The calm-eyed moon in the tranquil Heaven
To the chosen star cried, "Wake!"
To the watchful kings in the fragrant East
Your glorious message take!"
An angel sped from the joys above
All the wondrous news to bear
To the shepherds camped on Judea's plains,
Watching the night-slocks there.
The patient ox from his sleep he woke
The ox that toiled all day,
And his knees he bent in worshipping awe
Where the little stranger lay.
The ass and the sheep they creep'd anear
With their breath the straw to warm
Where the mother so meek and her King: Child lay
Safe from the might of the storm.
The falling snow on Bethlehem's hills
Neath the stately cedars tall
Soft whispered - "Awake and worship your Lord!"
To the flowers neath the spotless pall.
"Ah! Heaven and Earth, they eagerly cried
To greet, the Incarnate Word-
And only the souls that He came to save
Neglected the Gracious Lord!"
THE HOLY SEE AND THE JEWS.

BY ELIZABETH RAYMOND-BARKER.

THE tragedy whose final act has just closed at Rennes, in a nation claiming to be the centre of civilization and the chartered exponent of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," makes it especially interesting at the present time to consider what has been the general action of the Holy See throughout the ages in regard to that ancient race so deeply hated, and yet, to every thoughtful mind, so deeply interesting—the race which gave the world the Twelve Foundations of the Church, including "the Rock" on which it is built, the spotless Mother, and, through her, the Divine Founder Himself: the race of Israel.

JEWS TOLERATED AT ROME.

The Jews, although more or less rigorously persecuted throughout the Middle Ages in all European countries, and even in Arabia and more distant regions, were tolerated at Rome itself, the capital of the Christian world. This tranquillity and security, writes the learned Emanuel Rodocanachi,* which they were nowhere else permitted to enjoy, they found, at least relatively, under the immediate shadow of St. Peter, shielded by the representative of Christ upon earth. The sanguinary reprisals for strange and incredible crimes imputed to the Jews, the wholesale banishments, legal spoliations, and burnings at the stake, so common in other countries, were unknown at Rome. By no other sovereign were they treated with the moderation shown them by the popes.

It is true that at Rome as elsewhere the Jews were despised, obliged to live in their own quarter of the city, and, as a rule, compelled to wear a distinctive badge or color, although this rule had many exceptions, and fell at times into abeyance. Moreover these universal money-makers and money-lenders often found themselves the involuntary creditors of great personages, popes included; still, to the student of history, there

is no doubt that amidst the intolerance and barbarities of the Middle Ages and the times succeeding them Rome set a great example of moderation.

Indeed, throughout Italy the Jews had much less to suffer than elsewhere, for although cruel persecutions arose against them at Naples, Chiesi, and Trani, these, as in other Italian towns, were essentially local and transient. Owing to the incessant feuds and rivalries between one town or state and its next neighbors, it was sufficient for the Jews to be banished from one to find a ready refuge in any other with which it was fighting.

THEIR PRESENCE IN ROME IN EARLIEST TIMES.

It does not seem possible to ascertain the date of the first arrival of the Jews at Rome, but it is certain that they were there in the time of Pompey, who brought with him many Jewish captives to swell his triumph. These captives, freed by Caesar, formed from that time a separate caste, the Libertini.* St. Paul found at Rome an important Jewish colony, among whom the Christians were comparatively few. Still, both alike despised the gods of Rome and were alike hated by their worshippers. The pagans saw that where there were Jews, there also there were Christians; the New Law was growing up in the shadow of the Old, and both must perish.

From the time of Nero to that of Constantine the Jews were persecuted with the Christians. It is only from the time of Constantine that their history as a separate race comes into clear relief, and is comparatively easy to follow, especially at Rome. One of the first acts of this emperor was a repressive measure against the Jews, between whom and the Christians the divergence was by that time as apparent as it was profound. He made it penal for Jews to insult or injure converts to Christianity, forbade the adoption of Judaism by Christians as apostasy, and the blending of the distinctive rites and doctrines of the two as heresy. Jews were not to have Christians in their service, nor to eat with them, nor share their pleasures, nor bless the fruits of their land; above all, they were forbidden to make proselytes.‡

Julian the Apostate, who hated the Christians, favored the Jews; Jovian oppressed them, Valens treated them mildly,

*At the murder of Cesar, their liberator, the Jews of Rome watched weeping for several nights around the ashes of his funeral pile.
†See Eusebius, De Vita Constantini, lib. iv. cap. xxvii.
Theodosius and Honorius with rigor. They were no longer allowed to exercise any public function, or build new synagogues, and Christians were scrupulously to avoid all contact with them.

At Rome, nevertheless, the tradition of toleration was maintained. There the Jews might observe the ceremonies of their worship in peace, and were even permitted to exercise certain magisterial functions. Although they were not allowed their independence, their religious scruples were not interfered with. Proof of this exists in the Acts of the council held under Pope Zachary [A. D. 741] at Rome.

From the time when no longer the emperors but the popes became the absolute rulers of the Eternal City, the history of the Roman Jewry becomes distinct from that of every other, and is particularly interesting, since it furnishes the criterion of the dispositions of the Holy See throughout the ages in regard to the entire Jewish race. Elsewhere the action of bishops, provincial councils, or sovereigns, were more or less substituted for that of the popes, or it interfered with or distorted it, but the Jews at Rome were under the immediate rule of the Sovereign Pontiff, and thus their vicissitudes faithfully mirror the attitude of the church at every period in regard to the race of Israel.

THE POLICY OF THE HOLY SEE.

These vicissitudes were numerous. The Jewish question which agitated the Middle Ages was to thoughtful men a source of much perplexity, nor is it, as we have good reason to know, by any means a matter of indifference to our own times. Our forefathers were at a loss how to treat these heirs of a venerated tradition and of a detested name. Legem probo, sed improbo gentem, were the words with which some at least of the popes, on the day of their coronation, received the homage of the delegates of the Jewish community. But how could they treat with severity the representatives of the ancient Law without in some measure infringing the Law itself? Each pope who ascended the Throne of Peter had his personal and traditional views on the matter, and hence arose a diversity of treatment on their part, although this diversity was less real than apparent. That which strikes the student of history as the most remarkable and potent characteristic of the policy of the Holy See is its unity. Men are ambitious of a thousand different things: the church desires but one, and this is always
the same—the eternal welfare of her children. Her methods may vary, but her motive, never. All the popes in succession have pursued the same end in regard to the race of Israel, although the difference of times and circumstances has called for diversity of action. There have been three periods marking this diversity.

VICISSITUDES OF THE RACE.

While the Papacy was triumphant and its rule unquestioned it sought, not to subjugate but to win the Jews. This may be called the First Period. But when the popes saw their work threatened, attacked and almost compromised on every side, they ceased, during what may be called the Second Period, to oppose—in their wonted degree—their moderation to the popular fury, and made their authority the more strongly felt the more it was contested. It was the Reformation which assured the triumph of the Inquisition. Paul IV. published the bull which separated the Jews from the rest of mankind at the time when Luther was subverting Germany, and Calvin France and Switzerland, with their heresies. By a remarkable Nemesis the victories gained by the enemies of the Holy See cost most to those who hated it most.

In the Third Period, which followed when calm was somewhat restored, and the progress of heresy seemed for a time arrested, the Sovereign Pontiffs relaxed the severity to which the force of events had constrained them, and turned their attention more fully than before to the catechumenate, and the instruction of converts from Judaism. The First Period extends from the fall of the Empire to the accession of Eugenius IV., in 1431.

While the later emperors, with the zeal of recent converts, were persecuting them, the popes sheltered the Jews with their protection. St. Gregory the Great forbade that any should be compelled to abjure, be deprived of the right of possessing house or land, or of cultivating the soil. “It is,” he said, “by gentleness and kindness, by persuasion and exhortation, that unbelievers must be led into the bosom of the church.”

It was in vain that the provincial councils of Toledo, Rheims, and Meaux did their utmost by harsh decrees to force the illustrious pontiff and his successors beyond the limits they had laid down. They none the less persisted in treating the

*“Prædictos vero Hebræos gravari vel affigî contra ordinem rationis prohibemus,” etc. See Epist. lib. i., Indict. ix., Epist. x., and many other passages in St. Gregory’s Letters.
Jews as wanderers, not criminals or enemies; as sheep gone astray, to be won, not driven by force into the true fold.

Nevertheless, it sometimes happened that at Rome as elsewhere a sudden catastrophe or other great calamity was regarded as a sign of the wrath of Heaven against the “perfidious Jews.” Thus, when, after the alarms inspired by the year 1000 were appeased, an earthquake in 1020 caused widespread terror and dismay, the Jews were declared to have occasioned the divine displeasure, and as they had done before, during the famine in the time of Theodoric, so again for the earthquake, the populace attacked and burnt the synagogue. In other countries the Jews themselves would have been burnt. But the deeds we have related were rare in Rome, where the Jews were, as a rule, allowed to vegetate in their own quarter in tranquillity and almost ignored, as despised and somewhat suspicious strangers, but still not pariahs.

POPPES RECEIVE THE HOMAGE OF THE JEWS.

This alien community had been wont to salute the emperors on great occasions, and so also at the coronation of each pope the representatives of the Roman Jewry were in the foremost rank among the delegations assembled to congratulate the newly elected pontiff. They also, for a long period, went annually to salute the pope at Easter. In fact, rather than fail in demonstrations of fidelity to the Holy See, they were careful during the sad period of the Schism to render homage at the same time to the true pope and to the anti-pope, wherever the latter might be. Thus Callixtus II. and Gregory VIII., Innocent II. and Anacletus (in 1330), received almost simultaneously the homage of the Jews. In Pope Anacletus, indeed, they saw one almost of their own race, his grandfather, the Israelite Leone, having embraced Christianity; and it was made a matter of reproach to the pope that his features bore too strongly the stamp of his origin.*

This homage rendered by the Jews was doubtless sincere, for they knew the popes to be their best protectors. Alexan-

* Natali, in Il Ghetto di Roma, relates an extraordinary legend of a German Jew. This Jew, it says, being raised to the Papacy, led a holy life, devoted to his high calling, and would probably have died in the odor of sanctity but for an unfortunate incident. He was famed for his skill at chess, the only recreation he allowed himself. One day there arrived from Germany an aged Jew who was said to have no equal as a chess-player. He was invited to try his skill with the pope, and when on the point of being beaten, made a move of which he alone possessed the secret, but his adversary out-maneuvered him. On seeing this the old Jew recognized “his blood,” and springing up, embraced the Holy Father, calling him his son. And thus, adds the legend, the pope won the game but lost the tiara.
der III. (1159) employed a Jew as his treasurer, Innocent III. (1198) declared that, “following the example of his predecessors, Callixtus, Eugenius, Alexander, and Clement, he would be to the suppliant Jews a shield of defence.”* Honorius III. (1216) openly protected them.† Gregory IX. (1227) remonstrated and legislated, but in vain, against their persecution in France and Germany, and in Italy forbade them to be injured or put to death without trial, or molested during the celebration of their solemnities, or that their dead should be disinterred under pretext of compelling payment from the living.‡ Nicholas IV. (1288), although far from showing himself invariably favorable to the Jews, yet on hearing that they had been molested at Rome, commanded his vicar to keep careful watch that their property as well as their synagogue should be respected. Innocent IV. (1243) himself usually treated his Jewish subjects with much kindness, although he was the first pope to absolutely prohibit the reading of the Talmud,§ that vast and extraordinary compilation in which so strange a mingling of half-heathen myth and fable, cabalistic lore, wise proverbs and examples, together with doctrines tending to the subversion of religion and morality, side by side with parables full of truth and beauty, had accumulated in the course of ages. This prohibition, repeatedly violated, was repeatedly renewed, and always in vain. “The Talmudic Jew, with his intense pride of race, and scorn and hatred of other nations, was a difficult person to deal with.”‖ It was through Talmudic influences that the Jews in Spain were more in sympathy with Islam than the religion of Christ, and assisted the Moors in the eighth century to conquer the country and destroy the kingdom of the Visigoths.

When Benjamin of Tudela, between 1159 and 1167, visited Rome, he had remarked with surprise on the liberty there enjoyed by the Jews in comparison with those in other countries. But this, which may be called the golden age of the Roman Jewry, was not of long duration. There is no question that

* Raynaldus, Annales Ecclesiastici, 1199, liv. It was Innocent III. also who obliged the abbot of St. Mary de Pratis, Leicester, to provide for a Jew who had fallen into poverty (ib. 1205, lvi.)
† In the Bull “Sicut Judeus non debet,” November 7, 1217, but at the same time the Jews are prohibited from the exercise of public functions.
‡ Bull of March 5, 1233: “Sufficeret debuerat perfidie Judeorum.”
§ Bull “Impia Judaeorum,” May 9, 1244.
¶ See The Catholic Dictionary, under the heading “Jews.”
the spirit of proselytism among the rich and influential Jewish families was becoming a real and serious danger. The bulls issued by Clement IV. (1265), Gregory X. (1271), and Nicholas IV. (1288) testify to their anxieties on this account. Martin IV. and Honorius IV., also, on ascending the Papal throne, in 1281 and 1285, had felt it necessary to issue repressive edicts, which closed the liberal professions and certain trades to Jews, but left them, outside their own quarter, the sole resources of commerce on certain lines, and of banking transactions and management.

The last pope whose accession was saluted by the Jews before the exile of the Holy See at Avignon was Boniface VIII., in 1295, when, assembled near the tower of Serpietro, and headed by the rabbi, bearing the sacred book of the Law, they craved his clemency. "O nation beloved of God, and now his enemy," exclaimed the pope, pausing on his way, "who hopest in an uncertain future and closest thine eyes to the light of faith, holding aloof when the peoples of the earth draw near, for thee Christ shed his blood, and thou refusest to acknowledge him as thy Redeemer." And after receiving the book, he returned it to the hands of the rabbi.*

This presentation of the Pentateuch had become a custom from the time of the accession of Eugenius III., in 1145, when the pope in acknowledgment of this mark of respect, allowed the Gospel to be read before him in Hebrew instead of, as previously had been the custom, in Greek or Latin. The same ceremonial was observed in 1163, on the coronation of Alexander III.

THE POPES AWAY, THE JEWS SUFFERED.

The absence of the popes was the cause of much suffering to the Jews of Rome, no longer shielded by their restraining hand from the oppressive barons and turbulent people. If Pope John XXII., who was naturally clement, burnt the Talmud, it was doubtless to save the Jews from being burnt for reading it. He undertook their defence against tyrannical sovereigns, and was the first to forbid the seizure of a man's goods on his conversion to Christianity.† This extraordinary

* Piazza, p. 755, quoted by Rodocanachi, gives the following answer as made by some of the popes on receiving the sacred volume: "We praise and venerate this holy Law given by God, through the hands of Moses and your Elders (maggiori), but we blame and condemn your observance and vain interpretation thereof, seeing that you are still expecting the Messiah, whom the Holy Catholic Church declares to be already come, even our Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with the Father to all eternity."

† Raynaldus, 1320, xxiii., Bull "Cum sit absurdum," June 19, 1320.
custom had been introduced early in the Middle Ages into almost every country in Europe, but was never allowed at Rome. Under the plea that the neophyte in renouncing his errors was also to renounce everything relating to his past life, he was required to give up everything he possessed, and, as it were, begin his life over again. The rich, who chiefly profited by the spoils, and the poor, who came in for a share of them, highly approved of this process, though it certainly was not of a nature to encourage conversions. On the publication of the bull prohibiting the practice, Charles VI. of France, Jayme II. of Aragon, and Enrique of Castile, issued edicts commanding their vassals to respect the papal decree, but with indifferent success, and so late as 1542 Pope Paul III. found it needful to reiterate the injunction.*

At Rome, as we have said, nothing of the kind was permitted. There the popes paternally protected the converts, and it was doubtless for this reason that such large numbers of Jews travelled great distances to Rome,† to make their act of submission to the church under the benevolent guardianship of the sovereign pontiffs.

"We are bound," said Pope Paul III., "to behave with consideration and kindness to the heterodox who come to us; not to ill-treat them, but to stretch forth a helping hand, and smooth the way for them."‡ At the same time the popes strenuously forbade compulsion to be used with a view to conversion. "For he is not truly a Christian," said Urban V., "who comes for baptism not of his own free will, but because he is forced thereto."§

Clement VI., who ascended the Papal throne in 1342, would fain have adopted the mild treatment approved by John XXII. in regard to his Israelitish subjects, but the awful scourge called the Black Death was then devastating Europe; and as in post-reformation England every great calamity was laid at the door of the Catholics, so in mediaeval Europe it was attributed by the populace equally as a matter of course to the Jews.

---

* "Cupientes Judeos"; bull of March 21, 1542.
† In 1388 these arrivals were so numerous that the pope was obliged to make special arrangements for their reception.
‡ Clement XI., in 1720, in the Bull "Propaganda per Universum," enacted that if a Jew become a Christian, the portion of his father's goods falling to him shall not be withheld by the family on account of his conversion. But he is not allowed to disinherit his other brothers—a proceeding enacted by the penal laws of Protestant England, according to which, if the younger son of a Catholic land-owner became a Protestant, he could take the whole estate and reduce the rest of the family to poverty.
§ Bull of Urban V. (1362), "Sicut Judæis."
At Rome the misery was appalling, and the popes being absent from their too-turbulent capital, the lawless barons maltreated the people without scruple or pity, while the Jews, a prey to the violence of both alike, fared worst of all.

It was not until the year 1404 that they joyfully acclaimed the return of the pontiffs to Rome, when they did homage to Innocent VII. On receiving the Pentateuch from the hands of the rabbi, the pope returned it to him "without confirmation or derogation."

Only a year later took place the accession of Gregory XII., who, instead of returning the sacred book to the chief rabbi, desired to keep it; and from that time it became the custom at each coronation to present the new pope with a richly adorned copy of the Law.* Martin V., whose election in 1417 happily put an end to the period of anti-popes, not only protected the Jews from unjust treatment by sovereigns abroad or the populace at home, but remitted certain taxes, and allowed them again to be employed as physicians and as professors in the schools.

THE PERIOD OF STRICTER MEASURES.

Pope Eugenius IV., with whom begins the second period of greater severity, although this severity was very intermittent, decreed the withdrawal of these favors, but did not enforce the fulfilment of his edict, which was allowed to remain rather as a threat than as a law. Callixtus III. and Nicholas V. allowed it to remain a dead-letter. At the coronation of Callixtus, in 1455, when the Jews, as he was passing Monte Giordano, presented a splendid copy of the Law, the populace riotously struggled to seize it. From that time, therefore, they were allowed to do homage at the Castle of Sant’ Angelo, protected by the Pontifical Guards. Pius III., in 1503, received them in a hall of his palace.

There was, nevertheless, at that period an increased animus against the Jews. This had been strongly manifested in 1472, when Sixtus IV. had sanctioned the cultus of the little Simon of Trent, whom, it was affirmed, they had martyred.† Still, at Rome, they lost no opportunity of proclaiming their fidelity to the Holy See, and on the enthronement of Leo X., in 1513, rivalled the Christians in enthusiasm, and in the magnificence they displayed in his honor.

* There are several superb copies of the sacred books, dating from the last two centuries, in the library of the Vatican.

† Basnage de Beauval, Hist. des Juifs, La Haye, 1716.
With regard to the little Simon of Trent, and similar cases, it is known that none of the supposed victims of the Jewish blood-ritual have ever been formally canonized or even formally beatified. Little Simon of Trent is styled "Blessed" simply because he appears in the Roman martyrology, but that is only equivalent to a recognition of cultus. The same holds for the case of Andrew of Rinn, whose cultus was sanctioned, without any examination of the cause, by Benedict XIV. But all this is by no means the same as formal beatification, much less canonization. The alleged martyrdom by Jews of Christian children has repeatedly been disproved on examination of the facts of the case, and the so-called "confessions," extracted by torture, have as often been emphatically retracted by the sufferers at the moment of death. The use of blood, taken from some innocent victim, really did enter into the magic spells of professors of the black art, and as there is no doubt that sorcery was much practised among the Jews, it is possible that some sorcerers may at different times have combined this evil magic with their religious beliefs.

INJUSTICE OF ACCUSATIONS.

Still, Judaism as a system can certainly not be held responsible for these outrages. (1) There is absolutely no trace of any such rite in the Talmud or any Hebrew religious book. (2) Nor is there any such injunction or recommendation handed down by oral tradition; this is declared by numberless learned Jews of the highest character. (3) Several of the Roman pontiffs and other ecclesiastical authorities, after careful examination of evidence, have formally exonerated the Jewish people and religion from any such imputation.†

For instance, Innocent IV., July 5, 1247, in a document addressed in duplicate to the bishops of France and Germany, says: "Although Holy Scripture . . . forbids the Jews to touch a dead body of any sort at the festival of the Passover, there are people who falsely charge them of partaking in common at this festival of the heart of a child whom they have killed. They believe that the law of the Jews enjoins this upon them, although precisely the contrary is the case, and if

* I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. Father Thurston, S.J., for this information, and, for full particulars on the subject, would refer to his valuable article, entitled "Anti-Semitism and the Charge of Ritual Murder," in The Month for June, 1898. (Longmans, and Benziger Brothers.)

† This and the following page are largely taken from Father Thurston's article in The Month for June, 1898.
a dead body be found anywhere, the Jews are maliciously accused of having committed a murder."

The pope then goes on to speak with indignation of the outrages to which the Jews were subjected in consequence of these fabrications. He also, in a letter to the Archbishop of Vienne, a few months previously, recounted the atrocities perpetrated against the Jews of Valréas, who were accused of crucifying a Christian girl, and frightfully torturing her, although absolutely innocent of the crime.

Gregory X., in a bull of October 7, 1272, repeats the statement of Innocent IV., and declares the falsehood of the accusation that the Jews use human blood has been proved to him many times by Jewish rabbis and others converted to Christianity. This pope even established a rule that the testimony of Christians alone is not to be received against Jews unless some Jew confirm it.

Later on, Martin V. again forbids any such "false and calumnious charge" as that of ritual murder, or that of poisoning the wells, to be made against the Jews. So again, Paul III., in a letter of May 12, 1540, to the bishops of Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland, emphasizes the letters of former popes in regard to the falsity of these accusations. At the same time the non-existence of ritual murder does not imply that isolated outbreaks of fanaticism, and possibly of vengeance, may not have been attended with the murder of an innocent victim in odium fidei, but such had nothing whatever to do with Jewish ritual, and was reprobated with horror by thoughtful and educated Israelites.

All favors and concessions granted by preceding pontiffs were confirmed in 1534 by Paul III., but these were again restricted by Julius III., in 1550, when various parts of Europe, seduced by so-called reformers, were fast falling a prey to heresy and schism. Paul IV., who became pope five years later, résumé and codified the previous repressive edicts, enforcing the seclusion of the Jews in their own quarter, the Ghetto, and the wearing of a distinctive color or badge; forbidding them to employ Christian servants, especially as nurses, and this for very sufficient reasons, if we are to credit the records of the time. The same edict prescribes the precautions to be taken against usury and unjust charges, and prohibits the sale of articles left in pawn until the expiration of eighteen months. The practice of medicine, in which some of the rabbis excelled, was no longer permitted them except as
regarded their own race.* But notwithstanding the verbal severity of his bull, Paul IV. almost immediately instructed his vicar to modify its application. This custom of mitigating by "explanation" an ordinance of acknowledged severity gave a great elasticity to the edicts of the Holy See, which were thus far less rigorous de facto than de jure.

Pius IV. (de' Medici) proclaimed a general amnesty for the misdeeds which had occasioned the severity of his predecessor in regard to the Jewish community. Among other favors he allowed them to have shops outside the precincts of the Ghetto, on condition that they were closed on Sundays and great festivals of the church, and that the holders returned within the Ghetto at night. Pius V., while refusing them the right of owning houses outside the Ghetto, allowed the rental of shops for the display of their merchandise, except in streets through which religious processions were accustomed to pass.

In 1558 a general feeling of resentment against the Jews led to their expulsion from Ravenna and Palestrina, and in the following year from the Papal States, with the exception of Rome and Ancona. They were commonly accused not only of ruining the rich and stripping the poor by exorbitant usury, but also of the darkest crimes and sacrileges. Even St. Charles Borromeo, who was full of compassion and charity, must have considered that there was some reason to credit these accusations, when he advised the princes of Christendom to expel them from their dominions, as constituting a danger to their Christian subjects.†

In spite of the popular hatred and mistrust, Sixtus V. and the three succeeding popes treated the Jews of Rome with great moderation and kindness. This continued until Clement VIII., on his accession in 1592, beheld the enemies of the Holy See sweeping away the ancient landmarks of the faith, and, like a destroying flood, apparently carrying all before them. Protestantism under Elizabeth had taken definite possession of England; a Huguenot king was on the throne of France; Bohemia, the Netherlands, and Germany were tainted

* Innocent VIII., in his last illness, was assured by a Jewish charlatan of recovery by the transfusion of blood from the veins of three youths. The youths died, and so also did the pope. The practitioner fled. Still, this was quite an exceptional case. Among the popes who were attended by Jewish physicians were Boniface IX., Martin V., Eugenius IV., Innocent VII., Pius II., Julius I., Paul III., Julius III., Sixtus V., and Leo X.

† We know from Seckendorf, one of Luther's apologists and admires, what was the treatment advised by the heresiarch in regard to the Jews: "Their synagogues ought to be destroyed, their houses pulled down, their books of prayer, the Talmud, and even the Books of the Old Testament, should be taken from them, their rabbis forbidden to teach, and compelled to gain a living by hard labor."
with heresy, and Italy and Rome were in a state of ferment and unrest. This did not seem to Clement a time to encour-
age an alien community of misbelievers in the heart of Christen-
dom, and besides renewing the Bull Cum nimis absurdum of
Paul IV., he commanded the Jews to quit the States of the
Church, with the exception of Rome, Ancona, Naples, and
Avignon; but this, which was their last expulsion, was never
fully carried out, the pope recalling them in the following
year, 1593. At the same time, on account of the popular ani-
mosity against them, he renewed the edicts forbidding that
they should be ill-treated. Any person throwing stones at a
Jew or tearing his garments, or otherwise molesting him, was
sentenced to be whipped and fined, these penalties being in-
creased in severity as time went on.

THE PERIOD OF CONCESSIONS AND OF MILDNESS.

During the third period, from the time of Clement VIII.,
who began his reign in 1592, the condition of the Roman Jews
was increasingly ameliorated by the Holy See, which, while
maintaining strict discipline, allowed much of the old legisla-
tion to fall into disuse.

In the mild reign of Paul II., in 1464, a custom had been
inaugurated which, though at first harmless, had in the course
of years, owing to the animus of the Roman rabble, become a
source of much affliction to the inhabitants of the Ghetto.
This pope, a Venetian noble of high rank, and accustomed to
splendor and refinement, knowing the love of his Roman sub-
jects for amusements, and disliking the brutal combats with
wild beasts and other sanguinary spectacles so dear to them,
resolved to replace these by less savage forms of entertain-
ment. It was he who introduced the Carnival as it has for
three centuries been observed at Rome. Among the sports
indulged in races formed an important item, and indeed these
races gave its present name of the Corso to the ancient Via
Lata. On the first day, ran Roman youths; on the second,
Jews ("not fewer than eight"), and on the third, sexagenari-
ans. It is certain that there was at first nothing humiliating
in this participation in the carnival games by the Jews, but it
gradually became an occasion of raillery, ridicule, and violence
on the part of the crowd. At the approach of the carnival
the Jews, for many years, went year by year to ask the pope's
protection, and he had on every occasion issued an edict to
shield them from insult and injury, sentencing offenders to
severe penalties.* Clement IX. put an end to these abuses by an edict of January 28, 1668, in which he decreed that the Jews were no longer to take part in the races or other carnival games.

THE SPANISH INQUISITION AND THE JEWS.

For reasons given at the outset, we have dwelt chiefly on the action of the Holy See in regard to the Jews of Rome. Before concluding, it will be of interest, as briefly as we can, to notice it with reference to their treatment in Spain, and especially by the Spanish Inquisition.

And first it must be allowed that long before the time of Ferdinand and Isabella the Jew of Spain had become an element of danger to the country.

During the religious wars with the Moors the Jews suffered greatly from the zealous violence of the Spanish knights, and in those stormy times it was the popes and the clergy who were their best protectors. In a brief of Alexander II. to the Spanish bishops he praises them for having prevented their massacre, commending for the same reason Viscount Berengar of Narbonne, and at the same time censuring the archbishop for not having duly shielded them. Pope Honorius II., one hundred and fifty years later, also protected them from brutal treatment.

At the same time the popes did not allow Jews to hold power over Christians, either as masters or judges. The Jews had their own judges and were tried by their own laws and rights, often to the prejudice of the Spaniards. They had certain privileges not shared by Christians, such as that of not being imprisoned without express command of the king. We even find them obtaining at times so much power that they practically held the reins of government.

During the fourteenth century the Cortes and other councils often sent remonstrances to the government, since the existence of so many privileges in their favor produced repeated civil commotions.†

But while the real Jews had monopolized a great part of the national property and commerce, a far greater danger arose from the multitude of pretended converts. These threatened to uproot not only the Spanish nationality itself but also the

*Amongst other prohibitions (although in carnival time every one, Jew or Gentile, is pelted promiscuously) it was forbidden to pelt a Jew with anything harder than "fruit"; whereupon a certain Marchese del Grillo laid in a large supply of fir-cones by way of ammunition in their regard.

†See the Life of Cardinal Ximenes, by Dr. Von Hefele, Canon Dalton's translation, from which source we have largely drawn in these latter pages.
Christian faith, some being raised to bishoprics and other ecclesiastical dignities while secretly undermining the faith they professed to believe and teach, so that in the time of Ferdinand the Catholic the proselytism carried on by the Jews had reached an alarming degree.

It is important to bear in mind that it was these false converts that the Inquisition afterwards punished, and not the Jews properly so-called, a distinction too often forgotten by Protestant controversialists. "Neither the unbaptized Jew nor the unbaptized Moor could be brought before the Inquisition, but only those of these two creeds who had relapsed" (De Maistre).

After the conquest of Granada, in 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella, feeling the impossibility of suppressing crypto-judaism so long as the Jews remained in Spain, issued a decree for all the Jews who up to the 31st of July refused to be baptized to leave the kingdom. The indefatigable proselytism of the Spanish Jews aimed at nothing less than the Judaizing of the whole of Spain, and this decree was hastened on by various overt acts on the part of the Jews. They were accused of having defaced crucifixes, profaned consecrated Hosts, and, at La Guardia, of having crucified Christian children.

RE COURSE TO ROME.

Notwithstanding these imputed crimes, it is a fact well worthy of attention that, at the time of the greatest rigor against both pretended or suspected converts, and Judaizing Christians, persons accused or threatened by the Inquisition hastened to take refuge in Rome. The number of causes commenced by the Inquisition and summoned from Spain to Rome, especially during the first fifty years of the existence of that tribunal, is countless, and it must be added that Rome always inclined to the side of mercy.* "I do not know," writes Balmez, "that it would be possible to cite one accused

*See Balmez, History of European Civilization, ch. xxxvi. The Spanish Inquisition was instituted in the first place as a barrier against the encroachments of Judaism and Islamism, but it was in a very important degree for political reasons that the Spanish kings upheld an institution which, though apparently of an ecclesiastical nature, was constantly complained of and combated by the popes and bishops. It was, as is stated by Ranke (vol. i. p. 248), used as the means of completing the absolute authority of the king. Count Alexis de St. Priest, in his history of the banishment of the Jesuits from Portugal and their barbarous treatment in the prisons of Lisbon, observes with reference to Pombal, the chief mover in this persecution: "This minister, the destroyer of the Jesuits and apostle of absolutism, an enemy of Rome and the hierarchical power like no other, recognized in the Inquisition the best means for the accomplishment of his plans," and made it his tool accordingly. as also, later, did Philip II., to a marked extent. See also Life of Cardinal Ximenes, pp. 311-315, containing valuable evidence of the Papal action in regard to the proceedings of the Spanish Inquisition.
person who by appealing to Rome did not ameliorate his condition. The history of the Inquisition is full of contests between the kings and popes, and we constantly find on the part of the Holy See a desire to restrain the Inquisition within the limits of justice and humanity."

Again and again do we find the pope interfering to mitigate the lot of the appellants, and also not unfrequently complaining that the indulgence he had granted to accused persons had not been sufficiently respected. In fine, after several other admonitions, he observed to Ferdinand and Isabella that "mercy towards the guilty was more pleasing to God than the severity it was desired to use"; and gave the example of the Good Shepherd in regard to the wandering sheep.

It was, indeed, because they were sure of finding clemency there, that the accused so constantly had recourse to Rome. We have proof of this in the number of Spanish refugees convicted at Rome of having fallen into Judaism. Two hundred and fifty were found at one time, and yet there was not one execution. Some penances were imposed on them, and when they were absolved and reconciled they were allowed to return home, without the least mark of ignominy. This took place in 1498.

The Roman Inquisition, as Balmez states, was never known to pronounce sentence of capital punishment, even when the Apostolic See was occupied by popes of extreme rigor in their civil administration. While in all parts of Europe, he writes, scaffolds were prepared to punish crimes against religion, and scenes which saddened the soul were everywhere witnessed, Rome was an exception to the rule—Rome, which has been represented as a monster of intolerance and cruelty.

We conclude this imperfect notice with the words of the Calvinist, Basnage de Beauval, written in 1716. "Of all sovereigns," he says, "there have scarcely been any whose rule has been milder towards the circumcised than that of the popes. Even when persecuting contumacious Christians, they showed favor to this race, ... and left them full liberty of conscience. Some few popes, it is true, have shown themselves their enemies, for it is impossible that, in so long a succession of Bishops of Rome, all should have had the same temperament, or have followed the same method. Still, even at this present time, the Jews continue to live in greater tranquillity under the domination of these heads of the church than under any other."