are other more detailed discussions of epidemics and medical practices. One such example is a post-Jesuit expulsion file, which provides a detailed description of the medical responses to a 1780s smallpox outbreak at two missions.

Overall, I found this volume to be disappointing. Its narrow bibliographic focus identifies several useful Jesuit medical texts, but there is no discussion of actual medical practices in the field and the effects and effectiveness of Jesuit medicine in the face of serious public health crises. As a bibliographic exercise this volume is also limited. The literature review is overly Eurocentric, idiosyncratic, and myopic. Obermeier and the other authors do not cite a number of related and useful studies published outside of Europe. The essays in this volume contribute to our understanding of Jesuit medicine, but in an extremely narrow way.

Robert H. Jackson

Independent Scholar

robertvianey@gmail.com

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00601012-09

Bruno Feitler

The Imaginary Synagogue: Anti-Jewish Literature in the Portuguese Early Modern World (16th–18th Centuries). Leiden: Brill, 2015. Pp. ix + 206.

Readers of anti-Judaism/anti-Semitism scholarship know that there is no need of Jews to find Jewish hatred: whether in England after the expulsion of its Jewish population in 1290, or in twentieth-century Japan. According to Jeremy Cohen, medieval Christianity developed a prolific *adversus Judaeus* literature, which rather antagonized with virtual Judaism than with flesh-and-bones Jews. Not to say that in his *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition* (Norton, 2014), David Nirenberg claimed that the centrality of this phenomenon in Western cultures stems from a negative idea of Jewishness associated with debased forms of materialism, carnality, and formalistic legalism, including in such domains as the visual arts and music. Being perceived today as a mostly cultural phenomenon, Jewish hatred appears to have a life of its own, with a tremendous capacity for adaptation and endurance.

Bruno Feitler's book, however, deals neither with "real" Jews nor with mere projections of Judaism or metaphoric Jewishness. In spite of bearing the title "The Imaginary Synagogue," it studies the development of anti-Jewish literature in early modern Portugal—a country in which from 1497 to the eighteenth century did not live anymore open Jews, but a large group of converted Jews and their offspring called "new Christians" (*cristãos novos*). During that long

period of time, “new Christians” were often suspected and persecuted by the Holy Office for purportedly keeping in secret the religion of their ancestors and were excluded from honorific charges and high posts in secular and religious domains, on grounds that their “stained blood” could contaminate the rest of the “old Christian” population. In other words, the forced baptism of Jews by order of King Manuel I in 1497 led to the constitution of an enduring Jewish absent-presence converso phenomenon. According to past scholarship, Portugal’s early modern anti-Jewish literature purportedly merged to reveal the concealed manifestations of converso Jewishness, as an auxiliary means to inquisitorial persecution and “purity of blood” exclusion. At the same time, claims Feitler, this literary corpus enhanced an opposition between the old Christian majority and the new Christian minority. Feitler’s book aims to show how this negative image of the new Christian group was constructed over time in order to alienate the converso group from the rest of the society (3). This is what Feitler means by calling his book an “imaginary synagogue.” Instead of being a mere reaction to “real” Jews or “virtual” Jewishness, Feitler argues that Portugal’s anti-Jewish literature was a tool to exacerbate difference.

Relying on the magnificent collection of Judaica-Lusitana owned by the bibliophile Roberto Bachmann, which includes printed books, manuscripts, pictures, inquisitorial medals, and diplomas (121–29), Feitler narrates the evolution and character of that pervasive literature with the help of an iconographic apparatus reproduced throughout the book. The result is an agile and concise updated synthesis of the subject, which also offers some important innovative insights.

Much like the socio-political situation of Portugal’s Jews during the Middle Ages, Feitler argues along with past scholarship that the medieval *adversus Judaeos* genre was more moderate in Portugal than in other Christian countries. Even after the forced mass baptisms of 1497, the situation changed radically, and it took years to find an adjustment of that literature to the actual historical reality. Thus, Feitler finds an initial mismatch between the pressing need to obtain the assimilation of the newly baptized Jews through educational books, and the fact that at the beginning of the sixteenth century their literary image still remained an object of satire “in an entirely medieval manner” (11). Lacking a project of catechization, albeit perhaps with the exception of Bishop Diogo de Ortiz’s *Cathecismo pequeno* (1504), Feitler endorses the explanation given years ago by Israel-Salvator Révah: that only when a new Christian lobby tried to avoid the establishment of an inquisition on Portuguese soil in the 1520s–1530s after the Spanish model, we find the emergence of an anti-converso literature. This means that the ancient literary *adversus Judaeos* genre was used as a response to converso political agency and to those non-converso voices who criticized the repression and persecution of those who

were unduly baptized against their will. Feitler notes that most of this anti-converso/anti-Jewish merging literature had in mind the evangelization of the new Christian group through polemics and persuasion. For this reason, however, many of these tracts did not receive the official approbation to be printed because they implicitly questioned the Inquisition's means of "educating" the conversos through persecution, fear, and punishment. Feitler also reaffirms Frank Talmage's suggestive opinion that some of these texts responded to other contemporaneous challenges, whether it be with Protestantism (e.g., João de Barro's *Ropica pnefma* of 1531) or non-Christian religions (namely Islam) that the Portuguese found in their imperial enterprises (14–15). Uneasiness aroused by the encounter with the "schismatic" Ethiopian church—in which the Jesuits played a significant role—is part of that story, or, some of its "Judaizing rites" reminded the converso followers of the "Law of Moses." Therefore, Portugal's mid-sixteenth-century *adversus Judaeos* literature was sometimes interwoven with Christian (Erasmian) humanistic penchants, mission ventures, and imperial policies. The relatively inclusive character of this anti-Jewish literature confirms Giuseppe Marcocci's broader claim that before the 1560s Portugal's views on conversos were more open and variegated than in the decades that followed. Being theologically anti-Jewish, the initial *adversus Judaeos* genre was not necessarily anti-Semitic. This also means that the first generations of anti-converso tracts should be understood as implicitly arguing against the staunch supporters of the Inquisition and the "laws of purity of blood."

It was during the later sixteenth century, confirms Feitler, when the traits of the *adversus Judaeos* Portuguese literature became fixed for the next two centuries. Instead of arguing with heretic Judaizers in order to convert them, most of this literature denigrated the new Christians as an inveterate group of Judaizers (17). Converso evangelization turned to be considered as chimeric by most of the church authorities, including some Jesuits, who evoked the persistency of the "Jewish stubbornness" as revealed by the growing inquisitorial activities.

Feitler follows much of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi's characterization, by underscoring the existence of racist anti-Semitic overtones in early modern Iberian discourses. At the same time, he maps and further explores the characteristics of Portugal's *adversus Judaeos* genre, by dividing it into four sub-categories: sermons preached at autos-da-fé, polemical treatises against Jews and new Christians, reports (*memoriales* or *pareceres*), which aimed to "solve" the converso problem in Portugal, as well as circumstantial pamphlets focused on Jewish issues.

Although the original aim of the auto-da-fé sermons was to evangelize the audience, as could be proven by an extant sermon of the sixteenth century, this

sub-genre, which was the most prolific category with seventy items between 1612 and 1753, “was finally transformed into a series of insults to New Christians” (24). Portuguese early modern anti-Jewish tracts were diverse. Some of them were inspired by Italian Counter-Reformation essays, which envisioned the conversion of the new Christians (such as João Baptista d’Este’s *Christian Consolation and Light for the Hebrew People*, 1616). Others trumpeted racist anti-Semitic themes such as masculine menstruation, bad smells, big noses, tails, and other Jewish defects which allegedly persisted among the conversos. These physical traits were understood as evidence that conversos remained perfidious to Christianity and treacherous to their motherland (e.g., Vicente da Costa Matos’s *Brief Speech against the Heretic Perfidy of Judaism* of 1622 and Francisco de Torejoncillo’s best-seller *Sentinel against Jews*, first published in 1674). This literature attained a paroxysm with Roque Monteiro Paim’s *Jewish Perfidy* (1671) by avoiding theological arguments in order to support the expulsion of the baptized new Christians from the kingdom (63). Even conversionary tracts, such as Fernão Ximenes de Aragão’s *Catholic Doctrine* (1625), became permeated “with anti-Semitic ideas which, from our modern viewpoint, are of little use in works of evangelization and enlightenment, but appear to be, for these authors, the only possible approach” (49). New Christians were thus denounced as the inner enemies of Portugal’s old Christians. That is why, along with the accusation of being devoted crypto-Jews, they were simultaneously denounced for spreading irreligiosity and skepticism without necessarily feeling any contradiction. Portugal’s anti-Jewish turned mostly to be a “counterpoint” to praise Portugal’s Catholicity (24, 52).

Concerning the reports (*memoriales* or *pareceres*) most of them were written with the explicit political purpose of avoiding converso integration and social climbing. A “solution” to the persisting converso “problem” was to strengthen already existing inquisitorial persecution and “purity of blood” ethnic exclusion at the point of ponder the expulsion of the new Christian population after the Spanish *morisco* precedent. No wonder many of these *pareceres* appeared in specific historical moments, such as throughout the 1620s and 1630s, and the 1670s- to early 1680s. These were times in which popes, kings, and ministers were ready to consider the softening of the anti-converso policies and legislation, mostly because of economic and other “reason of state” considerations.

I think that Feitler’s analysis of anti-Jewish pamphlets is illuminating (105–16). Most of these were written after the 1650s as translations and adaptations of works written about Jews who embraced Christianity outside the Iberian peninsula, or defied rabbinic Judaism by supporting the “false messiah” Sabbatai Tsevi or Jacob Frank’s messianic-antinomistic movement in Poland. These short texts discreetly undermined the hegemony of Portugal’s early

modern anti-Jewish exclusionary literature, thus paving the way to Marquis of Pombal's decision to abrogate, by a law of 1773, the juridical differences between old and new Christians, on grounds of being religiously un-Catholic, socio-economically disastrous, and politically damaging (This move may have been partly motivated by his anti-Jesuitism, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1759).

If Catholicity was imagined as the ultimate alternative to new Christian Jewishness, as claims Feitler, it will be unsurprising if few of the more radical byproducts of Portugal's *adversus Judaeos* literature faced censorship (i.e., Costa Matos's *Brief Speech against the Heretic Perfidy of Judaism*) and banishment (i.e., Timoteo de Cabra Pimentel's *The Sling of David*, was published in Barcelona and Rome in 1631). This is because they questioned the notion of Catholicity, understood as Christian inclusive universalism, which envisioned the existence of sincere converted Jews in history and the final conversion of the Jewish people at the end of times. What is surprising, from a Catholic standpoint, is that these were the only exception to the rule.

Along the book, Feitler shows that all of the four sub-categories studied by him were not immune or isolated from each other, as well as from the specific historical contexts they were produced; even if the *pareceres* appear as the most appropriate means to express heuristic concerns. Feitler is also aware of the argumentative intentions of their authors, oftentimes reacting against converso and pro-converso political agency. Explicitly, he compares Portugal's anti-Jewish early modern literature as an imposing mirror through which the society was supposed to look constantly in order to avoid "Jewish" influence and new Christian contamination (120). Although this idealized view of "pure Catholicism" was far from reality, Feitler's book implicitly invites the reader to look at this literature through the performative prism of the "linguistic turn," for these negative images of the new Christians aimed to create reality. That is why converso supporters had to fight against that literature, as if they fought against the biased activities of the Holy Office and the un-Christian criteria of "purity of blood" exclusionism. I personally do believe that an explicit use of the linguistic turn methodology will reveal multi-layered argumentative intentions behind many of these anti-Jewish works, showing that a theologically anti-Jewish text written in times of increasing converso anti-Semitism, rhetorically served a pro-converso cause.

Claude B. Stuczynski

Bar-Ilan University

claud.stuczynski@biu.ac.il

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00601012-10