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Introduction

What does “Judeo-Christianity” mean in Late Medieval and Early Modern Iberia?

Claude B. Stuczynski
Bar-Ilan University (Ramat-Gan)

1. And what about Islam?

The title of this volume, which brings together scholarship from all over the world on Judeo-Christianity in late medieval and early modern Iberia, calls for some clarification. One might reasonably ask: What does the term “Judeo-Christianity” signify in places and times profoundly marked by the imprint of three different religious groups: Jews, Christians and Muslims? How can the first two be invoked while ignoring the third, thus overlooking a complex synergy that existed between the three? That most of the presented articles deal with times when the Iberian tri-confessional model gave way to an official religious monopoly by Catholicism does not provide license to employ the concept of Judeo-Christianity unreflexively. This is not only because, according to pioneering scholars such as Alexandre Herculano (1810-1877) and, particularly, Américo Castro (1885-1972), the demographic, socio-economic, and cultural imprints of the medieval Jewish and Muslim communities were still unexpectedly evident in early modern Catholic Spain and Portugal.1 The very existence in Spain of two large groups of converted “new Christians” from Judaism and Islam, the

Conversos and the Moriscos, imply some continuity with the medieval past, even if transformed and adapted to the new religious and political circumstances.\textsuperscript{2}

Regarding the kingdom of Portugal, of course, the Muslim presence was weaker. The issue was not only that Portugal’s military expansion over the Muslim south, the wars of Rep
conquista, ended well before Castile’s and Aragon’s enterprises. Its humbler and smaller Muslim-Mudejar population was eradicated in 1497 by a decree of expulsion ordered by King Manuel I in 1496, precisely when the Jews were instead forcefully converted to Christianity by the same monarch.\textsuperscript{3}

Contrary to the Spanish case, in Portugal, the term Mourisco meant Christians from Muslim origin brought in from outside (mostly through slavery) rather than an autochthonous Hispanic group of purported crypto-Muslims.\textsuperscript{4} Within Portugal, the descendants of converted Jews, not by chance unambiguously referred to as “New Christians” (Cristãos-Novos), represented the truly challenging ethno-religious alterity. It was no wonder, then, that Judaic heresy, purportedly held by these New Christians, became the main concern of Portugal’s Holy Office from its foundation in 1536 to the “enlightened” reforms of King José I’s minister, the Marquis of Pombal, in the 1760s and the 1770s.\textsuperscript{5}

Moreover, the Western Sephardic diaspora, which was mostly made up of Portuguese ex-Converso “returning” Jews, became tangible proof for the Conversos’ enemies that every New Christian was a “potential Jew”.\textsuperscript{6} According to Giuseppe Marcocci and Bruno Feitler, the binary antagonism between the New and the Old Christian populations, exacerbated by the Inquisition, was highly instrumental in constituting a specific Portuguese Catholic identity.\textsuperscript{7} At least until the expulsion of the Morisco group from Aragon and Castile between 1609 and 1614, such

\textsuperscript{2} According to Castro, the mass conversion of Iberian Jews to Christianity enabled their Converso offspring to infuse many of their “Jewish” idiosyncrasies into the old Christian Spanish majority (Américo Castro, De la edad conflictiva, Madrid, Taurus, 1961).


New Christian ethno-religious alterity was partaken in early modern Spain by Conversos and Moriscos.\(^8\)

One should not underestimate the impact of real and imagined Islam as the quintessential political enemy of Spain, especially during the 16\(^{th}\) and the start of the 17\(^{th}\) century, even if “Moorishness” was as constituting factor of “Spanishness”.\(^9\) In Portugal, the ideological fight against the “infidel” Muslims became a major tool in legitimizing its overseas imperial expansion in Africa and Asia.\(^10\) It hardly comes as a surprise, then, if some supporters of the Conversos such as the arbitrista Martín González de Cellorigo showed an anti-Morisco ethos of the Old Christian Catholic elites when pleading for New Christian social integration as full-fledged Christians of noble biblical ancestry.\(^11\) To speak on behalf of the Conversos in the name of Judeo-Christian affinities meant ignoring and sometimes relegating to a subordinate status the Muslim-Morisco component. At the same time, some Morisco apologists, who aimed to build historical, cultural, and theological bridges between Christian and Islamic Spain – with its rich Arabic-Mudejar heritage – minimized the Jewish roots of Christianity.\(^12\) I do not wish to argue that it was then impossible to imagine a durable Jewish-Muslim-Christian “menage-à-trois”, anticipating our contemporary inspiring model of “Abrahamic religions”.\(^13\) Nonetheless, the idea of a tripartite


and mutually enriching religious partnership from a theological and political standpoint was not immune to the traps of paternalism by one of the ethno-religious denominations, particularly since the hegemonic group became for both subaltern minorities a necessary pole of any heuristic alliance.\footnote{Concerning the medieval times, see: David Nirenberg, \textit{Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages}, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1996.} My claim here is a much simpler one: that an elaboration upon a Judeo-Christian common ground in the Iberian Peninsula almost by necessity yields collateral negative implications for Muslim/Morisco political visibility. Should we therefore abandon the concept Judeo-Christianity in order to avoid the risks of implicit islamophobia? I suggest answering this question in the negative, provided we bear in mind that the Judeo-Christian dyad was invoked upon a Muslim/Morisco absent-presence. As this volume aims to show, Judeo-Christianity was an identifiable theological-political phenomenon in late medieval and early modern Iberian Peninsula, deserving to be mapped, explored, and explained.

2. A contested polysemy

The second issue at stake is the very concept of Judeo-Christianity.\footnote{Javier Teixidor, \textit{Le judéo-christianisme}, Paris, Gallimard, 2006; Emmanel Nathan and Anya Topolski, “The Myth of a Judeo-Christian Tradition: Introducing a European Perspective”, \textit{Is There a Judeo-Christian Tradition? A European Perspective}. Ed. Emmanuel Nathan and Anya Topolski, Berlin, Boston, Walter de Gruyter, 2016, pp. 1-14; Annette Yoshiko Reed, \textit{Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays}, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2018, esp. pp. XV-XXX.} Scholarship has traditionally traced the term to the German Protestant theologian and founder of the Tübingen School of New Testament Studies, Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860). Baur employed the concept of \textit{Judenchristentum} to distinguish between the first communities of Jewish Christ-believers led by the apostle Peter (“\textit{der judenchristlichen Urgemeinde}”) and the Gentile communities led by Paul “the apostle to the Gentiles”. For Baur, although Christianity emerged from Judaism, it became a universal religion only after overcoming Jewish ritualism and particularism found among Judeo-Christians. The first Christians were certainly Jews, Baur acquiesced, but their ethno-religious proclivities aroused conflict with the more antinomian and inclusive Gentile-Christians. Even if the latter finally won this prolonged theological and ecclesiological struggle, Baur perceived the canonical Gospels as a sort of compromise between both ways of
being Christian: the “original” and the “upgraded”. Contemporary scholars of early Christianity have adopted much of Baur’s historical signification of Judeo-Christianity. Accordingly, Judeo-Christians were those vanished communities of Christians (such as the first Jewish Christ-believers, the Nazarenes or the Ebionites) which did not completely abandon Jewish practices when embracing Jesus as their Messiah.

It is beyond my scope to scrutinize the implications of Baur’s Judeo-Christianity. Suffice it to say that in light of what is now called “the Pauline turn”, which often depicts the “apostle to the Gentiles” as “a radical Jew” torn between his ethno-cultural origins and his messianic “calling” (“klesis”) rather than as a Hellenized Jew who willingly abandoned (some would even say: “betrayed”) his “narrow” origins on behalf of a universal supreme cause, Baur’s criteria fails to consider the positive Jewish penchants in Paul’s Epistles. Whereas the issue of Paul’s views on Jewish law remains a contested topic, the apostle (re-)appears before scholars of early Christianity, like Paula Fredriksen, as a messianic observant Jew who perceived his people as divinely chosen and destined to play a pivotal role in the advancement of human salvation. This more positively

---

16 According to Baur: “[t]he Pauline theological framework is the most significant element in the historical development of early Christianity …[w]ith the Apostle Paul we become specifically aware, first of all, of Christianity’s essential difference from Judaism; the impossibility, on the basis of Judaism, of making one’s own the salvation gained through Christ. All the epistles of the Apostle Paul therefore express the conviction that Judaism, and all that pertains to it, has entirely lost its significance for Christians who, by faith in Christ, have become conscious of their own Christian salvation” (Ferdinand Christian Baur, Lectures on New Testament Theology, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, p. 153). That said, Peter C. Hodgson (“F. C. Baur’s Interpretation of Christianity’s Relationship to Judaism”, Is There a Judeo-Christian Tradition?..., op. cit., pp. 31-51) offers a more harmonizing picture by claiming that for Baur: “Pauline theology is couched in categories that are still essentially Jewish even as it transcends Judaism” (ibidem, p. 50).


Jewish portrait of Paul not only blurs much of Baur’s compartmentalization; it also calls into question the very contours of Judeo-Christianity. Let us remember that this melded historiographical portrait of early Christianity follows a post-Holocaust recognition by the Christian churches of its positive Jewish roots and perennial values, to the point of (almost) rejecting patristic and medieval theological supersessionism and positing two parallel and valid ways to salvation: either as Christians or as Jews. Moreover, inasmuch as Christianity is now perceived as organically intertwined with Judaism, Judeo-Christianity becomes tautological and a matter of Christian self-awareness. These contemporary theological and ecclesiological changes demonstrate the degree to which a Judeo-Christian sensibility often results from a particular politics of hermeneutics which are related to historical circumstances. Thus, we are witnessing a shift in the perception of Judeo-Christianity: from epochal to situational, on the one hand, and from being inherent to specific sub-groups of “exotic” Judeo-Christians to being relevant to mainstream Christianities, on the other.

Already in the 19th century, Judeo-Christianity began to be understood broadly by theologians, philosophers, politicians, and the general public (including Jews), to denote a Western tradition framed by moral and spiritual values common to both Judaism and Christianity. As a way to integrate the Jews into the West, during the 20th century, Judeo-Christianity came to be envisioned as an alliance to confront shared challenges like Communism, Nazism and, more recently, (radical) Islam.

This reunification of Jews and Christians under a single conceptual umbrella,

---

22 According to Paula Fredriksen (When Christians were Jews: The First Generation, New Haven, London, Yale University Press, 2017), seen from post-Constantine Christian late antiquity, “Jewish Christians” “eventually became the measure of heresy” (p. 190). However, “in its founding generation … members of this movement were traditionally observant Jews, Paul included” (p. 185). Moreover, scholars tend now to find different forms and degrees of Jewishness within the spectrum of early Christianity. Cf. Carleton Paget, “The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research”, Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries. Ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, Peabody, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 22-54.


however, has been strongly criticized as a constructed political myth.\footnote{\textit{\textit{Arthur A. Cohen, The Myth of the Judeo-Christian Tradition, New York, Evanston, Harper & Raw, 1969.}}} Moreover, in his rebuttal of the concept, the French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard denounced the persistence of Christian theological supersessionism (much akin to Baur’s views) lurking beneath a hyphenated fraternal partnership.\footnote{\textit{\textit{Jean-François Lyotard, \textit{Un trait d’union}, Grenoble, PUG, 1993.}}} 

For my part, although I agree with Lyotard and other critics regarding how the concept is usually deployed both \textit{strictu} and \textit{latu sensu}, I do believe that Judeo-Christianity is still a meaningful term. In this sense, I endorse Annette Yoshiko Reed’s critical use of the concept:

as a classificatory rubric, the category of ‘Jewish-Christian’ is problematic in many ways. But it is problematic – I here suggest – in some ways that enable its special utility as a heuristic irritant … serving as an invitation to revisit the genealogies of the modern notions of ‘Christianity’ and ‘Judaism’ that structure and constrain our current historiographies of ‘religion(s)’.\footnote{\textit{\textit{Yoshiko Reed, \textit{Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism...}, op. cit., p. XXI.}}} 

Whereas I do not think that Judeo-Christianity is a theological necessity for Jews, it represents a mandatory challenge for Christians. The way Christian churches and believers perceive their relationship to Judaism tells us a great deal about how they understand their own religion. Furthermore, whereas Judeo-Christianity is inherent to Christianity and for this reason, the Jewish presence in Western Christians lands was theologically “tolerated” on an Augustinian interpretation of that hyphen, Muslim minorities were accepted on political grounds. As Brian A. Catlos has ironically argued, it was on the basis of “principles of convenience”, then, and not upon any ecumenical sense of \textit{convivencia}, that Muslims were accepted.\footnote{\textit{\textit{Ilan Shoval, \textit{Jews and Muslims as \textquoteleft Servi Regis\textquoteleft in the Kingdom of Aragon, 1076-1176. A Comparative Study of Minorities in a Medieval Frontier Society, Jerusalem, Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010 (in Hebrew); Brian A. Catlos, \textit{Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom, c. 1050-1614}, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014, esp. pp. 515-535. Cf. Idem, \textit{Kingdoms of Faith: A New History of Islamic Spain, New York, Basic Books, 2018, passim.}}} 

Isabel Poutrin has shown that the mass conversion of the Muslims in Spain and their ensuing condition as baptized Moriscos were framed upon the precedence of the Jewish-Converso case.\footnote{\textit{\textit{Isabel Poutrin, \textit{Convertir les Musulmans: Espagne, 1492-1609}, Paris, PUF, 2012; Idem, “The Jewish Precedent in the Spanish Politics of Conversion of Jews and Moriscos”, \textit{Journal of Levantine Studies}, vol. 6, 2016, pp. 71-87.}} By “precedence” I do not merely
mean the chronological anteriority of the Converso phenomenon vis-a-vis that of
the Morisco’s. The former preceded the latter because Islam, as a religious minority,
lacked the hyphenated theological-political interdependency with Christianity
that Judaism had. While it was often suppressed, silenced, and dismissed over the
long history of the Church for fear of “Judaizing”, Judeo-Christian approaches
resurface at specific times and places. One of these was the late medieval and early
modern Iberian Peninsula, following the Converso phenomenon. To put things
differently: as a way of perceiving Christianity, Judeo-Christianity should not be
formulated in the mutually exclusive alternatives of “tradition” versus “myth”, as
scholarship usually does. Rather, I prefer structural and teleological terms such as
“potentialities”, “latency”, “hermeneutics”, or “moments”.

3. From the Reformation to the Iberian Moment

Quite recently, F. Stanley Jones rejected Baur’s paternity of the concept of
Judeo-Christianity, and instead conferred it on the Irish Deist writer John Toland
(1670-1722). Although “his astounding quasi-theological project” *Nazarenus* (i.e.,
Toland’s book written in 1718), “seeks to dechristianize Christianity and remodel
it as a republican civic religion designed only to teach the common people
morality”, it depicted Judeo-Christianity as “the true and genuine Christianity”,
for wisely combining law and spirit. According to Toland, a softer Gentile-
Christianity was initially conceived for non-Jews who would live side by side with
Judeo-Christians in “union without conformity”. Since this harmonious project
failed (because the former were crushed by the latter), it was finally Muhammad
who became acquainted with that proscribed and “original” form of Christianity,
adopting Judeo-Christian norms and views into his own religious project. In other
words, not only did Toland consider Islam a Christian current; it appeared as the
purest among the extant forms of Christianity!

---


influence early Christianity scholarship like Baur’s, I believe it is meaningful to mention them for three reasons.

First, because Toland’s Christianization of Islam through a Judeo-Christian channel recalls how the Morisco theologian called “el Mancebo de Arévalo” elaborated his Islamic ideas upon a Judaic-Christian wisdom he is said to have been taught by elderly “Jews” from Toledo and by an adaptation of Thomas-a-Kempis’ *De Imitatione Christi*. Moreover, much like in Toland’s *Nazarenus*, Moriscos’ apologetics hailed the “Gospel of Barnabas” to underscore theological affinities between Islam and Christianity in their efforts to break the abovementioned Judeo-Christian monopoly. Toland’s way of conceiving Christianity as part of a tripartite Judeo-Gentile-Islamic historical and theological relationship was in many ways preceded by early modern Iberian Moriscos’ apologists.

Second, taking into consideration that, contrary to Baur, Toland’s Judeo-Christianity was a positive (i.e. optimal) way to be Christian, we must bear in mind that an analogous way of praising the Jewish roots of Christianity is also to be found among pro-Converso writers and thinkers, although rejecting any “Ebionite” attitude which would praise the Jewish law or the sole humanity of Christ.

Third, and most important, to antedate the birth of Judeo-Christianity to Toland’s days means to relate the concept to early modern times, when, according to Richard H. Popkin, the presence of Christian Hebraists, radical Protestant groups of Judaizers, and Iberian Conversos led to the crystallization of fuzzy “Christian-Jewish” and “Jewish-Christian” identities.

---

Matti Myllykoski has shown that *Nazarenus* was directly influenced by the positive views on Judaism held by the English Hebraist John Selden (1584-1654). At the same time, he has argued that Toland’s Judeo-Christianity merged in contexts in which the terms “Christian Jews” and “Jewish Christians” “had been in use for some one hundred and fifty years before he made the Jewish origin of Christianity a debated issue for the British public”.

The advent of the Reformation, with all its “conversions”, persecutions, anxieties, and religious zigzagging within different Christian denominations, exacerbated the question of Jewishness in the history of the Church and in present times. In England, as in other countries challenged by Protestantism, calling someone a “Christian-Jew” (whether Catholic or Protestant) or a “Jew” was a means of accusing Christians of misbehaving as carnal, legalistic, and therefore “Jewish”. Such negative discourses on Jewishness (which, according to David Nirenberg, were part of a longstanding Christian-Western tradition), took center stage in late medieval *devotio moderna* currents and in the Christian Humanist writings of Erasmus of Rotterdam. However, we should not forget the disproportional influence of the small Iberian-Converso population that lived in Elizabethan

---

38 Matti Myllykoski, “‘Christian Jews’ and ‘Jewish Christians’: The Jewish Origins of Christianity in English Literature from Elizabeth I to Toland’s Nazarenus”, *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: from Toland to Baur*, esp. p. 36.


42 “Use of ‘Israel’ and ‘Jews’ to mean Christians, a terminology that reflect the early Church’s battle with Judaism… was something wholly natural to Erasmus, used as it were automatically, without confusion” (Shimon Markish, *Erasmus and the Jews*, Chicago, London, University of Chicago Press, 1986, p. 63).
England as Christians (often suspected of Judaizing) in the creation of such hybrid Jewish-Christian real and imagined categories, or the fact that Erasmus referred to Catholic Spain as “Jewish” for being culturally and ethnically influenced by (baptized) “Jews” (and “Moors”). Moreover, Jerome Friedman has suggested that even Martin Luther’s (and other early Reformers’) judeophobia stemmed from an obsessive fear of a Jewish contamination of Christianity through the Conversos. All this indicates the simultaneously overlapping character of the Iberian-Converso moment as a place in which forms of Judeo-Christianity were previously elaborated.

4. Iberian Judeo-Christianity

Probably the most prominent trait of Judeo-Christianity in the Iberian Peninsula is that it concerned flesh-and-blood Jews and Jewish New-Christians, rather than metaphoric Jews. In the early modern Iberian Peninsula and in southern Italy as well (where a large autochthonous Jewish population became a baptized “neophyte” group to avoid expulsion), to be labelled as a “Jew”, or to be judged by the Inquisition as a “Judaizer”, primarily meant to be ethnically related to the Jewish people and to be accused of heretical behavior stemming from ancestral Jewish traditions and beliefs. For this reason, perhaps, the hybrid

---

combinations “Jewish Christians” and “Christian Jews” employed beyond the Pyrenees (and the Alps) were scarcely invoked. Rather, neatly derogatory terms to denote Christian inconsistency and religious hypocrisy, such as “marranos” (pigs), “tornadiços” (turncoats), or “alboraycos” (after the Islamic hybrid creature Al-Bouraq), were preferred.⁴⁷ These more tangible ideas of Jewishness explain why pro-Converso Catholic authors invoked Judeo-Christian concepts and themes from the Gospels: precisely to argue that most Conversos should be seen as sincere, full-fledged Christians, much like the first Christ-committed believers. Let us not forget that whereas for many Protestant authors, Peter’s church of Jerusalem announced the first seeds of Catholic corruption (because remaining attached to Jewish laws meant that their faith in Christ was weaker than Paul’s Gentile-centered communities), for Catholics, it was vital to claim that the original and unadulterated church was unitary, with the divided roles of Peter, as the founder of the papacy in Rome, and Paul, as the quintessential missionary.⁴⁸ That said, instead of praising the way Peter led his “Jewish flock”, Catholic Conversos celebrated Paul. Almost eighty years ago, Marcel Bataillon argued that many sixteenth-century Iberian Conversos became self-identified with the person and teachings of the “Apostle to the Gentiles”. This was so because, despite initially being a Pharisaic persecutor of Christ believers, Saul/Paul was “called” to become Christ’s most committed agent, without considering ethnicity and lineage – whether Jewish or non-Jewish – as an impediment (Galatians 3:28-29).⁴⁹ According to Bataillon, such an understanding of Paul’s ministry was employed as a tool against Converso exclusion based on “purity of blood” criteria. Today, scholarship maintains that such ideas were preceded, shared, and followed by more “Jewishly” committed Paulinian interpretations.⁵⁰ Consequently, two additional traits of Iberian Judeo-Christianity should be taken into account. On the one hand, one must consider its predominantly apologetic pro-Converso function.

⁴⁹ Bataillon, Érasme et L’Éspagne..., op. cit., passim.
⁵⁰ Maria Laura Giordano, Apologetas de la fe. Élites conversas entre Inquisición y Patronazgo en España (Siglos XV y XVI), Madrid, Fundación Universitaria Española, 2004; Stefania Pastore, Una herejía española: conversos, alabardos e Inquisición (1449-1559), Madrid, Marcial Pons, 2010; Bruce Rosenstock, New Men: Conversos, Christian Theology, and Society in Fifteenth-century Castile, London, Department of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary, University of London, 2002.
Judeo-Christianity was primarily a means to ensure Converso integration within the Church and the Old Christian society. On the other hand, its strongly Paulinian penchants were a way of discerning between Conversos’ Jewish lineage as scions of God’s chosen people (Romans 11), and the caducity of Judaism after Christ’s death. For pro-Converso writers and thinkers this was probably the most appropriated way to face a general “genealogical turn” in which ethno-religious and social identities were blurred, mostly as a consequence of religious mass conversion. Pro-Converso ideological identification with the “Apostle to the Gentiles” and the recurring invocation that Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ and the first Apostles were “their relatives” were two powerful tools to respond against the claim that Conversos were inherently Judaizers or potential Jews.

For the sake of brevity, I will summarize four main spheres through which pro-Converso Judeo-Christian themes and ideas were elaborated and channeled: history, hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and soteriology.

a) Genealogical narratives

According to Haim Beinart, from the 14th century on, converted Iberian Jews and pro-Converso writers begun to expand on a previous legend according to which the first Jews arrived in Spain well before the destruction of the Second Temple of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 CE. Similar stories were deployed by other medieval European Jewish communities to exculpate their responsibility in Christ’s crucifixion. However, other “historical” aspects were idiosyncratically added.


Among them was a purported letter written by the Jews of Toledo to Palestine asking the Jewish authorities to avoid Jesus’ condemnation, expressing their messianic enthusiasm and support. Some pro-Converso historians, chroniclers, and antiquarians, such as the controversial Jesuit Father Jerónimo Román de la Higuera and the anonymous Portuguese New Christian author of the “Apology on Behalf of the Christians called ‘New’ in this Kingdom of Portugal” (1624), aimed to prove through these narratives that Jews were among the first Iberians to embrace Christianity. Accordingly, they also helped the Apostle James to disseminate the Gospel in their motherland. Eventually, it would be also argued that Paul’s Epistles to the Hebrews was originally addressed to Spanish Judeo-Christians. Beneath these superimposed “historical” accounts (some of them were integrated into early modern mainstream Iberian historiographies), was a strong pro-Converso sentiment: that Christianity was initiated in the Iberian Peninsula by Jews.

In some apologetic writings, and most importantly, in the monumental enterprise of the French Franciscan Henri Mauroy, “An Apology in two parts for those who are descended from the patriarchs, that is, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and who accept Jesus Christ and the pious and holy Catholic faith, in refutation of the archbishop of Toledo and his followers” (1553), the birth of Christianity and the Primitive Church were depicted as mostly Jewish (including Jesus, the Virgin Mary, the Apostles, bishops, martyrs, and many popes), and that many outstanding theologians, biblical scholars, and churchmen who contributed to the splendor of the Church to the present days were Jewish. Mauroy’s summa, which aimed to refute the implementation of the exclusionary statutes of purity

55 Katrina B. Olds, Forging the Past: Invented Histories in Counter-Reformation Spain, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2015. I am preparing an annotated edition and study of this fascinating manuscript (“Apología em abono dos christãos cognominados nouos, deste reyno de Portugal, Dedicada a santidade de Vrbano viij Pontifice supremo, 1624”).
59 My apologetic and functionalist approach does not exclude other explanations of this historical myth: e.g. to nurture a pristine “nationalist” origin of Spain and/or to support a specific Iberian tradition of biblical knowledge (Idem, Ibidem, passim).
60 Henri Mauroy, Apologia in duas partes divisa, pro iis qui ex patriarcharum, Abraham, vide licet, Isaac et Jacob reliquis sati, de Christo Jesu et fide catholica pie ac sancte sentiunt, in archiepiscopum toletanum et suis asseclas, Paris, V. Gaultherot, 1553.
of blood by the archbishop of Toledo, Juan Martínez Silíceo, showed a spiritual superiority of converted Jews to other Christians, since they were at once the carnal and spiritual heirs of God’s chosen patriarch Abraham (e.g. Genesis 17:19; Romans 9:8). Other pro-Converso writers (e.g., the Dominican Friar Luis de Granada) addressed similar narratives more succinctly, seeking to demonstrate the absurdity of Converso exclusion in the name of pristine Christianity.61

b) ‘Double Literal’ hermeneutics

The first Converso writer to elaborate systematically on a Judeo-Christian Paulinian theology may have been the converted Jew, Salomon Halevy of Burgos/ Pablo de Santa Maria. After willingly receiving baptism with most of his family, close to the anti-Jewish riots of 1391, he had a meteoric career as a Canon Law scholar, a theologian, and as the bishop of Burgos. Beyond all that, he became known as an innovative biblical scholar. Following the “double literal” exegetical principle of Nicholas of Lyra, to understand the Old Testament better as simultaneously historical and typological, Pablo sought to demonstrate that the shift from Judaism to Christianity was organic and gradual. As recently shown by Yosi Yisraeli, Pablo was a pioneering Christian Hebraist.62 On the one hand, he believed that a proper understanding of Christianity required a solid knowledge of rabbinical sources. On the other hand, by implicitly questioning much of the accuracy of theological supersessionism, since Judaism and Christianity were for him part of a single evolving covenant between God and men, he envisioned practicing Jews as unaware potential Christians. Moreover, Pablo read the New Testament in an contextualized Jewish key; thus, Jesus and his disciples were depicted as committed observant Jews.63 Whereas Pablo was among the

61 Cf. Axel Kaplan-Szyld’s article published in the present issue.
63 See the almost asymmetrical anecdote told by the Dominican Friar Domingo Valtanás concerning one of the sons of the last Rab de La Corte in Spain, Abraham Seneor (aka Fernán Pérez Coronel). Having announced his decision to be baptized by King Fernand and Queen Isabel, he went into a synagogue to pray. When the Monarchs asked him whether he had changed his mind, he answered: “until being baptized he would not leave aside what he was obliged to do as a Jew, since he could not spend even an hour without having a law”. Well before his conversion, Valtanás tells us, the same Jew used to give alms to needy Christians and, during the day of Saint Dominic, he offered meals to the local Dominican Convent of Segovia (Fray Domingo Valtanás, Apología sobre ciertas materias morales en que hay opinión. Ed. Álvaro Huerga and Pedro Sáenz Roderiguez, Barcelona, Juan Flors, 1963, p. 156).
first to promote such a Judeo-Christian historicized portrait of Jesus Christ and his disciples (long before Toland and Baur), he stressed that Jewish laws were good and valid until Christ’s crucifixion rather than an inherently debased form of worshiping God. Among Paul’s writings, he highlighted the *Epistle to the Romans*. Romans chapter 11 stood at the center of his “Converso theology”. By underscoring the fundamental roles played by Jews during the most important moments in mankind’s history (struggling against idolatry in the Old Testament era, supporting Jesus as the Messiah in his life and during the Primitive Church and waiting to become a final driving force in the end of times), Pablo minimized the Jewish deicide related by the Gospels. Furthermore, he claimed that the proverbial “Jewish blindness” which prevented so many sons of Israel from naturally embracing Christianity was a provisory “mental” handicap and not an indelible “corporeal” disability. As such, he called to accelerate Jewish conversion through argumentative means, opposing attempts to exclude baptized Jews for ethnic reasons. Even if Pablo’s hermeneutics would not engender in Iberia a distinct exegetical tradition, other pro-Converso exegetes reached analogous outcomes with different means and even in contrary ways. All these figures shared a common determination to preserve Christianity from anti-Jewish racism through hermeneutical negotiations.

c) Ecclesiology and society

   It was around the exclusionary measures promulgated by Toledo’s rebels in 1449 that pro-Converso elements first developed views concerning the place of fresh masses of baptized Jews and their Converso offspring within the Church and society. Toledo’s advocates employed the Paulinian verb “to Judaize” (Galatians 2:14) to denote a propensity of New Christians to remain attached to Jewish idiosyncrasies, which made them unfit to hold honorable office in a
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64 Rosenstock, *New Men: Conversos...*, op. cit.


Christian city. A century later, the statutes of “purity of blood” issued in the same city by archbishop Silício were grounded on Paul’s attributed *Epistle of Titus* to denounce the treacherous and arrogant character of “those of the circumcision” (Titus, 1). Pro-Converso writers and thinkers expressed the idea that the Iberian Peninsula was living a moment which recalled Paul’s turbulent days, where the “Apostle to the Gentiles” faced the challenge of reuniting Gentiles and Jews in a single Christian community. Unsurprisingly, then, they also elaborated on Paulinian themes, albeit this time mostly upon the metaphor of the mystical body (1 Corinthians 12:12-27). Thus, in responding to Toledo’s anti-Converso laws of 1449, Pablo de Santa María’s son, Alonso de Cartagena, who was also bishop of Burgos, argued that as Christians, Conversos should be fully integrated into the different parts or organs of the Christian mystical body – whether in the ecclesiastical or secular spheres. This should be done in accordance with their inherited or acquired individual qualities and virtues (i.e., Converso nobles should be integrated into the aristocracy, and Converso plebeians must become part of the common people) to re-form a harmonious Judeo-Gentile community. With this claim, however, it remained unclear where to locate the specific ethnical Jewish idiosyncrasies brought by the converted sons of Israel to the mystical body as heirs of God’s chosen people. The solution offered by the more antinomian pro-Converso writers of the second half of the fifteenth century, like Friar Alonso de Oropesa or Friar Hernando de Talavera, and by many other sixteenth-century Iberian Erasmians, to focus on the head (i.e., Jesus Christ) instead of on the organs of the mystical body to blur Old Christian and New Christian social hierarchies, did not supply a concrete solution for a deeply corporate society.

By the end of the sixteenth century, however, this metaphor was repoliticized, this time by employing ideas and concepts mostly stemming from mercantilism and “reason of state” pragmatism. Such a discursive shift towards economy and politics reflected a growing self-perception in Iberia of living in times of socio-economic crisis and to the fact that Conversos, especially Portugal’s New Christians, were identified with international commerce, entrepreneurship, and
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Pro-Converso apologues, who now included among their ranks socio-economic and political reformers’ “arbitristas”, like the Spanish “licenciado” Martín González de Cellorigo or the Portuguese New Christian merchant Duarte Nunes Solis, insisted that without incorporating the Converso bourgeois elite within the Old Christian aristocratic class, the Iberian Peninsula would never recover its lost grandeur. At the same time, they elaborated on a widespread image of the Conversos as blessed by God in earthly domains for being offspring of biblical Israel who received Manna from heaven. According to Nunes Solis, Portuguese New Christian merchants acted in India, Japan, and Brazil as committed partners of the soldier and the missionary. Not only were they willing economic agents of empire, they ipso facto facilitated the fulfillment of Paul’s task of spreading the Gospel around the world under an Iberian imperial umbrella. The Conversos’ Judeo-Christian contribution to the mystical body had turned tangible again, but this time through richness, political expansion and mission.

d) Millenarian Soteriology

Previously, I mentioned David S. Katz’s book, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England*, to remind us that within the contexts of Christian debates on Judeo-Christian issues in England, voices emerged which called to readmit professing Jews into the kingdom, expelled since 1290. According to Katz, English philo-Semitism was an outcome of both mercantilist and Protestant millenarian considerations. During this period, similar projects were discreetly pondered (albeit unsuccessfully) in Catholic Spain and Portugal as well. That said, the restricted conditions of a renovated open Jewish life in early modern Sepharad seem to indicate that the economic concerns overwhelmed the soteriological.

In fact, Iberian millenarian voices, and most notoriously, that of the Portuguese Jesuit Father António Vieira, had most to do with converted Jews as playing determinant roles before the End of Times by becoming associated as agents
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Some of these views can be found in incipient form in late medieval Iberian sources, such as: the pseudo-Isidorian prophecies, the writings of Christopher Columbus or in King Manuel I’s ideas of empire. Father Vieira was himself influenced by millenarian-prophetic views elaborated in the 16th century in the popular ballads (“Trovadores”) of “the shoemaker of Trancoso”, Gonçalo Eanes Bandarra. Even before the expulsion of the Jews, they were a few ephemeral moments in which it was possible to identify some “elective affinities” between Jewish messianic and Christian millenarian hopes. All these views were imbued with concepts and views related to Joachim de Fiore and subsequent Joachimism, which related the final conversion of the Jews according to Romans 11 with the splendor of Christianity, as the last historical stage before the Eschaton (Book of Revelation, 20:1-6). According to Robert E. Lerner, the roots of Western Philo-Semitism are precisely to be found in Joachimism. I agree with Maurice Kriegel that philo-Semitism was not the only possible outcome of millenarian-Joachimite expectations. And yet, it is possible to assert that whereas most


forms of Joachimism left aside Islam and Muslims as positive actors in the Judeo-Christian drama of salvation, in the Iberian case “Jews” fulfilled a positive millenarian role as Conversos or freshly converted Christians. Thus, contrary to most Protestant ideas of the millennium concerning professing Jews, Father Vieira envisioned Jews returning to the Holy Land during the millenarian time of the “Fifth Monarchy” as already baptized Christians, albeit carrying with them some of their “Jewish” idiosyncrasies. By that, Vieira referred not only to the fact that they would rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem according to the prophecies of Ezekiel, while permuting the ancient animal offerings of the Old Testament into the Eucharistic sacrifices of the Gospel. They will preserve a particular way of remaining Jewish, by worshiping Christ through materiality: the Temple cult. For the pro-Converso millenarian thinker and anti-Inquisitorial activist that was Father Vieira, Jewish “wealth” and “materiality” were dialectical positive factors in advancing history. For this reason, Judeo-Christians along with Gentile-Christians will still play mutually enriching roles during the Millennium, thus mirroring those previous tumultuous times where, according to Paul, Jews and Gentiles were destined to interact through jealous rivalry (“parazēlōsō”) (Romans 11:14) and heart hardening (“porosis”) (Romans 11:25). 79

The five articles included in this special issue of Cadernos de Estudos Sefarditas shed light on important aspects of Iberian Judeo-Christianity. Erika Tritle revisits Alonso de Cartagena’s pro-Converso attitudes as transcending apologetics. In light of her claim that Cartagena envisioned a Judeo-Christian societal project where the Converso Jewish lineage was a sine qua non to build an upgraded Spanish “nation”, we might view Bruce Rosentock’s argument, that Cartagena supported Judeo-Gentile miscegenation, as one stage of a multi-layered ambitious plan. 80 Through Tritle’s essay, we better understand why Cartagena was so harsh towards professing Jews, while he supported the Conversos: his Judeo-Christian project aimed to unite Conversos and Old Christians to battle a common enemy, namely, Islam. Therefore, Cartagena is to be seen as endorsing the Western enduring idea of crusade, while at the same time, he pioneered a proto-national idea of Spain.


In hindsight, we can say that Cartagena’s homogenizing, socio-religious, Judeo-Christian project failed. Instead, a Spanish idea of being an upgraded “new chosen Israel” was wielded as a weapon against the Converso group.\(^{81}\) *Mutatis mutandis*, should we consider Cartagena’s theological-political project as a sort of warning to all those who today celebrate a Judeo-Christian political alliance against (radical) Islam in the name of Jewish-Christian fraternity?

Nadia Zeldes broadens the issue of Iberian Judeo-Christianity by studying Antonio de Ferrariis’s (alias Galateo) *De Neophitis*. Not only was late medieval and early modern southern Italy linked to Iberia by political and dynastical ties; this region shared with Iberia an analogous Converso phenomenon. According to Zeldes, similar anti-Converso prejudices concerning the “impurity” of the baptized neophytes appeared in southern Italy. At the same time, analogous Judeo-Christian arguments on behalf of the group were elaborated by the southern Italian Humanist Galateo. Zeldes calls our attention to the fact that *De Neophitis* was first brought to public attention in 1938 by the (southern) Italian philosopher and historian Benedetto Croce as a way to protest the enforcement of racial laws in his country. Here we find again the degree to which Judeo-Christianity is a pervasive theological-political issue destined to surface at those times when the most fundamental values of Christianity are questioned. The emphasis put by Galateo on the Jewish origins of Christ, Mary, and the apostles, in order to support a New and Old Christian marriage, was astutely reactivated by Croce to face contemporaneous anti-Semitism. Readers will not be particularly puzzled by the combination of pro-Converso and anti-Jewish bias in Galateo’s tract – after all, such a dissonance appeared in most Iberian Judeo-Christian discourses. At the same time, the fact that Galateo composed his pro-Converso plea through a Hispano-Italian bricolage, which included Juan de Lucena’s pro-Converso arguments and also, probably, Gianozzo Manetti’s and Marsilio Ficino’s anti-Jewish tropes, shows that Italy was a privileged place where Iberian anti-Converso and pro-Converso ideas were mirrored, interfaced, and adapted.\(^{82}\)

Axel Kaplan-Szyld’s article deals with a major figure of early modern Spanish Catholic mysticism, Fray Luis de Granada. His analysis helps us to understand that a spiritualization of pro-Converso theological discourses does not necessarily
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entail apathy or fatalism. By decoding the fourth part of the *Introducción del Símbolo de la fe* (1583) as an ostensible anti-Jewish tract which hid a project to catechize the Converso population and support them in their religious and social integration, the author offers an “against the grain” interpretation of Friar Granada’s masterpiece. According to Kaplan-Szyld, Friar Granada’s Judeo-Christian motifs were simultaneously a way to plead for the Converso cause, and an occasion to argue that the best way to be a Christian was to endorse Judeo-Christian values. By Judeo-Christianity, Friar Granada meant to follow Paul’s path of combining the Jewish God’s election with the Gentiles’ universal values. But above all, his Judeo-Christian theology was focused on the person of Jesus Christ as the humiliated “King of the Jews”, who, through his suffering at the cross, inspires endurance, hope, and consolation to every human being, and, most particularly, to the despised Christian members of his people. Friar Granada’s Christocentric Judeo-Christianity is strongly reminiscent of Cardinal Juan de Torquemada’s far-reaching argumentation against Toledo’s exclusionary laws of 1449: that a Christian believer cannot reject a Converso for his origins, because he/she consumes the Jewish body of Jesus Christ during the Eucharist.\(^3\) Kaplan-Szyld reminds us that Friar Granada wrote in Portugal, a country where attacks against New Christians were ubiquitous, and so his Judeo-Christian affinities should be understood as a daring pro-Converso manifesto, despite having been voiced by a mystical friar from his isolated monastic cell.

Ronnie Perelis and Alexander van der Haven close this collection of essays by taking the reader from the Catholic Iberian and Italian peninsulas to Protestant northwestern Europe, from devoted Catholic Conversos and pro-Converso writers to Christians who joined ex-Converso Sephardic communities through religious conversion, fuzzy Jewish-Christianity or Christian-Jewish identities.

In his analysis of the autobiography (“*Vida*”) of Manoel Cardoso de Macedo, a Portuguese Old Christian from the Azores who converted to Judaism in Hamburg, Ronnie Perelis claims that Macedo’s motivations and spiritual journey, which would lead him to leave Catholicism for Judaism and adopt the Hebrew name Abraham Pelengrino Guer, were biographically, narratively, and theologically, framed by his sojourn in England as a “converted” Calvinist. Providential determinism, tumultuous times, and a strenuous search for the truth, merge in his autobiography as Calvinist/Protestant ways in which
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Macedo heeded his Jewish calling. From a historiographic perspective, Perelis’ micro-historical observations contribute to a growing tendency among scholars to consider Protestantism a challenging factor for ex-Converso Jews who lived in a Protestant milieu, and even to some Judaizers who officially lived as Catholics in the Iberian Peninsula.84

Finally, a bidirectional and *a posteriori* meaning of Judeo-Christianity is apparent in Alexander van der Haven’s challenging study. Departing from Popkin’s hybrid Christian-Jewish and Jewish-Christian categories, the author analyzes a rather unexplored “Judeo-Christian” phenomenon which took place in the margins of the Portuguese-Sephardic community of Amsterdam during the 17th century.85 Many exiled Conversos from Iberia and Christian Judaizers refused to fully join or accept the directives of either the Jewish community or the established churches. Van der Haven claims that Judeo-Christian outcomes such as intermarriage resulted from a resistance to both Jewish and Christian confessional homogenization, although this was not part of a conscious and deliberate project to create a Judeo-Christian symbiosis. This, I believe, is a splendid way to understand what Leszek Kolakowski meant in his identification of groups of “Chrétiens sans église” during early modern times, which now has a fascinating “Jews without synagogue” counterpart.86

It is true that none of the historical actors in this collection of articles ever used the term “Judeo-Christianity”. Nonetheless, its validity stands. Whereas in the late medieval and early modern Iberian Peninsula pro-Converso writers explicitly called to endorse forms of Christianity more akin to its Jewish roots, in the context of the ex-Converso Sephardi communities outside Iberia, Judeo-Christianity turned into an implicit narrative-acculturated way of becoming Jewish, or a countercultural resistance to endorse Jewish or Christian confessionalization. As a Christian imperative, Judeo-Christianity presents a perilous challenge for


Western Jews – to partake in a “Judeo-Christian” civilization without being engulfed by its paternalistic hyphen. For Catholic Conversos and pro-Converso Catholic writers and thinkers, however, this was nothing short of a desideratum.