

Anti-Converso Riots of the Fifteenth Century, Pulgar, and the Inquisition

NORMAN ROTH *

While anyone who has looked, however casually, at the *crónicas* or other sources for fifteenth-century Spain knows something of the extent of unrest and turmoil (constant murders, robbery, rioting, etc.) which characterized that period, it is misleading to attempt to deny, as one writer has done, that animosity against and *conversos* played a special role in the violence of the era. This writer, Mackay, has stated that «even a single listing» of popular disorders shows they were a reflection of «general conditions of unrest», and warns against being «hypnotized by the purely anti-Semitic aspects» of such movements. Yet, in fact, *all* the instances of «popular unrest and violence» recorded in the *tabla* provides involved Jews or *conversos* or both!¹

The correct interpretation needs to be that the increasing hostility against Jews, and especially *conversos* (far more, in fact, than Jews), was encouraged and enabled to erupt into actual riots and massacres because of the general violent and anarchic atmosphere of the century. The anti-Semitism, however, was not a mere manifestation of that atmosphere, but a separate and very real issue. While appearing to criticize Baer's (correct) statement that only in the late 1440's was the *converso* problem revealed in its full gravity, and Márquez Villena's (equally correct) statement that deteriorating economic conditions were a cause of popular unrest, Mackay provides solid evidence which in fact completely substantiates Márquez' hypothesis, and

* University of Wisconsin. (Madison, EE.UU.).

¹ MACKAY, A.: «Popular Movements and Programs in Fifteenth-Century Castile», *Past and Present*, 55, 1972, 34, and p. 35, table I.

admits finally that from 1440 to 1449 «there is little evidence of serious popular agitation»².

TOLEDO

The first, and perhaps most notorious, of the riots specifically directed against *conversos* in Spain was that in Toledo in 1449, already amply studied by Benito Ruano and others before him, but leaving room for additional new information and interpretation.

The reign of Juan II began in great turmoil. Pero López de Ayala, the powerful noble of Toledo vacillated in his «loyalty» to the king and finally in 1440 entered into an alliance with the *infante* Enrique in open warfare against Juan. Many of the nobles of Castile joined in a confederation against Ayala. Unfortunately, the king did nothing, and the rebellion spread throughout Castile. It took some months before the king regained effective control of the cities. In 1444, he pardoned his son and Ayala, but the continued rebellion led finally to his deposing Ayala of his powers and castles. Two years later, however, as a part of the compromise which sought to end the tension, the king was forced to restore some of the power and possessions to Ayala.

In 1448 there was again a plot of some of the rebellious nobles against the king. Many were arrested and some, like the *almirante* don Fadrique Enríquez (whose daughter married the king of Aragón-Catalonia), escaped across the border. Badly in need of money, also for the wars against the Muslims, Juan asked for financial aid from the cities. In Toledo in the following year Alvaro de Luna apparently entrusted a certain wealthy *converso* merchant, Alonso Cota (member of the famous Jewish and *converso* Cota family of Toledo), with the responsibility of raising the required sum.

Alvaro de Luna, *condestable* of Juan II and Master of the Order of Santiago, was himself of a *converso* family, though probably several generations removed, as was probably his treasurer and chronicler Gonzalo Chacón, later *contador mayor* of the Catholic Monarchs³. Already in 1441 there had been serious charges brought against de Luna, some possibly true (illicit alliances and political intrigues) and others no

² *Ibíd.*, pp. 52-53, 54-57, 58.

³ See Carriazo's introduction to Gonzalo Chacón's *Crónica de don Alvaro de Luna* (ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo, Madrid, 1940), p. XXVI, ff. Carriazo did not suspect Chacón's *converso* origin, but the name Chacón—later Coronel—was that of a renowned *converso* dynasty. Gonzalo's father Juan was *alguacil* of de Luna in 1429, and may have been the first *converso* member of the family. Note that Gonzalo speaks with considerable sympathy, twice, of the «great persecution» of *conversos* in Toledo (*Crónica*, 244).

doubt exaggerated or totally false (murder, homosexuality, black magic). In 1443 he was a sponsor of the *pragmática* of Arévalo in favor of the Jews. This, of course, does not prove that Alvaro has a particularly «pro-Jewish» policy. The old theory of Amador de los Ríos, accepted by Serrano and by Carriazo, that he did and that this incurred the enmity of the *conversos* has been correctly refuted by Cantera Burgos, as well as the notion that the *converso* Santa María family (Alonso de Caratagena, Alvar, etc.) were supporters of the *infantes* of Aragón against Castile⁴.

In 1453, when the angry mob attacked Alvaro, accusing him of treason, at the place of Pedro de Cartagena in Burgos, he sought to protect Alvaro de Cartagena (son of Pedro, the brother of the bishop Pablo de Santa María) from the mob which was also attacking *conversos*. However, in the end de Luna's own retinue convinced him that Cartagena, could save *him*, since he knew secret ways out of the palace and the city. Chacón put into de Luna's mouth a speech in which he complains of the evil which *conversos* sought to do him, though he treated them better than anyone in the realm. However, this is unlikely, for it not only contradicts his previous statement that he wished to save Alvaro de Cartagena from the mob which was *attackin* the *conversos*, but also the fact that many *conversos* later supported de Luna in the 1449 riots⁵.

To return to Toledo and 1449, for some reason suspicion fell on the *conversos* as having themselves been the instigators of this special impost, perhaps in order to «humiliate» the «old Christians» who clearly could not afford to pay such a sum, reportedly one million *mrs.* The *alcalde mayor* Pero Sarmiento, and his assessor Marcos García de Manzarambrós, urged resistance to the tax and also sought the intercession of the *infante*, don Enrique, with his father. There resulted a riot, which began with a mob in the church of Santa María (a former synagogue), and the house of the *converso* Alonso Cota was burned (he survived, however, and was to retain his post under Enrique IV). Houses of other *conversos* were also attacked⁶.

⁴ CARRILLO DE HUETE, P.: *Crónica del halconero de Juan II*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid, 1946), pp. 325-332; cf. ROUND, N.: *The Greatest Man Uncrowned, A Study of the Fall of don Alvaro de Luna* (London, 1986), pp. 24-25. For the *pragmática*, see CABALLERO, F.: *Noticias de la vida, cargos y escritos del doctor Alonso Díaz de Montalvo* (Madrid, 1873), p. 47; CANTERA BRGOS, Fr.: *Alvar García de Santa María y su familia de conversos* (Madrid, 1952), p. 77. ff., pp. 427-433, and cf. also briefly Round, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64 (who adds nothing to what Cantera already said).

⁵ CHACON: *Crónica*, pp. 334, 381-384. Some additional details involving Alonso, and his brother Pedro de Cartagena, and their dealings with Sarmiento after he left Toledo following the 1449 riots may be found in Cantera, *Alvar García*, pp. 165-168, 423-427, and 474. These add nothing or feal importance, however, and surprisingly, Cantera said virtually nothing about Alonso de Cartagena's famous defense of *conversos*.

⁶ *Crónica del rey don Juan II* (BAE, 68), p. 661. Cota was apparently the father of a famous jurist,

The result was actual war, culminating in a siege of the city by Alvaro de Luna (a papal letter condemning Sarmiento refers to the use of «machines of war» in the conflict)⁷.

Less fortunate than Alonso Cota was another *converso* tax collector, Juan de Ciudad, who was killed and his body dragged to the plaza de Zocodover (Chacón says some of his descendants later went to other lands and became Jews)⁸.

The illegitimate son of the king of Navarre, Alonso, attacked Cuenca, but the city was ably defended by its bishop, Lope de Barrientos, who later wrote a profound defense of the *conversos* (discussed below).

When Juan II came to Toledo in May of 1449, he was presented with a defense and demands by Sarmiento and other rebels of the city, among which were charges against Alvaro de Luna, including the claim that he gave offices to «infidels and heretics, enemies of our sacred law». Furthermore, Sarmiento accused him of «publicly defending and receiving *conversos* of Jewish lineage, who for the most part are found to be infidels and heretics who have «judaized» and continue to do so and observe most of the Jewish rites and ceremonies»⁹. Another contemporary, Pedro de Escavias, also refers to the uprisings, caused by the «great division» of Christians (!) against *conversos*, led respectively by Sarmiento and Juan de Ciudad. The «old

also named Alonso, who was burned by the Inquisition in Toledo in 1486 (see FITA, F.: «La Inquisición toledano», *BRAH*, 11, 1887, 229). A document of Toledo in 1491-1492 refers to the houses of «Alfon Cota» in the *Alcava* (barrio) and a house in *Rúa nueva* in which Cota and «Alfon» de San Pedro lived. These were probably members of the same families (Cota and San Pedro) mentioned here (LEON TELLO, P.: *Los judíos de Toledo*, Madrid, 1979, II, 556).

⁷ YITZHAK BAER briefly summarizes the events, *History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Philadelphia, 1966), II, 279-281 (the much better and more complete Spanish translation by LACAVE, J. L.: *Historia de los judíos en la España cristiana*, Madrid, 1981, II, 529-533), but his claim that it was the «lower classes» who rebelled against the *conversos* is not supported by the sources. The letter of Nicholas V to Juan II condemning Sarmiento is cited by Beltrán de Heredia: «Las bulas de Nicolás V acerca de los conversos», *Sefarad* 21, 1961, 27, note. Further information on the status of the *conversos* and their involvement with de Luna can be found in Nicholas Round's previously cited book, pp. 171-180, with the most important new information being on the Díaz de Toledo family, and cf. also pp. 204-207, and on the part played by Alonso García de Guadalupe, brother of Diego de Valera, pp. 186-188. However, Round was apparently unaware that de Luna was himself of *converso* descent, which makes his «tolerance» of *conversos* somewhat less surprising.

⁸ BENITO RUANO, E.: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, Madrid, 1961, p. 35; cf. CARRILLO: *Crónica del halconero*, p. 511 ff.; LOPE DE BARRIENTOS: *Refundición de la crónica del halconero*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo, Madrid, 1946, pp. CXCII-VIII; and CHACÓN: *Crónica de don Alvaro de Luna*, p. 244. The «Chronicon de Valladolid» states that *houses* (plural) of Cota were «robbed and burned», and that Fernando Alonso Salinero and Alvaro de San Pedro and «another» were also killed (*CODOIN* XIII, 19).

⁹ CARRILLO: *Crónica de halconero*, pp. 521-523.

Christians» cried «Death to the heretics», and the *conversos* «Death to those who are against the king»¹⁰.

As Benito Ruano correctly understood, it was in large part due to the need both for Sarmiento and the other rebels of Toledo to find a justification for their treason (in spite of having been pardoned by the king) that they blamed the *conversos*. On the other hand, he elsewhere expressed considerable naivete, in my opinion, in suggesting that in light of Nicholas V's bull declaring discrimination against *conversos* heretical, an organized Tribunal like that of the later Inquisition could have enforced the bull and prevented persecution of the *conversos*¹¹. It was precisely the Inquisition which hypocritically persecuted and burned thousands, of *conversos*, whom it knew to be good Christians, totally ignoring Nicholas' bull and subsequent papal objections to the Inquisition.

Continuing with his program, Sarmiento assembled various officials in the city in June and issued the «*sentencia-estatuto*» prohibiting *conversos* and their descendants from holding any public office. One of the first statements in the statute refers to a privilege granted the city of Toledo by «don Alfonso, rey de Castilla y de León» affirming that on public office in that city be given to a *converso* of Jewish descent «because of (such *conversos* being suspect in the faith)¹².

Amador de los Ríos and Benito Ruano have argued that (although which king «don Alfonso» is not stated) no such privilege exists nor is there any other mention of it. However, Netanyahu correctly pointed out that the gloss of Alonso Díaz de Montalvo (to be discussed later) does refer to it; more importantly, he discovered that in three different manuscripts (which Benito Ruano had not used) of the *Memorial* of Marcos García de Mora defending the *sentencia* there is an important section, missing in the edited text, which clearly refers to laws given as a «special city

¹⁰ *Repertorio de príncipes*, ed. AVALLE-ARCE, J. B.: *El cronista Pedro de Escavias*, Chapel Hill, 1972 (University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 127), p. 206. Baer, in his usual manner, distorted the entire incident. Thus, there was no arrest of *conversos*, no trial, no torture under which the supposedly «confessed» to «judaizing» (*History of the Jews*, II, 278; *Historia de los judíos*, II, 530).

¹¹ RUANO, B.: «Del problema judío al problema converso», *Simposio Toledo Judaico*, Toledo, 1972, II, 5-28; rpt. in his *Los orígenes del Problema converso*, Barcelona, 1976, p. 28.

¹² The text of the statute has been frequently published: MARTIN GAMERO, A.: *Historia de la ciudad de Toledo*, Toledo, 1862, pp. 1036-1040; FRITZ BAER: *Die juden im christlichen Spanien*, Berlín, 1936, II, 315-317 (partial edition); DE CARTAGENA, A.: *Defensorium unitatis christianae*, ed. Manuel Alonso, Madrid, 1943, pp. 357-365; RUANO, B.: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, pp. 191-196, and again in his «La Sentencia-Estatua de Pero Sarmiento», *Revista de la Universidad de Madrid* 6, 1975, 277-306, appendix, reprinted in his *Los orígenes del problema converso*, pp. 82-85. For the sake of convenience, I cited the text as in RUANO, B.: *Toledo*, here, p. 192.

enactment» to Toledo by «the king don Alfonso» prohibiting baptized Jews from holding public office¹³.

Furthermore, whereas one might assume that the privilege of «don Alfonso» referred to is none other than the *fuero* of Alonso VII given to Toledo in 1118 which prohibited Jews and those «recently converted» from holding office, Netanyahu argued that this cannot be the document referred to, for a variety of reasons (especially because it said «*recent converts*», whereas in the text cited in the statute *all converts and their descendants* are mentioned).

However, his conclusion that sometimes after the *fuero* of 1118 («say in 1145»), the Christians of Toledo petitioned the king for yet a new law prohibiting not the «recent converts» of 1118 but even their descendants from holding public office is not convincing. There may have been some Jews who converted in the 1108 riots in Toledo; on the other hand, the *fuero* seems to be speaking in theological generalities, «no Jew or one recently converted», which may well simply reflect canon law and not refer to the 1108 incident at all¹⁴. In any event, there is no evidence of any large number of converts at that date, and certainly not later. More particularly, there is no evidence at all to support the contention that «old Christians» already resented Jews holding public office in Toledo, not in the twelfth and not in the thirteenth century. On the contrary, Jews often held offices of very great importance in Toledo. Thus, if the alleged privilege of «don Alfonso» has any reality, it most *certainly* refers to the *fuero* of 1118, which the supporters of the statute of 1449 misinterpreted, accidentally or deliberately, as barring *descendants* of Jewish converts from holding public office.

The statute continues with the complaint that, nevertheless, «most» of the offices such as public scribes are held by *conversos* who are henceforth prohibited from holding any office, as this causes harm to «old Christians of pure lineage» (*a los christianos viejos lindos*; possibly the first use of this term [p. 193]).

In spite of the absurd charges made against *conversos* the real cause of Sarmiento's hatred is revealed a few lines further on: some *conversos* of Toledo supported Alvaro de Luna, his old enemy. The robbery and killing took place he blames not only on the *conversos* themselves, but on Jews generally, «enemies of our holy Catholic faith» (a statement rarely made in Spanish sources) who always exhibit such

¹³ See Benzion Netanyahu, «Died the Toledans in 1449 Rely on a Real Royal Privilege?», *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 44 (1977, 104-105, and pp. 116-124 for the points below.

¹⁴ On the riot in Toledo in 1108, see my «New Light on the Jews of Mozarabic Toledo», *AJS* (Association for Jewish Studies Review), 11, 1986, 198-199 (offprints available in Madrid and Toledo; there, on p. 199, I erroneously wrote Alfonso VII instead of Alfonso VIII, who of course was the king who confirmed the *fuero*, in 1174).

behavior. Like notorious anti-Semites before him (eg, Lucas of Tuy), he goes back to the ancient legend of Jews having betrayed Toledo to the Muslims at the time of their conquest. So the «descendants» of those Jews, the *conversos*, continue to rob and deceive the people. Not only that, they have robbed and destroyed «the majority» of the houses of old Christians in the city and throughout the realm! (p. 194)¹⁵.

Certain public officials known to be *conversos* are named: López Fernández Cota (1), Juan Fernández Cota, Gonzalo Rodríguez de San Pedro (nephew of López Fernández Cota) (2), Juan Núñez and his brothers Pero (3) and Diego, Juan López del Arroyo, Juan González de Illescas, Pero Ortiz, Diego Rodríguez el Alba (4) Diego Martínez de Herrera, the *alcalde* Diego González Jarada and his son Pero González (p. 195).

Some of these family names: Cota, San Pedro, Núñez, de Illescas, Ortiz, appear in the list of most commonly occurring names of *conversos* in Toledo in 1485, 1495 and 1497¹⁶. No doubt this is only a partial list of *converso* officials in Toledo, and perhaps represents those whom Sarmiento particularly hated.

In response to Sarmiento's infamous «statute», many outstanding Christian authorities wrote stinging rebuttals in defense of the *conversos*. Among those which have survived (there were no doubt others) are those by Lope de Barrientos, Fernán Díaz de Toledo, Alonso Díaz de Montalvo, Alonso de Cartagena, and Juan de Torquemada. Later, Alfonso de Oropesa, was also to write on the same subject, but that belongs to another chapter.

Not all of these were themselves *conversos*, as has been erroneously claimed. Lope de Barrientos certainly was not, nor was Alonso Díaz de Montalvo¹⁷. Another

¹⁵ On the legend of the Jewish «betrayal» of Toledo in 711, see my article, «The Jews and the Muslim Conquest of Spain», *Jewish Social Studies*, 37, 1976, 145-158, and the follow-up study on Lucas of Tuy, «Jews and Albigensians in the Middle Ages: Lucas of Tuy on Heretics in Leon», *Sefard*, 41, 1981, 71-93.

(1) In 1422 he was «*escribano del rey*» and farmed the *diezmos* of the Jewish *aljama* of Toledo for the cathedral chapter (LEON TELLO: *Judíos de Toledo*, II, 224, etc.).

(2) *ibid.*, n.º 759, 902, 922, 934, 942, 965, 1011. His son Santo Haruque is described as a *Jew* of Maqueda (p. 339).

(3) He may be the *regidor*, deceased, named in the Inquisition proceedings of 1494; *ibid.*, n.º 1692.

(4) Could this be the doctor Diego Rodríguez of Valladolid, of the royal council (frequent mention in *Crónica de halconero*, etc.)?

¹⁶ See the introduction to CANTERA BURGOS, Fr. and LEON TELLO, P.: *Los judaizantes del arzobispado de Toledo*, Madrid, 1919, p. XXXIII.

¹⁷ The claim that these were all *conversos* was made by Beltrán de Heredia, «Las bulas de Nicolás», p. 26, n. 6. LEON TELLO also stated that almost all were *conversos* (*Judíos de Toledo*, I, 209). MARQUEZ VILLANUEVA, Fr., in his introduction to Hernando de Talavera's: *Católica impugnación*, claimed that Barrientos was a *converso*, which he certainly was not, and even added Alfonso de Oropesa to the list!

treatise was apparently written by Francisco de Toledo, dean of the cathedral, and was directed to Torquemada and also to the pope, but it has not survived. This Francisco later became bishop of Coria, and may have been a *converso*¹⁸.

Lope de Barrientos (born 1395, not 1382, and died 1469), Dominican master and bishop of Segovia, Avila and Cuenca, had been confessor of Juan II, and then his *Chancery* mayor. He addressed to the king his defense, «*Contra algunos zizañadoras de la nación de los convertidos del pueblo de Israel*». Barrientos condemned Sarmiento's henchman Marquillos as «another Haman», but noted that whereas Haman attacked Jews, Marquillos attacked Christians (i. e., *conversos*)¹⁹.

He raises the obvious objection that his persecution discourages others from converting and leads to «blasphemy» among those already converted who say that it would have been better not to become Christians. Indeed, he admits, *conversos* are much more persecuted than Jews are (p. 183). From a moral-historical viewpoint, Barrientos argues that the prophets and apostles were all Jews, and logically the latter would have been persecuted as *conversos* according to Marquillos' position (later, he mentions St. Julián, the Visigothic bishop of Toledo, who as a *converso*, and also a bishop of Barcelona, born in Valencia, in his own time, whom Barrientos met and spoke with, who was of Jewish descent (pp. 189-90). Not only that, but it would be of great dishonor to Christ himself to insult and abuse those of «that line of his holy humanity» (Jewish converts) by denying them offices and benefices within the Church. According to canon law, the *Siete Partidas*, and the agreement of all the *cortes*, indeed, not only must Jewish converts not be «disdained», they must even be favored (pp. 184-186).

He refers also to questions to Enrique III in the *Cortes* concerning the *conversos*, and calls those who already then sought to persecute them so many «perverse Hamans» (p. 187). That king issued decrees in favor of *conversos*, however. Barrientos says he himself also saw a papal bull addressed to Enrique against the persecution of *conversos*.

He notes that hundreds of Christians have become Muslims, recently even the brother of the bishop of Zamora (this refers to fray Alonso de Mella, a Franciscan and brother of Juan de Mella, bishop of Zamora and later a cardinal. Fray Alonso was the founder of the Durango heresy and leader of that movement, many of whom were imprisoned and burned by order of the king. Alonso fled to Granada, where according to Pérez de Guzmán, he was condemned to death²⁰), and many Christians

¹⁸ See AMADOR DE LOS RIOS, J.: *Historia... de los judíos de España y Portugal*, Madrid, 1876, III, 125; RUANO, B.: *Los orígenes del problema converso*, pp. 52-53.

¹⁹ Text edited by Luis Getino, «Vida y obras de Fr. Lope de Barrientos», *Anales Salmantinos*, 1, 1927, 182. (For the correct year of Barrientos' birth, see «Chronicon de Valladolid», p. 14).

²⁰ *Crónica de don Juan II*, p. 608.

are heretics; among the Basques and in Bohemia, for instance. Yet no one persecutes these, nor persecutes all the Basques because some are heretics, nor robs and kills the Andalucianas because every day many of them go to Granada to become Muslims²¹.

Remarkable also is another insight: since virtually all of the Jews in Visigothic Spain converted to Christianity, who among the Christians of Spain could be certain that he is not a descendant of those *conversos*? (p. 197).

Of great significance is the list he gives of prominent Christian families who have *converso* members or are of *converso* descent: The Manriques, Mendozas, Rojas, Sarabias, Pimenteles, Lujanes, Solis, Mirandas, Osorios, Saucedos (Salcedos), and others; including relatives of Hurtado de Mendoza, *mayordomo* of the king, and the *mariscal* Diego Fernández of Córdoba; also Francisco Fernández Marmolejo, who was *contador* of the «king don Alfonso» (this is an error for Pedro I) whose descendants include many *regidores* and *caballeros* in Seville (pp. 198-200). Of course he also mentions Juan Sánchez of Seville, *contador mayor* of Enrique III, mentioned also in the *cancionero de Baena*, as well as the Lunas, Stúñigas (later Estúñigas) and others²².

Particularly important is his statement that the *almirante* of Castile, don Alonso Henríquez, on one side was descended from Alfonso XI and Enrique II, and on the other from Jews. It should be pointed out that the second wife of Juan II of Aragón was Juana Henríquez, daughter of the admiral Fadrique Henríquez, and thus their son Fernando, the «Catholic king», was of *converso* descent!²³ Not only the royal line

²¹ Pp. 195-196; this is all taken verbatim from Fernán Ortiz. On efforts to reconvert Christians who had fled to Granada and become Muslims, after the conquest, see LADERO QUESADA, M. A., Granada, 1988, p. 350 and on the missionary activities of Hernando de Talavera in this regard, DESIGUENZA, J.: *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*, (Madrid, 1909), II, 306-307. Such Christian converts were called *tornadizos*, but this is somewhat confusing since Muslims who converted to Christianity were also sometimes given that name. Therefore, such Christian apostates were more specifically referred to as *elches* (from the name of the town). Examples of such apostasy may be found in DE MATA CARRIAZO, J.: *En la frontera de Granada (Homenaje al profesor Carriazo)*, I, Seville, 1971, p. 244, and see pp. 282, 283, 246 ff. Neither her nor any other author has referred to our source, however. The Catholic Monarchs in Toledo in 1480 enacted a law against Christians in Andalucía who aid the Muslims, supply arms to them, etc., and also against the «bad Christians» who go to Granada to become Muslims or Jews (*Ordenanzas reales*, I, XII, 4, in *Los códigos españoles*, Madrid, 1872, VI, 284; *Colección de códigos y leyes de España*, Madrid, 1867, p. 293).

²² The Stúñigas were, of course, an extremely powerful family. Pedro de Estúñigas, count of Plasencia, was chief justice of Juan II. Alvaro was the first duke of Plasencia and the chief justice of the Catholic Monarchs. Juan Sánchez was Isaac Abravanel's grandfather.

²³ P. 199; the text is cited from the earlier corrupt edition of Fermín Caballero by Américo Castro, *España en su historia*, Buenos Aires, 1948, p. 539, and note the anecdote there concerning a cousin of Fernando, Sancho de Rojas, which indicates that Fernando knew of his Jewish descent. According to Barrientos, de Rojas himself was of a *converso* family.

of Castile, he says, but also that of Navarre contains descendats of *conversos*, for the king don Carlos is descended by his mother from «pure Israelites», i. e., apparently, Jews and not *converso* (p 202).

Fernán Díaz de Toledo, a *converso relator* (counsellor, who received petitions to the Crown) and secretary of the king, prepared and «Instrucción» or background paper, for Barrientos (possibly in October of 1449)²⁴. He sought the bishop's favor on behalf of «all this poor persecuted nation of the lineage of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the flesh, which above all things is blessed of God». They will surely be rewarded, he claims, for all their merits and «laudable works» which they have done and do (he certainly did not have Jews as such in mind, but rather the *conversos*).

He warned that such persecution of *conversos* may prevent other Jews, «outside the faith», from converting, and observes that many *conversos* leave Toledo every day for the land of the Muslims or other kingdoms to become Jews, saying that their (Christian) faith is of no benefit nor does it protect them against such evils. As we have seen, Barrientos utilized these arguments and even expanded upon them. Díaz further condemns the prohibition of *conversos* holding office as contrary to canon and civil law, nothing the opinion of many canonists that the Visigothic prohibition applied only to apostates who returned to Judaism, but not to those who remain in the Christian faith.

Futhermore, both the *Partidas* and other laws of the kings and especially a privilege granted by Enrique III when many Jews in Toledo converted, specifically prohibit this discrimination. (This refers, of course, to the conversion of many Jews in 1391; unfortunately, however, the text of this privilege, referred to also by Barrientos, apparently has not survived.)

Of great interest is his statement that «d. Juan Gómez» archbishop of Toledo, was a *converso* and son of a Jew (judío; read perhaps *judía*?) of Toledo (p. 246). No such name appears in any list of the archbishop of the city, and the only possibility seems to be the archbishop Gutierre Gómez (1310-1319), who in fact was the son of Gome Pérez, *alguacil mayor* of Toledo, and his wife Horabuena (Ora Buena). That name is so exclusively Jewish in medieval Spain, and particularly in Toledo, that there can be little doubt as to her background. The archbishop's brother, interestingly, was Fernand Gómez, chancellor of Fernando IV and frequently involved with the Jew Samuel in the service of that king. It happens that Fernán Alvarez de Toledo (d. ca. 1460), the count of Alba, was a nephew of Gutierre Gómez and also of Iñigo López de Mendoza, which further supports the possibility of the *converso* background of

²⁴ See the numerous references to Fernán Díaz in CARRILLO: *Crónica del halconero* and in BARRIENTOS: *Refundición* (see the index to the latter volume for the both works). He was somewhat more important than his title implies. Alfonso Alvarez, a cousin, became the *contador mayor* of Castile in 1445, and the great jurist Alonso Díaz de Montalvo was at one time a pupil of Fernán Díaz (ROUND: *The Greatest man Uncrowned*, pp. 172-182).

tha archbishop (of course, the archbishop Juna de Cerezuela, brother of Alvaro de Luna, was also of *converso* origin, but somewhat remote; hardly to be described as the «son of a Jew»)²⁵.

However, immediately this in the printed text appears information taken from Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, supposedly about this archbishop, which in fact is about Julián of Toledo. We must assume a lacuna in the text here, and the name of «Julianus Pomerius» (as also in the text of Alonso Díaz de Montalvo, discussed later) should here be added as yet another *converso*. It is to him, i. e. Julián of Toledo, that Rodrigo refers. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt as to the name of «Juan Gómez» here as a *converso* archbishop.

No less important is the statement that there have been, and are, many other prelates of *converso* origin in Spain (we know of at least half-a-dozen *converso* bishops in the fifteenth century alone). Among these was the bishop of Barcelona, a master of theology and almoner of Benedict XIII, whom Fernán says he saw in Morilla some 36 years ago (about 1413). We recall that Barrientos repeated this information, adding that he personally knew this *converso* bishop, whom I so far have been unable to identify.

Christians ought to treat the *conversos* graciously, the says, and with all possible «good», hel, sustain and honor them, tretaing them «fraternally and charitably and even with all manner of love».

«Thanks be to God», he adds, many noble families in Spain are of *converso* origin (he names all of them, including the Mendozas, Ayalas, Lunas, and —a shocker, Cervantes!)²⁶. Also the royal houses of Castile, Navarre, Aragón and Portugal have *converso* «descendants». Everywhere —clergy, *caballeros*, counts, etc.— are *conversos* to be found.

Even thought a certain amount of bragging and selfaggrandizement is evident in all this, he would not dare make such statements (nor would the more renowned and sober Barrientos repeat them) were they not true (as *relator* and secretary to the king, Díaz was «always with him», as Barrientos says in his *Crónica*, and personally knew all the nobility). A descendant of one of the *converso* families named, Salcedo,

²⁵ Another remote possibility might be the archbishop Gutierre Alvarez, called Gómez de Toledo, who was archbishop in 1442 and died in 1446. He wrote «*De sanctissime trinitate*», a treatise against the Jews (in all editions of his works). Nevertheless, the strongest suspicion falls on Gutierre Gómez, both because of his mother's name and the relationship of the family to other prominent *conversos*, on which see DE PULGAR, F. (not, as sometimes written, «Hernando del Pulgar»), *Claros varones*, ed. Brian Tate, Oxford, 1971, p. 87, n. 77.

²⁶ Juan de Cervantes was cardinal of San Pedro. Of course, the *converso* origin of the famous author is still debated, and whether or not he was related to Juan de Cervantes I do not know.

later archbishop of Seville, was indeed the one who preserved the manuscript of this document²⁷.

A response to Fernán Díaz, in the form of a «memorial» or treatise, by *bachiller* Marcos García de Mora (also called «Marquillos») prompted the reply of Barrientos which we have previously discussed²⁸. It is a fanatical diatribe, marred not only by anti-Semitism but by vile attacks on Alvaro de Luna. Making no distinction between Jews and *conversos*, he claimed that the whole kingdom is tyrannized and destroyed by «Jews».

Most of the tirade is a defense of his and Pero Sarmiento's actions in Toledo, but he unleashes a series of patently false charges against all (or most) of the *conversos* of the city: they kept Jewish holidays and Sabbaths, worked on Sundays, maintained lamps in the synagogue, went there to pray every day, etc. Therefore, he says, those who were burned deserved their death, for heretics must be burned in accord with canon law²⁹.

Against the charge of virtual treason, in that Sarmiento and his followers refused to receive the king in the city, he replies that they sought to «save» the king from slavery to Alvaro de Luna and the «Jewish counsel» of the infidels (*conversos*). Personal jealousy and spite were no doubt key motives of his attack on the *conversos*, for he complains that «Mose Hamomo» (his name for Fernán Díaz) not only was a notorious «Jew» but that, although a doctor (of law), «he knows no letters at all except Jewish and heretical ones» whereas he (García) thought only a *bachiller* is a «famous legist and canonist». How far from the truth this charge is can be seen in the aforementioned fact that Alonso Díaz de Montalvo himself was a pupil of Fernán Díaz!

Unnoticed by all who have written on this subject is the manuscript of a treatise by the *bachiller* Alonso González de Toledo, and also addressed to Barrientos. In it, he refers to the decree of IV Toledo (the Visigothic council) against Jews holding public office, but says that he has seen the glosses of those decretals and that one of them specifically states that the prohibition is against *Jews* but not *descendants* of Jews (*aquellos que son de la fe de los judíos más non de los que son de la gente de los judíos*; f. 129r).

²⁷ Text of Fernán Díaz edited by Fermín Caballero: *Noticias de la Vida... Alonso Díaz de Montalvo* (see n.º 4 above), pp. 243-254; there is a lengthy analysis by Nicholas Round, «Politics, Style and Group Attitudes» in the «Instrucción del Relator», *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 1969, 189-319, which is chiefly a summary of the work and sheds little light on its contexts. Caballero's edition is perhaps not to be trusted, and a critical edition of the text would be welcome.

²⁸ Edited by BENITO RUANO, E.: «El memorial contra los conversos del Bachiller Marcos García de Mora», *Sefarad*, 17, 1957: 320-351; reprinted in his *Los orígenes del problema converso*, pp. 102-132.

²⁹ *Sefarad*, p. 331; *Los orígenes*, p. 113.

Another argument which he uses against discriminatory treatment of *conversos* is the «fame» of the archbishops-elect (Alonso de Cartagena, certainly), whom he observes will no doubt be honored throughout the entire world (f. 129v) (However, the reference to him as «archbishop-elect» is peculiar, for he assumed that office in 1436 immediately after the death of his father, Pablo de Santa María. Possibly he had not yet been confirmed by the pope).

The same manuscript contains also the lengthy reply of Barrientos to his treatise but there is nothing new there not already known from his previously cited treatise (ff. 132v-154r)³⁰.

Alonso de Cartagena, son of the *converso* Pablo de Santa María, succeeded his father as bishop of Burgos. He wrote a lengthy Latin defense of *conversos*, particularly seeking to refute the arguments of «Marquillos».

Following a long introduction, much of it anti-Jewish polemic, he argues for unity of Christians, both «old» and converts, drawing support from such sources as Augustin, canon law (particularly the Council of Basle in which he himself had participated), the *Siete Partidas* and laws of Enrique III³¹.

Turning directly to his refutation of «Marquillos», Alonso refers to a nearly complete copy of the canons of the Visigothic Toledo councils which he was able to see at Basle, *since no perfect of complete copy existed in Spain* (a very important piece of evidence as to the lack of influence of this anti-Jewish legislation on later medieval Spanish law). Against the claims that IV Toledo prohibits *conversos* from holding office, he argues that these councils were not «universal» but «particular», and therefore not binding. Furthermore, «Jews» in that legislation means those not converted, and «of Jewish origin» (*ex Judaeis*) means, according to him, «Judaizers», but not sincere converts³².

He concludes (part three) by condemning the activities of the followers of Sarmiento (whom he never names, however), and says they are guilty of heresy like the ancient heretics or those of more modern times, and as had Fernán Díaz and Barrientos he includes here the Hussites of Bohemia, followers of John Hus who was corrupted by the «perverse doctrine of John Wyclif of England» (again, as a member of the Council of Basle, Alonso had participated in the condemnation of Hus)³³.

³⁰ «Judíos y cargas públicas», Madrid BN Ms, 1181, ff. 129r-154v.

³¹ ALONSO DE CARTAGENA: *Defensorium unitates christianae*, ed. Manuel Alonso, Madrid, 1943, pp. 191, ff., 196, 206-108.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 228 ff., and cf. especially p. 231 again on the Basle manuscript of the Toledo canons. See, e.g., p. 239: *Nam hii ex iudeis sunt, cum ad iudaycam cecitatem per vomitum redeunt*; and see especially pp. 242 and 259. Note that this was also the opinion of Barrientos in his very interesting «response» there, p. 327.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 286-287. He also refers to the Durango heresy, mentioned above in the discussion of Barrientos.

There is also a very important text by Alonso Díaz de Montalvo (b. 1405), who held important judicial posts under Juan II and Enrique IV and was a prolific author (among other things, he compiled the *Ordenanzas reales de Castilla*, which saw five editions in 1485 alone; edited and glossed the *Fuero real* and also the first edition of the *Siete Partidas*, 1491). In 1453, he assisted the commission which condemned Alvaro de Luna to death. Montalvo's biographer has pointed out that the important political treatise contained in his gloss to *Fuero real* I. IV, containing the history of the rebellion of the supposed «count of Dacia», is actually a satirical attack on Luna³⁴.

This text deals with the situation of *conversos* holding ecclesiastical and public office. Those who are false he calls «perpetually damned», and recalls once again the old Visigothic laws prohibiting Jews or their *descendants* from holding office. However, he notes that for the sake of «peace» in the faith, no distinction must be made between «Israelites» (*conversos*) and Gentiles if the former are *true* converts. Nor is there any distinction with regard to guilt for the crucifixion of Christ, for which «all are culpable» Jew and Gentile alike (a view shared by many theologians; indeed, the accusation that Jews were responsible for the crucifixion is quite rare in medieval sources, and especially in Spain). All (Jews and Gentiles) are «like lost sheep, but now are converted (turned to) the shepherd».

If, in fact, there are heretics among the *conversos*, God will be able to distinguish them and «separate» them from the faithful. But converts are not automatically suspect, for through baptism all —Jew and Gentile— become one body (I Cor. 12.12) and form one Church, without distinction.

He also notes that Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada had spoken highly of «Julianus Pomerius» and his virtue, who was of the Jewish people and proclaimed the doctrine of God (indeed, Jiménez does say all this about Julian of Toledo, but adds that this being of Jewish origin was like a rose flourishing among thorns!³⁵). Not only should true converts be considered equal to other Christians, they must not be denied any office of Christian honor, and to act contrary to this is against «express law and right».

The very argument used by Barrientos is also found here: there are many Christian heretics, like those in Vizcaya, but not all the inhabitants are therefore condemned as heretics.

Something totally new and of great significance appears, however: to those who cite the *Fuero juzgo* against *conversos* holding public office, he replies «that law is

³⁴ CABALLERO: *Noticias*. (see n. 4 above), p. 51. In his gloss to the *Partidas* (L. VII. 1), there is an apparent contradiction in Montalvo's defense on Luna, which is satisfactorily explained by Caballero, pp. 53-54.

³⁵ JIMENEZ DE RADA, R.: *De rebus hispaniae* III.13 (in his *Opera*, Madrid, 1793; reprint Valencia, 1968, p. 60).

non authentic, nor is that book authentic, nor is it observed in Spain, and as happens with the antiquated that law is already replaced by a contrary law: 7 *Partidas* tit. 24, ley 6, which is later». The law of *Partidas* to which he refers specifies that those who convert must not be compelled, but should do so of their own free will, and that after conversion all «Jews» shall be honored by everyone in the kingdom and neither they nor their descendants be reproached for having been Jews.

Again, he carefully distinguished the true converts from those who may be heretics and relapse to Judaism. However, those who are faithful must not be denied and office, and especially those who for *five or seven years* have been good Christians. These can hardly be called «neophytes».

Rather curiously, he concludes by condemning the policy of Enrique III (the father of Juan II, for whom Alonso wrote these glosses), at *de advice* of Pedro Tenorio, archbishop of Toledo, to restrict converts from ecclesiastical and public office, and combines this with an eloquent denunciation of Toledo for maintaining such pernicious statutes (*note that his is exactly the opposite of what Fernán Díaz and Barrientos both said, claiming to have seen privileges of Enrique III permitting converts to hold such offices*).

Finally, he concludes by protesting that this persecution of *conversos* is not true zeal for the faith, but a type of malice, and that hatred should be directed at sin and not men. Those who pursue these false notions and laws are the true heretics³⁶.

As is well known, the battle against *conversos* did not end, of course, with the Sarmiento affair, but continued well into the sixteenth century and beyond. When the archbishop of Toledo Juan Martínez Siliceo (1546-1557) published his *Estatuto de limpieza de la sangre* against *conversos* holding ecclesiastical office, the famous leading follower of Erasmus in Spain, Juan de Vergara, who himself had been secretary to two previous archbishops of Toledo, wrote a denunciation of the *Estatuto*. In this work, still in manuscript, he again raised all the points that had already been made in the fifteenth-century dispute, noting that such discrimination is contrary to the laws of the kingdom and to scripture and natural law, and injurious to «many noble people and *principals de los Rey(nos)*». He adds, as had Fernán Díaz and Barrientos, that it is especially against the laws of Alfonso X and Enrique III, and finally he notes that only papal bulls but also St. Paul in Romans protected the Jews, who are the «adopted sons» (*of God*)³⁷.

³⁶ *Fuero Real*, Madrid, 1781, ed., glosses to IV. III. 2, pp. 339-352.

³⁷ «Contradicción del Estatuto de Toledo», Universidades de Salamanca Mrs. 455, ff. 70-87 (on Juan de Vergara, see the important article of J. GOÑI in Luis Moreno Nieto ed., *Diccionario enciclopédico de Toledo y su provincia*, Toledo, 1977, pp. 502-506).

CIUDAD REAL

In June of 1449, the rebellion against the *conversos* spread also to Ciudad Real. The Order of Calatrava, already notorious for its murder and robbery in the city on previous occasion, was involved also in instigating these riots. More than 300 men, «armed with many and diverse arms», attacked the *conversos*, and especially the tax collectors and other officials, and burned a great part of the city. The robbery of houses of *conversos*, which officials of the city were powerless to stop, lasted for two days. Some *conversos* officials were killed and their bodies dragged in the public square.

From the perspective of centuries, one reads almost with more distress than the list of those killed of the burning of «many books» and «many writings». One can only wonder what treasures may have thus been lost.

Juan II this time intervened vigorously to punish those responsible, and it was this which elicited the lengthy report of the events in Ciudad Real, ending with a plea for mercy and promises to make «restitution» to those robbed and to restore *conversos* to their offices (of course, no «restitution» could be made to those who had been murdered). Nevertheless, the king readily granted his complete and unconditional pardon to all the inhabitants of the city, and exemption from any punishment for any crimes related to the incident. He did, however, accept the offer of restitution³⁸.

RESPONSE: THE INQUISITION

All of this gave added power to those who already favored the establishment of an Inquisition. Nevertheless, it is notable that Juan de Torquemada, later to be the Inquisitor General, and other religious leaders convinced the pope to issue a bull of excommunication against Sarmiento, but Juan II almost immediately asked for and received a suspension of that bull (October of 1450). Apparently the king sought to regain the support of Toledo. In August of 1451, he actually *confirmed* the prohibition of *conversos* holding office in Toledo. The pope then pardoned all the followers of Sarmiento whom he had excommunicated, and restored them to their former offices. Finally, Sarmiento himself was pardoned and restored (already in 1450) to favor³⁹.

³⁸ DELGADO MERCHAN, L.: *Historia documentada de Ciudad Real*, Ciudad Real, 1907, pp. 399-406, document 12); cf. Delgado's description of the events, pp. 158-163, but not always accurate or in agreement with the text of the document.

³⁹ Text of Nicholas' bull in BENITO RUANO: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, pp. 215-216; cf. *ibid.*, p. 76 on the pardons, and Juan II's letter, pp. 222-223. Note that all this disproves Sicroff's claim that the pope *renewed* his condemnation of Sarmiento's «Sentencia», A. SCIROFF, A.: *Les controverses des status de «pureté» de sangre» en Espagne du XVe au XVIIe siècle*, Paris, 1960, p. 63.

Beltrán de Heredia would have us believe, for reasons he best knew and which certainly had to do with his own strong anti-Jewish animas, that the establishment of the Inquisition in Castile was due entirely to the «animosity» between Alvaro de Luna and the *conversos*, and that Alvaro wished to rid himself of his enemies by accusing them of heresy. There is no evidence to sustain such a theory (especially given the fact that Alvaro was himself of *converso* origin and in any case, the actual battle against the *conversos* was precisely because they were accused of *supporting* and even instigating the tax policy of Alvaro⁴⁰).

The statement of Alonso de Espino, who incidentally was certainly *not* a «*neófito*» (convert), in 1459 that if there were to be an Inquisition in Castile, many real Judaizers would enter the flames and thus be saved from eternal fire does not prove that his judgement was true, and still less that there was any «Semitic» conspiracy between *conversos* and Jews, as Beltrán claimed⁴¹.

In 1461, however, almost two decades after the Toledo riots, Enrique IV did petition Pius II to establish an Inquisition in Castile. Apparently, there was no response to this request (the pope died soon after). Fernando de Plaza, a Franciscan, in a sermon at court (possibly in 1457, when the king was in Segovia), claimed he had the circumcised foreskins of sons of *conversos* whom their fathers had secretly circumcised. The king, somewhat skeptical, ordered him to produce the foreskins and the names of the circumcised *conversos*. (It has been claimed that this absurd sermon was one of the main causes of the Toledo riots of 1467, but this seems doubtful⁴²).

TOLEDO RIOTS OF 1467

A document of interdict against the city, and against Alvar Gómez, a *converso*, the *alcalde mayor* and former secretary of Enrique IV, was read in Toledo in 1467. This involved the payment of certain ecclesiastical taxes and charges against «certain Jews» (*conversos*?) who were granted rights as tax-farmers on the assessments. Before a compromise could be reached in the ensuing debate Fernando de la Torre, a possible relative of the philosopher Alfonso, intervened. After a further lengthy debate, a group of armed *conversos* broke into the cathedral with the intent of killing

⁴⁰ «Las bulas de Nicolas V» (see n.º 7 above), pp. 33-34.

⁴¹ *Fortalitium fidei*, 182 v, cited *ibid.*, p. 35. That Alonso was not a *converso* was already known, but has been conclusively demonstrated by Benzion Netanyahu, «Alonso de Espina: Was he a New Christian?», *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 43, 1976, 107-165 (he did not, however, cite Beltrán there).

⁴² ENRIQUEZ DEL CASTILLO, D.: *Crónica* (BAE LXX, p. 130); cf. DE AZCONA, T.: *Isabel de Castilla*, Madrid, 1964, pp. 377-382. MENDEZ BEJARANO, M.: *Histoire de la juiverie de Sevilla*, Madrid, 1922, p. 144 made the claim that this was a chief cause of the 1467 riots.

their enemies. Inevitably, open combat resulted once again. Pero López de Ayala, as usual, headed the «old Christian» cause. During the ensuing battle, stores and houses of the *conversos* were burned and the fire spread through a large part of the surrounding neighborhood.

Fernando de la Torre, captain of the *converso* band, in attempting to escape from the city was captured and imprisoned in the tower of the church of San Leocadia and hung the next morning. His body and that of his brother Alvaro were later dragged to the plaza of Zocodover⁴³.

Conversos were accused of faving documents in Hebrew which exempted them from certain «contributions», and other books in Hebrew prohibited by the Church, which books the local Jews were called to examine and describe (not influenced by any modern theories of «crypto-Judaism», the Jews at the time despised the *conversos* and were only too glad to cooperate in causing them trouble⁴⁴).

The result of all this was again restrictive measures and persecution of the *conversos*. A manuscript source lays the blame entirely on the clergy and government of the city, «who favored the destruction and robbing of the *conversos*»⁴⁵. Like his father before him, in 1468 Enrique IV granted a pardon to those who had engaged in the anti-*converso* riots and ordered that no *conversos* be allowed to hold public office (but in 1471 he reversed this order). He also personally attempted to pacify the *cofradías* of Toledo, divided between «old» and «new» Christians by uniting two of these and himself becoming a member. In 1480, the synod of Alcalá, under the influence of Archbishop Carrillo of Toledo, prohibited *cofradías* based on distinctions of «limpieza»⁴⁶.

Indeed, among the *converso* officials of Enrique was Diego González de Toledo («doctor Franco») possibly his *contador mayor* and «oidor» of the Audiencia, whose son Alonso Franco had been one of the leaders in the battle in 1467, and who owned houses in the *judería* of Toledo⁴⁷.

The bitterness against *conversos* in Toledo certainly did not subside, however. In 1486 a *converso* canon of the cathedral, Pedro Díaz de Madrid, was compelled to

⁴³ BENITO RUANO: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, pp. 93-100.

⁴⁴ See the letter of Pedro de Mesa, canon of Toledo, in *Memorias de don Enrique IV de Castilla*, Madrid, 1835-1913), II, 545-551, which was not utilized by Benito Ruano.

⁴⁵ Cited by Benito Ruano, *op. cit.*, p. 100 (cfr. his *Los orígenes del problema converso*, pp. 135-151; which, however, adds nothing new).

⁴⁶ See «Anales de Garcí-Sánchez, jurado de Sevilla». *Anales de la universidad hispalense*, 14, 1953, 50. On the Alcalá synod, BENITO RUANO: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, p. 136. See generally on all this *Memorias de Enrique IV*, II, 551-553; LEON TELLO: *Judíos de Toledo I*, 236 and document 60, pp. 472-479.

⁴⁷ *Memorias de Enrique IV*, II, 76, n.º 1; BENITO RUANO: *Los orígenes del problema converso*, p. 139; LEON TELLO: *Judíos de Toledo*, II, 322, n.º 935.

swear before witnesses that he would cease to assist at «hours» (services) in the cathedral, which had been prohibited to *conversos* by a bull of Nicholas V; and this in spite of the king's above-mentioned actions⁴⁸.

Uprisings against *conversos* continued to spread. The riots in Córdoba in 1473 are variously reported by the *converso* historians Alonso de Palencia and Diego de Valera (for whatever reason, Baer chose to accept the most biased account, that of Alonso, and ignored completely the report of Diego de Valera⁴⁹). These riots quickly spread to numerous other towns in the region and beyond. In Jaén, the *condestable mayor*, Miguel Lucas de Iranzo, who protected de *conversos*, was murdered in the church and his family terrorized and forced to hide in the castle. Alonso blamed all of this on Juan Pacheco, but he isn't even mentioned in the other sources, and this is only another instance of Alonso's antagonism to officials of Enrique. Diego Enríquez del Castillo briefly mentions the uprising in Córdoba, blaming the *conversos* and claiming they could no longer live in the city after that (untrue).

Of great importance is the letter of the *condestable*, written only a day or so before his own assassination, to the judge and city officials of Andújar. In it, he tells of the scandalous news concerning the riots. The condition and quality of the *conversos* is such, he says, that there is no reason for such actions. He reminds the officials of their duty and loyalty to the king and honor of the city. «It would be more just and honest and better if one or some of the said (*conversos*) who live badly and counter to conscience and the law should be accused and punished by justice, and not do generally against all of them what has been done.» It is also further obvious from the letter that his «uncle» (relative by marriage) Pedro de Estavias had also ordered the protection of the *conversos*⁵⁰.

In 1478 «certain clergy and others» in Seville informed the Catholic Monarchs (who had remained in the city since the birth of their son Juan) that there were many *conversos* guilty of «judaizing» in the city. Cardinal Pedro González de Mendoza, also archbishop of Seville, issued certain laws which every Christian was to obey. Particular attention was given to the details of what the clergy must teach their parishioners, and what every Christian must teach his children. Of course, *conversos* were to be given special attention in this regard

⁴⁸ LEON TELLO, *ibid.*, I, 471, document 59.

⁴⁹ DE PALENCIA, A.: *Crónica de Enrique IV*, tr. Antonio Paz y Melia, Madrid, 1904-1908, III, 107, ff.; DE VALERA, D.: *Memorial de diversas hazañas*, (BAE LXX), pp. 78-79. Diego incorrectly gave the date April of 1474, but according to Pedro de Escavias it was in March of 1473 (which is correct); see Juan Bautista A Valle-Arce's previously cited edition (n.º 10 above), p. 230, and cf. pp. 90-94 of his introduction. See also ENRIQUEZ DEL CASTILLO, D.: *Crónica*, p. 214.

⁵⁰ AVELLO-ARCE, *op. cit.*, 174-175.

with special sermons designed to convince them of the error of the Jewish rites and the danger of «perpetual damnation» in observing these⁵¹.

One of the common myths prevalent about *conversos* (Menéndez Pelayo, López Martínez and other writers) is that they received little or poor instruction in their new faith. There is, in fact, no evidence to sustain this theory. On the contrary, if *conversos* were so poorly instructed, how are we to explain the abundance of bishops, theologians, and other clergy who were *conversos*? The outstanding Christian theological writers of the fifteenth were nearly all *conversion* or of immediate *conversos* descent. Almost all of the writings which we have from *conversos* of the fifteenth century and after reveal them to have been very good Christians indeed.

FERNANDO DE PULGAR

Nevertheless, discrimination against the *conversos* continued, such as efforts to ban *conversos* from *cofradías* and other guilds, in spite of the previously mentioned Alcalá synod ruling against this, also continued. Fernando de Pulgar, himself a *converso* (actually, apparently, the son of a *converso*: Diego Rodríguez de Pulgar of Toledo, a scribe of Juan II) and secretary to both Enrique IV and the Catholic Monarchs, wrote a sharply ironic letter of protest to Cardinal Mendoza:

Your lordship surely knows of the new statute passed in Guipúzcoa (!) in which it was decreed that *we* should not go there to marry or to dwell, etc., as if we had no other desire than to go and inhabit that fertile domain and that blooming countryside. It seems a little like the ordinance the stonecutters of Toledo made, not to teach their trade to any (*converso*).

He continues to ask, sarcastically, is it not laughable that old Christians «send their sons here to serve us as footmen», yet don't want to marry the *conversos* whom they serve? Among the *conversos* he names as having Christian apprentices in their houses are Fernán Díaz de Toledo, the *relator*, and Fernando Alvarez and Alfonso de Avila, *converso* secretaries (like Pulgar) of the Catholic Monarchs. Pulgar adds that four «old Christians» are currently receiving instruction in his house, and «more than forty» already had done so⁵².

⁵¹ PULGAR, F. de: *Crónica de los Reyes Católicos*, versión inédita, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo, *Colección de crónicas españolas*, V, Madrid, 1943, 334; the later redaction, in *BAE LXX*, 331.

⁵² PULGAR, F. DE: *Letras*, ed. J. Domínguez Bordona, Madrid, 1958, p. 137, n.º XXXI;

Most important is another letter of Pulgar to the cardinal, incorrectly edited and misinterpreted by Carriazo and so re-edited by Cantera Burgos⁵³. Pulgar here refers to the «stupidity so blind» and «blindness so stupid» of the *converso* which brought about the consequences which recently had resulted. Cantera cogently compared this with Pulgar's similar phrase in the first redaction of his *Crónica*, in which he refers to those who insist in «judaizing» as being possessed of a «blindness so stupid and and ignotance so blind»⁵⁴. Nothing that some, indeed, deserve punishment, he reserves the necessity of this for the «few who have relapsed», but not for the *many* who have not; otherwise, «there would not be sufficient wood» for the burning of all *conversos*. As Cantera noted, this contrasts poignantly with the chilling opposite view express by Bernáldez: «For the fire is lighted... it will burn until it reaches the extremes of the driest wood»⁵⁵.

The few bad *conversos* are so, he says, because of the example of bad «old Christians», and to burn the thousands of good *conversos* would be «most cruel and even difficult to do». Whithout causing widespread animosity to the ministers of the Inquisition. (He estimates that there are in Andalucía alone some 10.000 *conversa* girls between the ages of ten and twenty who never go out of their houses and know of no other doctrine than that of their parents (good Christians).

Sarcastically, he concludes that the Inquisitors of Seville, Diego de Merlo and the «doctor of Medina» (probably fray Juan de Medina, a Jeronimite) are good men, «but I know well that they will not make such good Christians with their fire as the bishop don Paul (Pablo de Santa María) and don Alonso (de Cartagena) will with water; and not without cause, for these chosen by or Redeemer Christ (for their task), but those others (Inquisitors) were chosen by the licentiate our chancellor for theirs».

An anonymous rebuttal to Pulgar, discussed at length by Carriazo and again by Cantera, contains among other things the interesting statement that a certain

CANTERA BURGOS, F.: «Fernando de Pulgar y los converso», *Sefarad* 4, 1944, 297; English translation, used here, is that of HIGHFIELD, R.: *Spain in the Fifteenth Century*, London, 1972, p. 299. Pulgar says «we» thus including himself among the conversos. Guipúzcoa is a small Basque town. Incidentally, the letter to Pedro Navarro, reproduced in facsimile and discussed by Carriazo in the introduction to his edition of PULGAR: *Crónica*, pp. LXIV-XX, is not by him but by Fernán Pérez de Pulgar, and was written not in 1484 but in 1509! He was and altogether different person, author of *Breve parte de las hazañas del excelente nombrado Gran Capitan*. There is no evidence that he was in any way related to Fernando de Pulgar. Carriazo, of all people, should have known this, for he had already edited and discussed this very letter, correctly, in 1926 (article reprinted in his *En la frontera de Granada*, p. 75 ff.).

⁵³ *Crónica*, ed. Carriazo, V, XLIX-LI; ed. Cantera, *op. cit.*, pp. 306-310. Carriazo, incredibly, had great difficulty in deciphering this extremely simple and legible text.

⁵⁴ *Crónica*, *ibid.*, p. 335, lines 8-9.

⁵⁵ Cantera, *op. cit.*, pp. 307-308.

«member of your nation whom you know», as well as the Franciscan Alonso de Espina, had gone among the *conversos* to instruct them⁵⁶. Pulgar was criticized for having said that the Inquisitors of Seville acted incorrectly in what they did, as had the queen. He defended himself against the charge, saying that he never wrote such things; although possibly the queen did err in what she ordered or instructed, and the Inquisitors in their proceedings. He notes that Juan II, although «certainly good», had done wrong in entrusting the city of Toledo or Sarmiento⁵⁷.

In one of his letters to a friend, written from Toledo, Pulgar mentions that Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (chronicler, author of the important biographical sketches of famous contemporaries, *Generaciones y semblanzas*), was told that Pablo de Santa María had written to an «old *condestable* who was sick in Toledo» (Ruy Lope Dávalos), and Pulgar notes the irony of this in a city so full of «notable physicians» (surely a reference to *conversos*, or Jews). «I don't know whether it can be said now, for we see that the famous *odrerros* (makers of leather bottles) have expelled from here the notable physicians, and thus I believe that now they are there provided with many better rebellious bottlemakers than native good physicians»⁵⁸. (Cantera was certainly correct, contrary to the suggestion of Pulgar's editor, in seeing this as a clear reference to the Toledo riots of 1449, and particularly with regard to the bottlemaker who was one of the instigators of that riot).

Similarly, letter XIV refers to the battle over «*limpieza de sangre* in Toledo, and de decrees against *conversos* holding public office. The «old Christians», he says, cannot bear seeing wealth —especially new wealth— in the hands of those they consider undeserving of it. He complains that many have been forced to leave the city, including one with great knowledge of astrology and astronomy. Demanding that all such people of «low birth» should abandon their honors would result in such absurdities as taking away all offices, tax-collection, etc., which Enrique IV had conferred on people of «low lineage» (Jews and *conversos*) some thirty years earlier. Sarcastically, he concludes «we ought to believe that God created men, and not lineages in which they are chosen»⁵⁹.

But Cantera also overlooked one of the most important of all Pulgar's statements in his letters, that of 1473 to Francisco de Toledo, bishop of Coria, himself also of

⁵⁶ Cantera, p. 319; cf. Carriazo, pp. LIII-LV. Cantera was also undoubtedly correct that Letter XXI was Pulgar's reply to that attack (incidentally, the text of Augustine there which Cantera could not identify in the first letter is here specifically mentioned: Ep. 149).

⁵⁷ PULGAR: *Letras*, pp. 85-89; Cantera, pp. 321-329.

⁵⁸ *Letras*, p. 21, n.º IV; Cantera, p. 331; cf. PEREZ DE GUZMAN: *Crónica... Juan II* (BAE LXXVIII), p. 662, and Manuel Alonso's introduction to Alonso de Cartagena, *Defensorium*, p. 25.

⁵⁹ *Letras*, pp. 63, 66, 67.

converso descent. The letter contains valuable insights into the events going on throughout Spain at the time, and especially in Toledo. The people driven out of the city make war on it, and those in the city with those expelled from it. «And since those citizens are great inquisitors of the faith, it is supposed that heresy has fallen upon the goods of the workers of (the count of) Fuensalida», so that they steal those goods and burn and loot everywhere. Those expelled, with the same religious zeal burn and loot wherever they can. «There is no more Castile», he concludes sadly. The count of Fuensalida, of course, was Pero López de Ayala. In 1473, Enrique IV sent him to take charge of Toledo, and two years later the Catholic Monarchs were asking the people of Toledo to send representatives to testify to his crimes⁶⁰.

According to the bitterly satirical poem *Coplas de Mingo Revulgo*—which, contrary to Baer's incredible dismissal of it as one of the «low and vulgar ditties» of the era, is actually a very important source for the reign of Enrique IV—the religious situation was so deteriorated that one could not distinguish the flock of Christ «nor that of the other stammerer (Moses) nor of the keen Moor of Meca». In his gloss to the poem, Pulgar explains that because of the lack of effective leadership one cannot recognize in the Catholic faith who are Christians, Jews or Muslims, «for according to the laws of the realm, Jews and Muslims should wear (distinguishing) clothing and signs by which to be recognized» but this—like all «good laws»—is now «infirm» and all alike wear the same clothing⁶¹.

Of great interest also is his discussion of the difference between the law of Christ and that of Moses, which may shed some light on the reasons for conversion of some of the Jews. Apparently totally unaware of the ethical teachings of either the Bible or rabbinical sources, Pulgar states that Moses conquered Canaan by force of arms and that «his» law was given to the accompaniment of much noise, trumpets, etc., whereas that of Christ was not given so but was only a law of humility, charity, etc. (Indeed, it could be shown without much difficulty that the real «lack of instruction» and ignorance of many *conversos* was in Jewish religious sources, not Christian).

⁶⁰ *Letras*, pp. 120-121, n.º XXIV. Cantera briefly mentions it, but not this passage. On López de Ayala and Toledo, see RUANO, B.: *Toledo en el siglo XV*, p. 277, n.º 72, and p. 281 (unfortunately, he made no use of Pulgar's letters).

⁶¹ *Coplas* X, in PULGAR: *Letras*, with his *glosas*, pp. 172-173; Baer's characterization of the satire in *History of the Jews* II, 300 (*Historia de los judíos* II, 547). Baer scarcely mentioned Pulgar at all. (The authorship of the *Coplas* is still the subject of debate. It was frequently attributed to Pulgar himself, and also to the *converso* poet Rodrigo de Cota and even to Juan de Mena. J. Rodríguez Puértolas argues that the author was the *converso* fray Íñigo de Mendoza, which is possible if unproven. Rodríguez made the common error of referring to Pulgar as «Hernando del Pulgar», who was, as previously mentioned, an altogether different and later author; see his «Sobre el autor de las *Coplas de Mingo Revulgo*», *Homenaje a Rodríguez Moñino*, Madrid, 1966, II, 31, 131 ff.)

Finally, the *Coplas* refer to the necessity of confessing to the priest all sins and allowing him to «strip the skin» from one in order to save him. Pulgar refers this to the Inquisition, so that if by shame, forgetfulness or ignorance the penitent should neglect to mention a sin, the Inquisitor will force him to remember in order to bring him salvation⁶².

Pulgar definitely changed his public stance, at least, towards the Inquisition. In his earlier writings and private letters, as we have seen, he was adamantly opposed to it. However, as he himself came under suspicion and attack, and as the Inquisition gained power he becomes a complete supporter, both in his *glosas* and in the revision of his *Crónica*. Indeed, his earlier open opposition to it may be one more important source in the growing evidence which casts doubt on the accepted theory that the Catholic Monarchs themselves were entirely responsible for initiating the Inquisition.

Turning to another major work by Pulgar, *The Claros Varones* a series of illuminating but highly romanticized biographical sketches of important contemporary figures, we discover an unusual expression used in his account of Juan de Silva, count of Cifuentes (d. 1464). Pulgar says he was a «nobleman of pure blood» (*era fijo dalgo de limpia sangre*). There is nothing at all «exaggerated» in Carriazo's statement that his was a strange observation for a *converso* to make, as Brian Tate wrote. Indeed, it is very strange, and certainly in contrast with his sharp criticism of the doctrine of *limpieza* in his letters. It may possible reflect a suspicion of the time that the Silvas were «tainted» with *converso* blood, which rumor Pulgar wished to deny⁶³. Yet another reason for Pulgar's praise of de Silva is that he gave his support and protection to the *conversos* in Toledo in the 1467 uprising. In 1471, Pulgar's wife Mencía Fernández sold go to one of de Silva's followers a substantial amount in Toledo from the «master of León, a Jew» (probably a physician) and others. We know that Pulgar lived in Madrid in 1473, possibly until 1487 and this may explain this sale of his Toledo property⁶⁴.

Another important document concerning Pulgar has come to light. In 1467 the *infante* Alfonso, brother of Enrique IV, was proclaimed king and Enrique deposed (the «farce of Avila»). Immediately thereafter, Alfonso granted to his secretary Fernando de Arce 20.000 *mrs* of tax money confiscated from Pulgar because he remained loyal to Enrique (among this sum was 6.000 *mrs* of taxes on the Jewish

⁶² *Glosa to Coplas*, pp. 224, 227-228.

⁶³ *Claros varones*, ed. Brian Tate, Oxford, 1971, p. 39; Carriazo, in Pulgar: *Crónica*, p. XXV, and Tate's observation on this, p. 92, n.º 118.

⁶⁴ LEON TELLO: *Judíos de Toledo*, II, 399, n.º I.113. On Pulgar in Madrid, see Carriazo, introduction to *Crónica*, p. XXX.

butchers of Toledo). This document again places Pulgar in Toledo, as we also know from his letters, and precisely at the time of the *converso* riots there⁶⁵.

The return to Cantara's seminal study of Pulgar, he has shown that the *converso* author carefully revised chapters 96 and 120 of this *Crónica* to reflect his view that the *converso* problem was no longer confined to Seville alone, but rather was now a problem of the entire kingdom (as noted before, perhaps a more correct interpretation is his own change of heart with regard to the Inquisition, not the *converso* problem, which he surely knew from his being an eyewitness of the riots in Toledo was not confined to Seville»). Pulgar minimizes or ignores the violence to the *conversos* in this revision, praises Isabel for routing out the heresy among *some* who were «judaizing», and perhaps most importantly he revised his earlier statement that the pope had «conceded the authority» to establish the Inquisition in Castile to «the pope ordered» its establishment. Cantera correctly concluded that this was to avoid placing the responsibility for the Inquisition on the Catholic Monarchs, an observation which historians of the Inquisition have completely ignored⁶⁶.

Contrary to Carriazo's views, Cantera has also correctly demonstrated that Pulgar was vehemently opposed to the «Judaizers» and other false *conversos*, both in his letters and in the *Crónica*. More can be said, however. Pulgar also stresses repeatedly that these false *conversos* were *few*. Also, of course, it must be emphasized that he was above all an apologist for the monarchy, a devout Christian, and in favor of the Inquisition in spite of what he at first had considered its excesses.

Pulgar has left a very interesting document, the supposed speech of Gómez Manrique, *corregidor* of Toledo and a famous poet, which some believe is almost entirely Pulgar's own creation. Benito Ruano has called this «speech» one of the earliest political discourses in Spanish literature (there were, of course, other much earlier, such as those in the works of Juan Manuel). While it is undoubtedly correct that *literary style is mostly Pulgar's, it seems unlikely that he would have dared to invent entirely the sentiments expressed in it or the fact of the speech, which Manrique and others could easily have challenged.*

In any event, the speech contains a glowing defense of the *conversos*:

We see from experience some men of
those whom we judge (to be) born of
low blood, whose natural inclination

⁶⁵ LEON TELLO, *ibid.*, p. 374, n.º 1.047 (she did not seem to be aware of the significance of these documents concerning Pulgar and made no comment on them even in the introductory study. Indeed, in the index this second document does not even appear under «Pulgar»!).

⁶⁶ CANTERA BURGOS: «Fernando de Pulgar y los conversos», p. 334 ff.; with the parallel versions of the chapters from each recension.

forces them to abandon the lowly offices
of their fathers and study science and
become great intellectuals (*grandes letrados*).
We see others who have a natural
inclination for arms; others for
agriculture; others for good and
orderly speech; other for administration;
and for other various arts in which
they have a particular ability
according to their natural inclination.

He asks, rhetorically, should all these abandon their natural inclinations which result in these abilities because through them they obtain honors? On the other hand, many descendants of king and nobles are now of base condition because of their lack of ability. This, too, is natural: «should we now make valiant (*esforzados*) all those descendants of King Pyrrhus, because their ancestor was valient? Or should we make wise the descendants of King Solomón because he was the most wise? Or give riches and great estates to those of the lineage of King Pedro of Castile or Dinis of Portugal, because they do not have them, and yo seem to think should have them according to their descent⁶⁷!».

This was a particularly loaded political and social attack. The statement about the descendants of Pedro is obvious, and touched a raw nerve at the time, as well as that about Dinis of Portugal, in light of the recent war between Castile and Portugal. King Pyrrhus, of course, was the famous Greek hero who fought constant wars against Rome and Sicily. Plutarch, in his *Lives*, says of him that he might even have been greater but that he was never satisfied with that already achieved and constantly had his eye on new conquests. Did our author have this in mind, perhaps, and was this therefore a cleverly veiled criticism of the Catholic Monarchs' planned war against Granada? Important, too, is the implicit denial of the «*limpieza de sangre*» argument: honors or riches belong to those whose abilities show they deserve them, not to those who claim «old» or noble birth.

Baer, who say Manrique's speech cited only second-hand in Altamira's history of Spain, at first wrote that it was entirely fictitious because Manrique's «anti-Semitism» is well known! Later, having read Cantera's article (but *still* not having actually consulted Pulgar's *Crónica*, with Baer apparently never saw), he claimed that the speech was entirely Pulgar's own invention, and appears to indicate that Cantera is the source for this view. In fact, Cantera never said anything of the sort; only that Pulgar's letter of 1478 (n.º XIV) was «included almost entirely» in this

⁶⁷ PULGAR: *Crónica*, ed. Carriazo, V, 348-349. Benito Ruano's statement in his *Toledo en el siglo XV*, p. 127, n.º 29.

speech in the *Crónica*⁶⁸. This, however, is also a great exaggeration, for there are only superficial similarities. Nothing permits us to conclude from this that Pulgar entirely «invented» Manrique's speech.

Baer then further provides, with no indication of a source, obviously, the entirely false information that Gómez Manrique, whom he has already labelled «anti-converso» as well as «anti-Semitic», ordered the arrest and execution of several conversos, including the *Bachiller* (Alfonso) de la Torre in 1485. The famous philosopher, author of the *Visión delectable de la filosofía*, which was influenced by Maimonides, died in 1460⁶⁹! Neither Pulgar, nor Fita's study of the Toledo Inquisition of 1485, which Baer cites, gives any hint as to this supposed activity of Gómez Manrique.

Pulgar's information in his *Crónica* is, in fact, extremely important for the Toledo Inquisition as being almost the only contemporary record. He writes:

In this year (1485) the Inquisition continued, which had begun against the Christians of Jewish lineage who began to «judaize». In the city of Toledo *some* men and women were found who secretly observed Jewish rites, who in great ignorance and danger of their souls kept neither the one nor the other law because they were not circumcised like Jews... and although they observed the Sabbath and some Jewish fasts, they did not observe all the Sabbaths nor all the fasts, and if they observed one rite they did not observe another, so that they were false to both laws (Christian and Jewish). It happened in some cases that the husband kept certain Jewish ceremonies and the wife was a good Christian, and that one son and daughter would be good Christians and another hold the Jewish opinion. Thus, in one house there was a diversity of belief, and one would hide from the others⁷⁰.

⁶⁸ *History of Jews* II, 339, and p. 495, and p. 495, n.º 14; *Historia de los Judíos* II, 578 and p. 777, n.º 16.

⁶⁹ *The Visión delectable* was first published ca. 1484, and there was an Italian translation published in Venice in 1556, and from this it was translated *back* into Spanish by a Jew, Francisco de Cáceres (eds. Frankfurt, 1623; Amsterdam, 1663)! On Alfonso de la Torre and Maimonides influence, see the works cited in my *Maimonides. Essays and Texts* Madison, 1985, p. 138, n.º 17.

⁷⁰ *Crónica*, ed. Carriazo, VI, 210.

It is important to note here that Pulgar states there were only «some» *conversos* who were condemned. According to Fita's account, in the first *auto* only two families were burned that of Sancho de Ciudad and that of Pedro González de Teba of Ciudad Real. In 1486, some 750 *reconciliados* marched in the procession in February, and others in later *autos*, and in May 14 men and 9 woman were burned. These figures do not support Pulgar's statement of «some», unless he meant only those who actually were condemned to death.

The most important statement Pulgar makes, however, is one which should be memorized by all those who have written much nonsense concerning the Inquisition. He says that «because in this case of heresy, testimony is received from Muslims, Jews, servants, infamous and vile men (*raezes*; a variant of *rafez*, *rahez*, etc.) and because of this some were imprisoned and condemned to the penalty of burning, there were found in this city some Jews and poor and vile men who, from enmity or malice, gave false testimony against some *conversos*, saying they «Judaize». Knowing the truth, the Queen ordered them judged, and eight Jews were apprehended and tortured⁷¹.

Pulgar is clearly aware of the great animosity of the Jews for the *conversos*, and the fact that some of these would have given false testimony against the *conversos* is not at all surprising. Furthermore, his contention that many other «vile men», servants, and the like also gave suspect testimony about the supposed «judaizing» of *conversos* is supported also in other contemporary accounts we have of the Inquisition, particularly from totally trustworthy «old Christians» in Córdoba. From all of this much caution needs to be used in accepting at face value the testimony of Inquisitional processes as to the «crypto-Judaims» of the *conversos*.

Just as importantly, from the events detailed here of the anti-*converso* riots of the fifteenth century, and of the nature of those who instigated them, we gain many new insights into the probable origins of the Inquisition and the nature, and source, of the anti-Semitism which sought to eradicate, not a religion, but an entire people. This anti-Semitism was not yet directed at Jews as such, who were in fact untouched by the unrest in most places, but at the socioeconomic and political threat which some «old Christians» saw in the *conversos*. It was to result ultimately, however, in the total expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Hatred and bigotry, once unleashed, proved impossible to control.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.