. 110).

[372] Abbot Chabeauty, *Les Juifs nos maîtres*, 1882, p. 192.

[373] Abbot Chabeauty, *Les Juifs nos maîtres*, p. 193.

[374] Abbot Chabeauty, *Les Juifs nos maîtres*, p. 196.

[375] On Sixtus of Siena, see the end of the chapter on Paul IV.

[376] See Jean Drault, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, 1944.

[377] Edouard Drumont, *La France juive*, vol. I, p. 145.

[378] Augustin Hamon, *L'Agonie d'une société*, Paris, 1889, in Marc Crapez, *L'antisémitisme de gauche au XIXème siècle*, Berg International, 124 pages, 2002. p. 74. See also *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*.

[379] Raphael Viau, *Vingt ans d'antisémitisme, 1889–1909*, 1910, p. 14.

[380] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, vol. II, Pont Seuil, 1981, p. 296.

[381] Charles-Auzias-Turenne, *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit*, October 1893.

[382] Mgr Henri Delassus, *L'Americanisme et le conjuration antichrétienne*, Société de Saint-Augustin, Desclée de Brouwer et Cie, Paris, 1899, pp. 25–27.

[383] Mgr Henri Delassus, *L'Americanisme*, p. 58.

[384] Mgr Henri Delassus, *L'Americanisme et La Conjuration antichrétienne*, p. 21.

[385] Mgr Henri Delassus, *L'Americanisme et La Conjuration antichrétienne*, p. 214.

[386] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, p. 1156.

[387] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, p. 1124.

[388] Mgr Henri Delassus, *L'Americanisme*, op. cit., pp. 214–218, 222.

[389] Mgr Henri Delassus, *La Conjuration antichrétienne*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1910, pp. 1118–1119.

[390] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, pp. 149–150.

[391] See the long chapter on this subject in *La Mafia juive*, 2008.

[392] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, pp. 151–152.

[393] François Trocase, *L'Autriche contemporaine telle qu'elle est*, Ed. Pierret, Paris. In the *Keriboth* treatise of the Talmud (11a and 11b), the sacred book of Judaism, it is written that Jews have the right to rape their goy servants.

[394] François Trocase, *L'Autriche juive*, 1899, Samizdat, 2000, p. 170.

[395] Alexandre Soljénitsyne, *Deux Siècles ensemble*, vol. I, Fayard, 2002, pp. 51–54.

[396] Ibid., pp. 153, 175.

[397] Alexandre Soljénitsyne, *Deux Siècles ensemble*, pp. 175, 333–335. The table is confirmed by the Sephardic sociologist Edgar Morin, with this figure: “Seventeen Polish banks out of twenty in the mid-19th century” (*Le Monde moderne et la Question juive*, Seuil 2006, p. 117).

[398] Alexandre Soljénitsyne, *Deux Siècles ensemble*, pp. 180, 231.

[399] *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Jerusalem, undated, vol. 5, pp. 409–410. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, New York – London, 1905–1912, vol. IV, pp. 21–22. In Curzio Nitoglia, *Contre-Revolution et Judeo-Maçonnerie*, *Sodalitium* No. 50, June-July 2000.

[400] Another Argentinian, Hugo Wast, wrote a novel with a strongly anti-Jewish tenor in 1935, entitled *El Kahal*, which is very well known in South America. On Jacob Brafman and his efforts to avoid being forced into military service by agents of the Jewish community, cf. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, p. 26.

[401] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire d L'antisémitisme*, I, 1949, Points Seuil, 1990, p. 318.

[402] The book was republished in 2005 by the Librairie du Savoir, under the title of *Le Sang chrétien*.

[403] We recall that in February 2007, Professor Ariel Toaff, son of the Grand Rabbi of Rome, published a 374-page book entitled *Pasque di Sangue* (*Paque de sang, les Juifs d'Europe et les accusations de meurtre rituel*), in which he recognises that ritual murder was practised among certain Ashkenazi Jews. Cf. *Le Fanatisme juif*, 2007, p. 212.

[404] Frank L. Britton, *Behind Communism*. On the feast of Purim, cf. *Le Miroir du Judaïsme*, pp. 233–237.

[405] Henri Minczeles, *Histoire générale du Bund*, 1995, Denoël, 1999, p. 31.

[406] Abbot Julio Meinvielle, *Les Juifs dans le mystère de l'histoire*, Buenos Aires, 1936, 3rd edition, 1959, Editions DFT, 1965, p. 31.

[407] We find again here the insults contained in the *Toledot Jeshu* (Life of Jesus), a work of the 2nd century A.D.

[408] Roland Gaucher, *Les Terroristes*, Editions Albin Michel, 1965. *Les Espérances planétaires*, p. 296.

[409] The very serious historian Arkadi Vaksberg writes: in April 1903, a pogrom “decimated the Jewish population of Kishinev” (Robert Laffont, *Staline et les Juifs*, 2003, p. 17). Jewish organisations and witnesses reported 500 deaths at first but the number was revised downwards.

[410] The New York Jewish banker Jacob Schiff also provided financial backing for Japanese ambitions, cf. *Les Espérances planétaires*, pp. 264, 277.

[411] Alexandre Soljénitsyne, *Deux Siècles ensemble*, vol. I, Fayard, 2002, p. 326. Cf. *Le Fanatisme juif*, p. 26.

[412] Léon Poliakov, *Histoire de L'antisémitisme*, 1955, Points Histoire, 1991, vol. II, p. 352.

[413] As of the end of 2009, the affair of the film producer Roman Polanski was reopened after he was arrested in Switzerland for raping a 13-year-old girl in the USA 30 years before. There are many other cases of this kind. See in this regard *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme* (2006), *Le Fanatisme juif* (2007), and *Le Miroir du Judaïsme* (2009).

[414] Read the chapters on this subject in *Les Espérances planétaires* (Russia, 1917) and *Le Fanatisme juif* (USSR of the 1930s and Central Europe in 1945).

[415] Grand Rabbi Joseph Sitruk, *Chemin faisant*, Flammarion, 1999, pp. 374, 376.

[416] *Les Espérances planétaires* (2005, pp. 187–208), *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme* (2006, pp. 70–82), *Le Fanatisme juif* (2007, pp. 19–21), *Le Miroir du Judaïsme* (2009, pp. 135–145).

[417] Grand Rabbi Joseph Sitruk, *Chemin faisant*, Flammarion, 1999, p. 375.

[418] Pesachim, 118b and 119, and Sanhedrin, 110b.

[419] Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 11 volumes, published between 1853 and 1875; also published as *L'Histoire des juifs*, 5 volumes, in French.

[420] Emmanuel Levinas, *L'Au-delà du verset: Lectures et discours talmudiques*, Les Editions de Minuit, 1982, pp. 84–86.

[421] Elie Wiesel *Memoires*, vol. I, Seuil, 1994, pp. 30–32. *Psychanalyse du Judaïsme*, p. 204.

[422] In *Le Fanatisme juif*, p. 390.

[423] Grand Rabbi Joseph Sitruk, *Chemin faisant*, Flammarion, 1999, p. 300.

[424] Grand Rabbi Joseph Sitruk, *Chemin faisant*, Ibid., p. 341.

[425] André Neher, *Le dur Bonheur d'être juif*, Le Centurion, 1978, p. 33.