

ARTICLE VIII.

THE TREATMENT OF THE JEWS IN THE
MIDDLE AGES.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D.

WOULD that it might be said of the mediæval church that it felt in the well-being of the Jews, the children of Abraham according to the flesh, a tithed interest manifested in the recovery of the holy places of their ancient land. If outward treatment is to be made the standard of judgment, this cannot be said. They were classed with Saracens. Popes, bishops, and princes, here and there, were inclined to treat them in the spirit of humanity, but the predominant sentiment of Europe was the sentiment of disparagement, contempt, and revenge. The very nations which were draining their energies to send forth armaments to reconquer the Holy Sepulcher joined in persecuting the Jews. Döllinger has said, speaking of the history of the Hebrew people as a whole, that "their fate has been perhaps the most frightful drama of history." Certainly not the least of the humiliating spectacles in its past annals which the church must contemplate is the treatment which was meted out to the children of Abraham in the Middle Ages by Christian communities and in the name of the Christian faith. Some explanation is afforded by the conduct of the Jews themselves. By their successful and often unscrupulous money dealings, the flaunting of their wealth, their exclusive social tendencies, their racial haughtiness, and their secretiveness, they strained the forbearance of the Christian public to the utmost. William of Newburgh, the English chronicler of

the twelfth century, states that the effect of the royal protection given to the Jews was to make them proud and stiff-necked against Christians. The statement no doubt contained truth, and expressed the general feeling of the age. The edicts of councils and the conduct of communities put it beyond reasonable question that in an offensive way they showed disdain of the rites and symbols of the Christian faith. The feelings of bitter animosity and retaliation prevailed in all parts from Bohemia to the Atlantic; and, if it had not been for the humanitarian interposition of popes and the protection offered by princes, who were for the most part governed by selfish motives, the sufferings of the Jews would have been more awful than it actually was. How far the manifestation of the spirit of humanity and of Christian forbearance and love might have secured a change in the religious persistence of the Jews can only be matter of surmisal. They were regarded as most strongly entrenched against Christian persuasion. Peter the Venerable, in the Prologue to his Tract against the Jews, said, "Out of the whole ancient world you alone were not ignorant of Christ; yea, all peoples have listened, and you alone do not hear. Every language has confessed him, and you alone deny. Others see him, hear him, apprehend him, and you alone remain blind, and deaf, and stony of heart." The few active efforts that were made for their conversion betray, to say the least, as much the spirit of churchly arrogance as the spirit of Christian charity.

The grounds upon which the Jews were persecuted were three: 1. Their fathers had crucified Christ, and the race, predestined to carry the guilt of the deed, were receiving their merited deserts when they were restricted in their liberty, or received abuse or death from the Christian public; 2. They perpetrated horrible atrocities upon Christian children, and mocked the host and the cross; 3. They ac-

cumulated wealth by exorbitant rates of interest. All these charges are, of course, modifications of the more comprehensive accusation, that the Jews who had put Christ to death were the insatiable enemies of the church, and would make prey upon Christians as they might have opportunity. In consequence of this feeling, they were safe in no Christian state. They were aliens in all, and had the rights of citizenship in none. The epithets "enemies of Christ" and "the perfidious" were as common designations for them as the designation Jews. The ritual of Good Friday contained the words "Let us pray also for the perfidious Jews" (*oremus et pro perfidis Judaeis*). The canonist and the theologian use this last expression. The Decretals of Gratian, the Third Lateran (1179), the Fourth Lateran, and other councils class together under one and the same canon the Jews and the Saracens; and it is noticeable that such eminent theologians as Peter the Venerable have more good to say of the Saracen than of the Jew.

Three classes are to be taken into account in following the treatment of the Jews,—the popes, including the prelates, the princes, and the mass of the people with their priests.

Taking the popes one by one, their utterances were, upon the whole, opposed to inhumane measures. Gregory the Great protected them against frenzied persecution in Southern Italy. Innocent IV. (1247) denied the charge of child murder brought against them, and threatened with excommunication Christians oppressing them. Martin IV. (1419) issued a bull in which he declared that he was following his predecessors in commanding that they be not interrupted in their synagogal worship, or compelled to accept baptism, or persecuted for commercial transactions with Christians. On the other hand, it is true that the example of Innocent III. gave countenance to the

severest measures, and Eugenius IV. quickly annulled the injunctions of his predecessor, Martin IV. The scene at the Ghetto in Rome at the coronations of the mediæval popes afforded to the Jews some indication of how they would be treated under the ensuing pontificate. Thus, as the procession which celebrated the enthronement of Innocent III. passed by the Jewish quarter, the Jews prostrated themselves before the young pontiff elect, while the chief rabbi handed to him a copy of the Hebrew law. How anxiously they looked to see whether his face was darkened by a frown or lit up by an expression of grace!

As for the princes, the Jews were regarded as being under their peculiar jurisdiction. At will, princes levied taxes upon them, subjected them to the confiscation of their goods, to imprisonment, and to expulsion from their realms. Special quarters were assigned to them for residence, which are still pointed to on the Continent and in England. It was to the interest of these princes to retain them as sources of revenue for the royal exchequer; and for this reason, when they felt the claims of none other, they were inclined to protect them against the ultimate measures of blind popular prejudice and rage.

The history of the violent measures against the Jews of the Middle Ages begins with the first crusade. In entering Jerusalem (1199), the Crusaders burnt the Jews in their synagogues. Their expulsion from Spain in 1492 represents the culminating act in the mediæval drama of their sufferings. Between these two dates were enacted the decrees of Innocent III. (d. 1216), which established the permanent legal basis of their persecution. England, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and Hungary joined in the persecution. In Italy the Jews suffered the least. Tens of thousands were burnt or otherwise put to death. They were driven, at one time or another, from almost every country. The alternative of baptism or death was often

presented to them. Döllinger stated that the number who submitted to compulsory baptism was very insignificant; but Graetz, their own historian, gives statistics to prove the contrary. Most of those, however, who accepted baptism afterward openly returned to the faith of their fathers or practiced its rites in secret. It is a remarkable phenomenon that, during these decades of persecution, the Jews, especially in Spain and France, developed an energetic literary activity. Gerschom, Raschi, and the Kimchis belong to France. The names of Maimonides and Benjamin of Tudela suggest a long list of scholarly Spanish Jews. The pages of Graetz are filled with the names and achievements of distinguished students in medicine and other departments of study.¹

Following somewhat closely the progress of this persecution, we find that the hostile feeling against the Jews was inherited from the post-Nicene Church, and in fact goes back to the very beginnings of the church. Juvenal and Christian writers testify to their having spread calumnies against the Christians in the era of Roman persecution. Christian synods in the early part of the fourth century began to legislate against them. The Synod of Elvira (306) forbade Christians to eat with Jews, and to intermarry with them. After the triumph of Christianity, the empire joined the church in enacting restrictive and punitive laws. In 439, Theodosius II. excluded them from all public offices, and the substance of this law passed into the Justinian Code, and was adopted by the later canon law. Hostile conciliar action was most frequent in Southern France and Spain; as, notably, at the synods of Toledo (589, 633), Orleans (533, 538), Clermont (535), Macon (581). Princes anticipated the ecclesiastical enact-

¹ Joseph Jacobs, in his "Jews in Angevin England," tries to prove that the Jews in England developed a culture of their own. Graetz positively denies this (vi. 225).

ments or confirmed them. So, before 581, King Childebert had forbidden the Jews to appear on the streets during the last three days of Passion Week. The anti-Jewish decrees of the Toletan Synod of 633 had the assent of King Sisenand, and, according to the Toletan Synod of 638, King Chintilla had issued an edict banishing the Jews from Spain. The edicts, offering the alternative of baptism or death, seem to have been inaugurated by King Sisibut of Spain (612). The Synod of Toledo (633) refers to the custom under this prince of compelling the Jews to be baptized.

When princes favored the Jews from commercial reasons, it was much to the disgust of the church authorities. In Lyons they were at the head of the slave traffic and held Christian slaves.¹ Louis the Pious protected them, and revoked the canon that a slave on being baptized might claim freedom by the payment of a stipulated amount. The Jews were so influential that the market-day was, on their account, shifted from Saturday to the Christian Sabbath; and priests were denied the privilege of going among the slaves of Jewish masters with the message of the gospel. Contrary to canon law, the Jews were permitted to build new synagogues. Against such royal toleration, the celebrated Archbishop of Lyons, Agobard, protested in vain. Forerunner of modern enlightenment in some particulars, he nevertheless put himself in the path of the anti-Semitism of a later day, by reasserting in his five tracts the conciliar decrees. Judaism, he asserted, was as far apart from Christianity as Ebal was from Gerizim.

Prior to the first crusade, Gregory VII. wrote to Alfonzo VI. of Castile to enforce the laws against the Jews. These laws had already been passed by many synods, and were to

¹ Wiegand has given a full statement of the condition of affairs in Lyons in his brochure "Agobard von Lyon und die Judenfrage," Erlangen, 1901.

be confirmed by many more synods and ecumenical councils from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. They enacted that Christians should not eat with Jews or marry them, that no Jew should have a Christian for a slave, that they should keep within their own houses and not show themselves from Thursday of Passion Week to Easter, that they should hold no public offices with jurisdiction over Christians. The Jews were forbidden to employ Christian nurses or servants or laborers, to publicly sell meat, were commanded to pay a fixed sum to the priest at Easter, and to refrain from labor on Sundays and feast days, and Christians were warned not to employ them as physicians. The reason given for this last regulation, as by the Synod of Salamanca (1335), was that the Jewish physicians were bent upon exterminating the Christians. The regulations forbidding Jews to practice usury, and threatening Christians with punishment who borrowed from them, are often repeated. Jews who had become Christians and in any way reverted to the Jewish rites were to be compelled to return to the church, and the baptized children of Jewish parents were to be separated from their parents and brought up in convents or in Christian families. In case of issue from a marriage between Christian and Jew, the children were to be baptized and, if necessary, by force. These latter regulations go back as far as the synods of Toledo of 589 and 633.

None of the regulations was so humiliating as the one requiring the Jew to wear a distinguishing costume or a distinguishing patch upon his garments. This patch was ordered placed on the chest, or on both chest and back, so that the wearer might be distinguished from afar, as of old the leper was by his cry "unclean." The reason given for the regulation was that the Christians might be prevented from ignorantly having carnal connection with the despised people. Louis IX. decreed that the color of the

patch should be red or saffron, the King of England that it should be yellow. Its size and shape were matters of minute enactment. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) gave the weight of its great authority to this regulation about dress, and decreed that, while in certain localities it was already in force, the requirement should thereafter be everywhere obligatory. Dr. Graetz pronounces this law to be the culminating stroke in the humiliation of his kinsmen. He goes on to show at length, how it took the spirit out of the Jews, and inured to their debasement. He is justly very severe upon Innocent III., declares he brought more misery upon the Jews than all their enemies had done before, and charges him with being the first pope who turned the inhuman severity and bitter wrath of the church against them.¹

Innocent restated the position that the Jews were not to be forced to be baptized; but, in letters to Alfonso of Castile (1205) and the Count of Nevers (1208), who had been treating them with some leniency, he made the awful affirmation that God intended the Jews to be kept, like Cain, the murderer of his brother, to wander about on the earth, destined by their guilt for slavery till the time should come in the last days for their conversion.

With this view the opinion of the theologians coincided. Peter the Venerable, the abbot of Clugny who flourished a half-century before Innocent, presented the case in the same aspect as did the great pope. He was confessedly one of the best men of his age. In the face of great provocation, when Bernard arraigned the monks of Clugny for luxury, he remained patient and gentle. When Abelard was a wanderer, condemned by council and pope and without a friend, this good man received him, and did one of the finest deeds of chivalry that the Middle Ages has to show when he sent Abelard's body to Heloise. And yet

¹ *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten, etc.*, vii. 4, 16.

this same Peter of Clugny launched a fearful denunciation against the Jews. In a letter to the King of France, Louis VII., he exclaimed, "What would it profit to fight against enemies of the cross in remote lands, while the wicked Jews, who blaspheme Christ, and who are much worse than the Saracens [*longe Saracenis deteriores*], go free and unpunished. Much more are the Jews to be execrated and hated than the Saracens; for the latter accept the birth from the Virgin, but the Jews deny it, and blaspheme that doctrine and all Christian mysteries. God does not want them to be wholly exterminated. God does not want them to be killed, but to be kept, like the fratricide Cain, for still more severe torment and disgrace [*ad majus tormentum et majorem ignominiam*]. In this way God's most just severity has dealt with the Jews from the time of Christ's passion, and will continue to deal with them to the end of the world; for they are accursed, and deserve to be [*sic de damnatis damnandisque Judaeis*]. They should be punished severely,—not unto death it is true, but by depriving them of their ill-gotten gains, even as the Israelites once spoiled the Egyptians." The money derived from their spoliation was to be applied to resist the audacity of the Saracens, and wrest the holy places from their hands. Peter adduces the shameless sacrilege of the Jews, as he terms it, who took in pawn sacred vessels plundered from the churches.

Of a very different spirit was Bernard, who stands far above his age on the question of the treatment of the Jew. When the preparations were being made for the second crusade to recover the damage entailed by the loss of the far Eastern stronghold of the Crusaders, Edessa, the monk Radulf went up and down the Rhine, inflaming the people into a fever of passion against the Jews. The abbot of Clairvaux then rose up, and spoke, as was his custom, with no uncertain sound. He set himself against the "dema-

gogue," as Neander called Radulf, and the massacres which followed his harangues. Otto of Freising says that "very many were killed in Mainz, Worms, Spire, and other places."¹ Bernard sent messengers with letters to the communities condemning Radulf's Semitic crusade. To the archbishop of Mainz he wrote a burning epistle, reminding him that the Lord is gracious towards him who returns good for evil. Radulf's doctrine was like that of his master, the devil, who had been a murderer from the beginning. "Does not the church," he exclaimed, "triumph more fully over the Jews by convincing and converting them from day to day than if she once and for all should slay them by the edge of the sword!" How bitter the prejudice was is seen in the fact that when Bernard met Radulf face to face, it required all his reputation for sanctity to allay the turbulence at Mainz. No wonder that Graetz should pronounce him "a truly holy man, a man of apostolic simplicity of heart."²

If we turn to England we shall find the chroniclers William of Newburgh, Roger de Hoveden, and others expressing no objection to the persecution of which they give account, but fully approving it. Richard of Devizes³ speaks of "sacrificing the Jews to their father, the devil," and of sending "the blood-suckers with blood to hell." Matthew Paris, in some of his references at least, does not fall in with the popular animosity, and seems inclined to dissent from it. There are two ecclesiastics to whom we go as to a court of final resort if we wish to discover the sentiment among the more intelligent classes towards the Jews in England. The great Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste, laid down the principle that the Jews were not to be exterminated, and on the ground that the law had been given through them, and that, after passing through their second captivity, they would ultimately, in accordance

¹ *De gestis Frid.* i. 37-39. ² vi. 148, 151. ³ Howlett's ed., p. 383.

with the eleventh chapter of Romans, embrace Christianity. He, however, declares that Cain was the type of the Jews, as Abel was the type of Christ, who was slain by the Jews. And, inasmuch as they persist in blaspheming Christ, they continue to be not only under the curse of guilt, but the curse of punishment (*maledictione pœnæ*). For the sake of God's mercy, they should be preserved, and not killed, that Christ might be glorified; but for the sake of God's justice, they were to be held in captivity by the princes, that they might fulfill the prediction concerning Cain, and be vagabonds and wanderers on the earth. They should be forcibly prevented from pursuing the occupation of usurers, and he pronounced all princes who protected or winked at their money-lending to Christians to be equal partakers of the guilt. These views Grosseste expressed in a letter to Margaret, Dowager Countess of Winchester, who had offered a refuge on her lands to the Jews expelled by Simon de Montfort from Leicester. His object was not to discourage her in her humane undertaking, but he called upon her to insist upon their earning a livelihood in some other way than by lending money. In 1244 this, the greatest Englishman of his age, helped to secure the release of forty-five Jews unjustly imprisoned at Oxford. That he was not above the prejudices of his age is further vouched for by a letter also, written in 1244,¹ in which he calls upon his archdeacons as far as possible to prevent Jews and Christians living side by side. Grosseste's great predecessor, Hugh of Lincoln, protected the Jews when they were being plundered and massacred in 1190, and Jews showed their respect by attending his funeral, and mourned over him as a true servant of the great God.²

The highest sentiment of Europe is to be found repre-

¹ See Luard's ed. of Grosseste's Letters, p. 318.

² See Thurston, *Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln*, pp. 277, seq., 547.

sented by these enlightened and progressive men. Bernard had more than one to sympathize with his views among the higher clergy of Germany, and not a few won the respect of the Jews, as did Hugh, by their humane treatment. But the general feeling was that the Jews were suffering as Cain suffered, their sufferings were to continue till the last days, and Christians were justified in being the executors of the divine vengeance.

The hostile feeling which broke out at the time of the first crusade had its first exhibition at Rouen (1095). The Jews were forced into the church, and offered the alternative of baptism or death. In Germany the Crusaders rose up against them at Cologne, Mainz, and other places, and the number put to death along the Rhine in this persecution is placed at five thousand. To their credit, be it said, not a few German bishops offered them protection.

On the eve of the second crusade and of the third crusade, in England as well as on the Continent, similar scenes of plunder and massacre occurred. According to Otto von Freisingen, not only did the bishops of Cologne and Mainz, in 1146, seek to shield them from being hunted to death, but the Emperor Conrad, who afterwards took the cross, offered them Nürnberg as a place of refuge. While Gregory IX. was warring with Frederick II., whom he had excommunicated for going on a crusade, and while he was appealing for a new crusade, wild scenes were again enacted in France, and the alternative of baptism or death presented. Gregory, however, wrote to Louis IX. (1236), reaffirming the church's opposition to forced baptism, against which at a later time Clement VI. and Benedict also issued bulls.

No charge was too serious to be laid at the door of the Jews. A favorable opportunity was afforded by the ravages of the Black Death in 1348. It did not occur to Europe to think of the Saracen as the author of that pesti-

lence. The Jew was guilty. In Southern France, so the wild rumor ran, and Spain, he had concocted poisons which were sent by the wholesale and used for contaminating fountains. From Barcelona and Seville to the cities in Switzerland and Germany the unfortunate people had to suffer persecution for the alleged crime. In Strassburg the entire Hebrew population of two thousand was seized, and as many as did not consent to baptism, were burnt in their own graveyard and their goods confiscated. In Erfurt and other places the entire Jewish population was blotted out by fire or expulsion.

The wealth of the Jews and the practice of usury were no doubt the chief source of irritation and a frequent occasion of severe and indiscriminating treatment. Thomas Aquinas gave the weight of his great name to the principle that princes might deal with the goods of the Jews as though they were their own, and might seize their children, and compel them to be baptized. This was the position which, in the civil sphere, Frederick II. had taken. The Emperor Charles IV. was acting upon the practice of his predecessors when he declared, point-blank, that the Jews belonged to the emperor *servi camerae speciales*, and that he might do with them as he listed. The same theory was carried into practice in England, France, and Spain. Sovereigns not only levied arbitrary taxes upon them, but actually farmed them out for debts to the crown. As brokers and the chief holders of coin in Europe, the Jews had no rivals till the rise of the Caorsini, the bankers of Cahors in Aquitaine, and their competitors the bankers of Lucca and Lombardy. The Crusaders borrowed heavily from them, but Eugenius III. offered to all going on the second crusade exemption from interest due Jewish creditors; as Gregory IX. did later.

• The canonical regulations against usury gave easy excuse for declaring debts to the Jews not binding. Con-

demned by Tertullian and Cyprian, usury was at first forbidden to laymen as well as clerics, as by the Synod of Elvira; but under pressure of the civil practice the prohibition was restricted at the Council of Nice (325) to the clergy. Later Jerome, Augustine, and Leo I. again applied the prohibition to all Christians. Gratian received it into the canon law. Few subjects claimed so generally the attention of the mediæval synods as usury. Alexander III., at the Third Lateran (1179), went so far as to declare usury forbidden by the Old Testament as well as under the New Testament. Clement V. put the capstone on this sort of legislation by declaring, at the Council of Vienne (1311), null and void all state and municipal laws allowing usury. He pronounced it heresy to deny that usury was sin. Usury was another name for loaning money at interest, and no distinction was made between a legitimate and an excessive rate. All interest was usurious. The wonder is that, with such legislation on the church's statute-books, any borrower should have felt bound by a debt to a Jew. No doubt the Jews were relentless in exacting the last farthing of interest agreed upon. But the treatment which the Christians showed towards them was a poor example. After the Jews were supplanted by the bankers of Lombardy, the latter were found to be no more merciful and, at the demand of the citizens of London (in 1376), the Caorsini, who had taken the place of the Jews as handlers of coin, were banished.

Glancing at some special features in the treatment of the Jews in different lands, we find that in 1182 Philip Augustus expelled them from France, and confiscated their goods. The pretext used was the alleged crucifixion of a Christian child. The decree of expulsion was repeated by the most Christian kings of France, but in that country it was never so strictly carried out as in England and Spain. The good King Louis IX., after making heavy exactions

upon them, declared usury illegal, and banished them from his kingdom. The decree was later modified, and all copies of the Targum were ordered burnt. In 1239 Gregory IX. had issued a letter to the archbishops in the western European states ordering the Targums burnt. Impressed with the solemn purpose of undertaking his second crusade, Louis ordered every Jew to wear a patch in the shape of a wheel on his breast and back. This was the year before he set out on that fatal expedition. The religious purpose was no doubt predominant in his mind, in his dealing with the Jews. His brother Alfons of Poitiers banished them from his realm after confiscating not only their synagogues but their places of burial. Of course the unscrupulous Philip the Fair, who spoiled the Templars, was not actuated by high religious feeling when he issued his two edicts of expulsion in 1306 and 1311. It is estimated that one hundred thousand emigrated under the stress of these decrees, and synagogues all over France were sold or destroyed. The Christians owing Jews interest were commanded to turn it over to the royal treasury. Louis X. recalled the Jews, but it was stipulated they were still to wear the patch. In 1320 the Pastorelles started a furious persecution. In 1394 Charles VI. again ordered their banishment and the confiscation of their goods.

In Germany, the Jews were subjected to constant outbreaks, but enjoyed the protection of the emperors against popular fury. In the fifteenth century they were expelled from Saxony, Spire, Zürich, Mainz, Brandenburg (1510), and other localities of Germany and Switzerland. The Ghettos of Frankfurt and other German cities are famous. The Jewish quarter of Berlin which existed as early as 1200 is at this moment seeing some of its old buildings torn down.

In England the so-called Jewries of London, Lincoln, and five or six other cities represented special tribunals

and modes of organization, with which the usual courts of the land had nothing to do. From the reign of Henry II. (1133-89), when the detailed statements of Jewish life in England begin, bishops, priests, and convents were ready to borrow from the Jews. Nine Cistercian convents were mortgaged to the famous Aaron of Lincoln, who died in 1187. He boasted that his money had built St. Albans, a boast which Freeman uses to prove the intolerable arrogance of the Jews. The usual interest charged was two pence a week on the pound, or forty-three per cent a year. It went as high as eighty per cent. The name of Herbert, pastor of Wissenden, is preserved as one of the clergymen who gave to Aaron of Lincoln their promissory notes at two pence a week. The Jews were tallaged by the king at pleasure. They belonged to him, as Stubbs says, as did the forests. The frequency and exorbitance of the exactions under John and Henry III. are notorious. At the time of the levy of 1210 many left the kingdom. It was at that time that the famous case occurred of the Jew of Bristol, whose teeth John ordered pulled out, one each day, till he should make over to the royal treasury ten thousand marks. The Jew submitted on seven successive days to the painful operation, but, when unable to stand it longer, on the eighth day he paid the mulct. The description that Matthew Paris gives is highly interesting, but it was not till four centuries had elapsed, that another historian, Thomas Fuller, commenting upon this piece of mediæval dentistry, had the hardihood to say, "All these sums extracted from the Jews by temporal kings are but paying the arrearages to God for a debt they can never satisfy for crucifying Christ." Old prejudices die hard.

Henry III.'s exactions became so intolerable that in 1255 the Jews begged to be allowed to leave the realm. This request, to rely again upon Matthew Paris, the king refused, and then, like "another Titus or Vespasian," farmed

them out to his rich brother Richard, Earl of Cornwall, and rival emperor-elect of Germany, that, "as he himself had excoriated them, so Richard might eviscerate them."¹ It was in an audience with the Jews at this time that Henry, in explanation of his demands, swore "by God's head" that his debts amounted to two hundred thousand marks, and that Edward, his son, spent fifteen thousand marks a year.

The English Crusaders, starting on the third crusade, freely pillaged the Jews, indignant, as the chroniclers relate, that the Jews should have abundance and to spare while they, who were hurrying on the long journey to Jerusalem, had not enough for their barest wants. It was at that time, on the evening of the coronation of Richard I., who was soon to become the hero of the crusade and meet Saladin face to face, that the ruthless massacre occurred in which neither sex was spared. William of Newburgh, de Hoveden, and the later chroniclers give detailed accounts of this sorry event, when the false rumor spread that Richard, in the midst of the festivities, had ordered the extermination of the Jews. The populace gladly took it up, and pillaged, and slew without mercy. William of Newburgh had no doubt that God was fulfilling his purpose in the massacre, howbeit through bad agents. In describing the holocaust which occurred at the same time at York, when five hundred were shut up in the castle, and the men, in despair, after putting to death their own wives and daughters, were many of them burned to death, de Hoveden and Matthew Paris take care to say that their papers of mortgage were also consumed.

The enlightened Stephen Langton, who stood for popular rights in the contest over Magna Charta, shared the prejudice of his age in regard to the Jews, and at a synod of Oxford ordered them to wear a woolen patch on their

¹ *Ut quos etoriaverat, comes eviscerat.*

garments and of different color. By the statute of Jewerie (1276) Edward I. ordered it should be yellow, made in the shape of the tables of the law, and worn by all over seven.

English communities were roused to a lamentable pitch of excitement by the alleged crucifixion of Christian boys. The deed was done, so it was asserted, at the time of the Passover, and seemingly for the purpose of using the blood for magical operations. But the contemporaries are not clear as to the purpose. Among the more notorious cases of slaughtered innocents were William of Norwich (1144), Harold of Gloucester (1168), Robert of Edmonsbury (1181) and Hugh of Lincoln (1255). Although they were popularly known as saints, none of these children have been canonized by the church. The alleged enormities perpetrated upon Hugh of Lincoln, as given in the account of Matthew Paris, are too shocking to be enumerated at length. All the acts in our Lord's crucifixion and last sufferings were repeated, and disembowelling added. In his account of a similar occurrence in London, the chronicler interjects the statement that the deed was "said often to have occurred." In some cases, after having circumcised the intended victim, the alleged criminals were discovered, and, as in 1239, four were hung.¹ In the excitement over little Hugh, eighteen Jews were gibbeted.² The crime of crucifying innocent children is too atrocious for the present age to give it credit. The marvel is that it was believed, and that no protest against the belief has come down to us from those days. Some Jews under pressure of fear and force submitted to baptism, and some also of their free-will. The first case of the latter kind, so far as I know, is given by Anselm. The Jew became a monk. The most famous case of yielding to baptism under constraint was the case of Benedict of York. Roger de Hove-

¹M. Paris, Luard's ed., iii. 543. He says their guilt was clearly proven (*convicti manifeste, suspendio perierunt*). ²iv. 30.

den gives a detailed account of how, on being wounded, he was saved from death by being baptized under the name of William. When it was reported that he denied his baptism, and was brought before the king and the archbishop of Canterbury, the archbishop most unprelatically said, "If he does not choose to be a Christian, let him be a man of the devil." Hoveden rebukes the archbishop for his manner of statement, and suggests he ought to have said, "Let him be brought before the proper tribunal for trial." Benedict did in fact relapse into "his former errors, and, like a dog returning to his vomit," was refused the usual sepulture of both Jews and Christians. An isolated case occurred here and there of a Christian turning Jew. A deacon was hanged for this offense.¹

The final act in the treatment of the Jews in mediæval England was their banishment from the land by Edward I. in 1290, "the great blot," as Green says, upon that monarch's reign. From that time until the Caroline age, England was free from Jewish inhabitants. Cromwell added to his fame by giving them protection in London. No feelings of religious tolerance had influenced the English sovereigns when they offered protection to the Jews. They were the king's chattels, and he used them as an instrument for filling his exchequer. In spite of the church's legislation against usury, in spite of the violent hostility of the populace, in spite of acts of sacrilege perpetrated here and there by a fanatical Jew, the king defended them. They built some of the first and best stone houses in England, and, if the statement of the historian Green is correct, they dared to assume "an attitude of proud and even insolent defiance."

The treatment of the Spanish Jews is justly regarded as the most merciless the race received in the Middle Ages. This judgment is due to the numbers who were made to

¹ M. Paris, iii. 21.

suffer, and the contrast between their sufferings and the power they had previously had in the realm. Edward I. protected against plunder the sixteen thousand Jews who were banished from England. But Ferdinand of Spain, when he issued the fell decree for his Jewish subjects to evacuate Spain, apparently looked on without a sign of pity. Spain, through its church councils, had been the leader in restrictive legislation. There the edicts of the West Gothic kings confirmed the attitude of the church. Later kings, as Alfonso VI., Alfonso XI., and Pedro the Cruel (d. 1369), received Jews at their courts and employed them on embassies. But under other kings the laws were enforced. Alfonso X. (d. 1284) issued a law punishing Christians turning Jews, with death. William Rufus had forbidden the transition in England as a poor exchange. The introduction of the Inquisition made the life of the people more and more severe, although primarily its merciless regulations had no application to them. But persecutions filled the land with ungentle proselytes, the *conversos*, and these became subject to the inquisitorial court.

The dire persecution of 1391 swept tens of thousands to a violent death, and two hundred thousand are reported to have accepted baptism. In Seville alone, out of seven thousand families; four thousand were obliterated. A hundred years elapsed till the final blow was given. It was the year of the discovery of that new continent in a part of which was to be put into practice religious toleration as it was never before reached on the earth. Religious motives were behind it, and religious agents struck the blow. The immediate occasion was the intense feeling aroused by the alleged crucifixion of the child of La Guardia (*el santo ninyo de la Guardia*), one of the most notorious cases of alleged child murder by the Jews. Dr. Lea has given us our best English account of it.¹ The

¹ Chapters from the *Rel. Hist. of Spain*, 437-468, also Graetz, viii, 466-472.

inquisitors used torture in trying to make out a case, but the testimony was conflicting, and the body never found. Such a slight matter could be easily rectified, and the theory was credited, that, like our Lord's body, so this child's body was wrapt up into heaven on the third day after its taking off. Lope de Vega and other Spanish writers have made the case famous in Spanish literature. The horrible details of the case confirmed the purpose of Ferdinand that the Jews should leave Spain. According to Llorente, he whose name embodies all that is awful in the Inquisition strengthened the king's hand. Ferdinand, so it is said, moved by the appeals of a Jewish embassy seconded by grandees, was about to modify his sentence, when Torquemada, hastening into the presence of the king and his consort, presented the crucifix, exclaiming, Judas Iscariot sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver. Your majesties are about to sell him for three thousand ducats. Here he is, take him and sell him.

The number of Jews who emigrated from Spain in the summer of 1492, Graetz sets at 300,000. Other estimates put it at 170,000 to 400,000. They went to Italy, Morocco, and the East, and, invited by King Manuel, 100,000 passed into Portugal, where places of residence were set apart for them. But here their tarrying was destined to be short. In 1495 an edict offered them the old alternative of baptism or death, and children under fourteen were taken forcibly from their parents, and the sacred Christian rite was administered to them. Ten years later two thousand of the alleged ungentine converts were massacred in cold blood.

Such was the drama of sufferings through which the Jews were made to pass during the mediaeval period in Western Europe. As against this treatment, what efforts were made to win the Jews by appeals from the gospel? It may be replied, that no appeals were likely to make the gospel attractive, when such a spirit of disparagement and

hostility prevailed. Anselm,¹ while he did not direct his treatise on the atonement *Cur Deus Homo* to the Jews, says, that his argument ought to be sufficient to persuade both Jew and Pagan of the divine right of Christianity. Treatises were addressed to the Jews, designed to show the fulfilment of the old law and to prove the divinity of Christ. Of this character was Grosseteste's *De Cessatione Legalium*, written in 1231, and used in later years by Sir John Eliot and John Selden. But the most famous of these tracts was the tract of Peter the Venerable. In Migne's edition it fills more than one hundred and forty columns, and would make a modern book of more than three hundred pages of the ordinary size. Its heading was little likely to win the favor of the people for whom it was written. It was entitled "A Tract against the Inveterate Hardness of the Jews" (*inveteratam duritiem*). The author starts out by asking them how it was that they still persisted in rejecting the Son of God, denying the truth and refusing to soften their iron hearts. He then proceeded to show from their own Scriptures the divinity of Christ, "for to the blind even the light is as night and the sun as the shades of darkness." He proves four propositions; namely, that Christ is the Son of God, that Christ is God, that he is not a temporal but an eternal and heavenly king, and that he has already come. He concludes, under a fifth head, by refuting the foolish fables the Jews believed from the Talmud.

Some idea can be gotten of the nature of some of Peter's arguments from Scripture by a reference to a single one. The first text adduced to prove that Christ is the Son of God is Isa. lxvi. 9: "Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith Jehovah. Shall I that caused to bring forth shut the womb? saith thy God." "What is more clear, O Jews," continues the author, "for

¹ *Cur Deus Homo*, x. 23, Migne's ed., Vol. clviii. p. 431.

proving the generation of the Son of God? For if God beget, so far as he beget, he is necessarily Father, and the Son of God so far as he is begotten is necessarily Son." In taking up the proof, that the Messiah has already come, Peter naively says that "if the Jew shall presume to think when the argument is finished that he lives, he [Peter] holds the sword of Goliath, and, standing over the Jew's prostrate form, will use the weapon for his destruction, and cleave his blasphemous head in twain with the edge of it."

What effect could such arguments have but to deepen opposition to the Christian system, and to arouse revulsion where it did not before exist? There were Christians who had real sympathy for the Jews. Such chroniclers of England as Roger de Hoveden, relating the massacre of 1189, bear witness to it. But if the mild abbot of Clugny, Peter the Venerable, approached the Jews in a manner of marked arrogance, what was to be expected from other writers like Peter of Blois, who wrote against the *Perfidy of the Jews?*

There were attempts to reach the Jews of another nature. In London a *domus conversorum*, intended for the protection of Jewish proselytes, was established in 1233, and an annual grant of seven hundred marks from the royal exchequer promised for its maintenance; but no reports have come down to us of its usefulness. In Spain and Southern France, preaching was resorted to and public disputations. Not a few Jews, "learned men, physicians, authors, and poets," to use the language of Graetz, adopted the Christian faith from conviction, and "became as eager in proselyting as though they had been born Dominicans." At the public disputations, representative rabbis and selected Christian controversialists disputed. Jewish proselytes often represented the Christian side. The most famous of these disputations, that of Tortosa, stretched through a year and nine months (1413-1414),

and held sixty-eight sittings. It was presided over by the tenacious antipope Benedict XIII. or his representative. The discussion was restricted chiefly to the alleged authority of the Talmud and its attitude to Jesus as the Messiah. Many baptisms are reported to have followed this trial of argumentative strength, and Benedict announced his conclusions in a bull, again forbidding forced baptism, as opposed to the canons of the church, but insisting on the Jews' wearing the distinctive patch, and enacting that they should listen to three Christian sermons every year,—on Easter, in Advent, and in midsummer. Raymundus Lullus appealed for the establishment of chairs in Hebrew with an eye to the conversion of the Jews, as did also Raymundus of Penaforte, the Dominican. At the beginning of the fifteenth century the propaganda of the eloquent preacher Vincent Ferrer was crowned with marked success, and the lowest estimates place the number who received baptism under his influence at twenty thousand. Among the Spanish bishops of Torquemada's time, two at least were Jews. The most distinguished of the Spanish converts was Rabbi Solomon Helevi (1353-1435), who dignified the archiepiscopal chair of Burgos. The Christian scholar Nicolas of Cusa, if not a born Jew, was of Jewish descent.

These efforts relieve, it is true, the dark picture, but relieve it only a little. The racial exclusiveness of the Jew, and the defiant pride which Christendom associates with him when he attains to prosperity, still render it difficult to make any impression upon him by the presentation of the arguments for Christianity. There have been converts. Neander was a Jew born. So were Paulus Cassel and Adolf Saphir. Delitzsch had a Jew for one of his parents, and there have been, in these latter days, others, known to fame and unknown, who have passed from the traditions of the Talmud to Christian faith. Döllinger is authority

for the statement that thirty years ago there were two thousand Christians in Berlin of Jewish descent. There is fortunately no feeling in the church to-day that it should come to the aid of Providence in executing vengeance for the crucifixion of Christ, a thought which ruled, as we have seen, the Christian mind in the Middle Ages. The way to win the children of Abraham, if they may be won, is by cultivating towards them, in place of suspicion, the spirit of brotherly confidence and Christian love. In view of the experience of the mediæval church, if for no other reason, this mode of treatment is worth trying.