

WHOSE EUCHARIST? EUCHARISTIC IDENTITY AS HISTORICAL SUBJECT

MIRI RUBIN

In the interview for my current job, as a History Tutor at Pembroke College Oxford, one of the questions posed to me, towards the end, was, "What are *you* doing studying the Eucharist?" As the interview had gone rather well up to then, I decided that this was a friendly question, one which would allow me to explain an intellectual autobiography, rather than a trick, or hostile one. I thus unfolded a truncated version of the following story, and that version must have satisfied my interviewers, a panel of eleven men, since they elected me unanimously to the post.

The story related to the intellectual aspirations which prevailed and still prevail in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, my *alma mater*.¹ There the teaching of history is contained within frames defined by the presence or absence of Jews: there was the department of Jewish History which covered all periods and places, and then the department of General History, which excluded Jews from the history of Europe and the rest of the West. Asian and African histories were studied in separate departments. It was thus possible to reach the fifth year of the study of History, in my case 1980, without ever having come across Jews: I had studied Ottoman history, the Crusades, medieval trade, Roman citizenship, and the Jews had been absent from all of these themes and pedagogic programmes. In 1979 I embarked on a methodological course for MA students the theme of which was "Popular religion and popular culture in early modern Europe". Here we encountered the then new and fresh ideas of Keith Thomas, Natalie Davis, Robert Muchembled, Jean-Claude Schmitt, and were each charged with the task of writing an extended research essay on a source for the study of popular religion. Being a medievalist, I chose to look at medieval drama for my

Miri Rubin
Pembroke College, Oxford OX1 1DW, UK

paper. I dutifully went to the English department, acquainted myself with the hundreds of brown volumes of EETS, and began to read the plays known as Corpus Christi drama.

What is the Corpus Christi drama? What indeed is Corpus Christi? These are questions to which later work, indeed some twelve years later, would aim to provide some answers. But the beginning of a search for an answer was my task back then. And it began with an unravelling of the feast of the Eucharist—Corpus Christi—and then the Eucharist itself. I did so without the stirring of personal memory or snippets of childhood rhymes, without smells and sounds that still flow from the many public and private manifestations of the Eucharist for those who grow up in Europe or the Americas. As opposed to those who studied Jews alone, and who felt equivocal about investigating the Christian mysteries too closely, I did not even feel that: not revulsion, not fascination, just the dutiful curiosity that well-trained and hard-working historians entertain *vis-à-vis* their subjects as a matter of course.

Yet despite the attempt to define two separate historical projects: the General, scientific, largely German-inspired history of the Department of General History, or the providential and pious Jewish History, when I began to do research for my PhD in Cambridge, I found that my chosen theme, hospital formation and charity in England in the Middle Ages, nonetheless brought me in touch with Jews again and again: sermons which encouraged Christians to give to the poor often cited the example of Jews, famed for the care which they offered to their own: ending with the hortative question “Have you ever seen a Jew begging in the streets?”² When I explored the endowment of hospitals such as St John’s Oxford, it became clear that hospital-founders often benefited from deals struck with Jews who were able to amass properties pawned and sometimes lost to them, since they could not undertake land tenure in fee. Jewish businessmen were thus keen to sell the lands, and enterprising founders of charitable institutions—hospitals and academic colleges—accumulated the lands needed to found: charitable creation enabled by Jewish legal incapacity. I noted these cases, this confluence, but engaged little with the realities of life behind them.³

It was in the years of research for *Corpus Christi*, in the attempt to explore as a sort of historical ethnographer the practices and meanings which came to be related to the Eucharist in the later Middle Ages, that I came to the closest and most arresting realisation of the impossibility of excising Jews from the history of Europe. It was then that I came to appreciate the deadly intimacy of the relationship between Christians and Jews. Never before had an historical environment been more telling and rich in such messages than the terrains of Eucharistic practices: from the meal at the Eucharist’s inception, the Last Supper, to the many ways in which the Jews came to be the central endorsers and guarantors of the Eucharistic moment of Christian culture after around 1200. The Eucharist developed out of the discussions of

theologians and the reasoning of canonists, the political aspirations of papal officials, and the pastoral dilemmas raised by bishops and preachers; it was endorsed by the formulations of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), was made of the immediacy of materiality, which was nonetheless always qualified: the Eucharist as Christ's body was not to be seen like other objects, nor was its materiality amenable to the changes which operate on other ingested foods. Periodically, it miraculously revealed its qualities for all to see. Increasingly, it became something of a touchstone. Ever truthful it distinguished between the real and the false, ever correct it could delve into intentions beyond appearances and ritual form. It was a prime marker which people wore with pride, rejected with passion, and claimed with invention and even audacity. It alone could tell true claims from delusions: the Eucharist alone in its many-formed self-fashioning.

It is the century which saw the pastoral dissemination and parochial absorption of all the dictates and the promises of the Eucharist, the thirteenth century, which also saw the making of the powerful tale of its abuse in the hands of Jews. In this narrative were imputed to Jews inventive stratagems for the acquisition of the host and its desecration and shaming, stratagems worthy of those keen Eucharistic purveyors, the holy women of the Low Countries described so lovingly by medieval writers such as Jacques de Vitry and Thomas of Cantimpré and by contemporaries such as Caroline Bynum and André Vauchez.⁴ The questions which Jews were said to have posed to the Eucharist—"If he is God let him show himself to us"—echoed those which were attributed to doubting layfolk, weak priests and all manner of Eucharistic players in the dramas of *exempla* and inquisition. Yet the narrative which attached such questions to Jews differed, inasmuch as its end was violent and finite: the Jew/perpetrator was destroyed, as were his kin and neighbours and often tens of communities in the neighbourhood of his town. The Eucharist's most deliberate foe called forth the most excellent manifestation, and brought forth greater violence than any other doubter or questioner could elicit. A great intimacy thus developed between the Eucharist and the Jew: the Jew came to be told through his Eucharistic doubts, and the Eucharist through the Jew's rejection.

The powerful signification of the Eucharist, that which lent to it the charisma that bestowed identity and dignity on so many, was located in its many and rich associations. It was food, it was God, it was small and mundane, it was lofty and impenetrable. It was white, it was red. It was man-made, it was made for humanity. Its quality as food brought it home, into the intimacy of hearth, into spheres of women, and thus, imaginably, of doubt and error, into the nurture and protection of children. Claudine Fabre-Vassas has recently unfolded the rich ethnography which related Jews, Christians and the pig in her *The Singular Beast*, based on the historically situated observation of pig-rearing, killing and eating in the south of France.⁵ She shows how the intricate processes of bleeding and baking still resonate with

Eucharistic meanings, how pig and child enjoy still a symbolic equivalence which renders the Jew the enemy of both. Current practices may possess echoes of the medieval apocryphal treatment of Christ's childhood, wherein Christ is said to have been shunned by the parents of Jewish children. When he appeared to seek his playmates their parents hid them in the oven, and when they opened the oven they found pigs, not children, therein.⁶

The image of baking similarly linked Jews to the most intimate space of the female, and even the Marian, body. Images of the female body in the Middle Ages likened the womb to an oven, to a secret and dark but nurturing space; they also named Mary the oven of the Eucharist, portraying her as the baker of the Eucharist. Inasmuch as Jews rejected the Virgin Birth, they also rejected the hallowed space in which Christ was born, as enemies of the bread baked therein.⁷ A famous early medieval tale has presaged the meaning of these images. The tale of the Jewish Boy ended with the Jewish father throwing his son, who had come to appreciate Eucharistic truth when he received communion with Christian school-friends, into an oven, only to be saved by the Virgin and to convert to Christianity.

The association of the inner, the private, the whole and the unsullied, with Christianity through the mediation of the image of the Virgin further served to enhance the difference of those who did not accept the underpinnings of the whole salvific system, and within it Mary's special niche. Such were not only Jews but those dualists who abhorred the notion of God's birth of a woman, like those to whom the words of the Dominican preacher Moneta of Cremona were directed in the mid-thirteenth-century: "Why do you say that a pregnant woman is like a devil, when Luke attests that she is full of the Holy Spirit?"⁸ It was that fertility of the inner *sanctum* which was the essence of femininity, full of secrets and of potential fecundity, which Jews were accused of defiling and abusing: in the desecration of women and in the magic allegedly operated on pregnant women in the working of maleficent abortions.⁹ The trail which connected femininity with incipient sanctity was clearly threatened by the *maleficium* which Jews and Jewish doctors were seen to work.

The multivalent imaginings which the Eucharist inspired further expressed in their twists and turns the many possibilities of appropriation which it offered. In the niceties of their fine theological-philosophical distinctions as they discussed the fortune of the Eucharist during digestion by the Christian's body, Franciscan and Dominican theologians found an occasion to mark their difference from each other.¹⁰ Franciscans, who cleaved to the humanity of Christ, were particularly wedded to the notions of continued corporality which became one with the body of the recipients. Dominicans insisted rather on the strict meaning of accidents, so that once the Eucharist no longer resembled itself, it could no longer pose a serious intellectual theological dilemma, and was not to be discussed in pastoral exchange. If Franciscans were willing to dwell at least awhile upon the possibility that something

meaningful occurred when a mouse or a cat occasioned to receive the consecrated host, Dominicans were able to establish their intellectual identities and priorities by finding *prima facie* reasons for stopping short of discussing the problem. Intellectual identities, not only styles, were forged in debates about the Eucharist. And yet even the friars with their sophisticated, subtle preaching and single-minded devotion to pastoral and ecclesiastical causes, could never compete with the simple privilege of the priest in orders, perhaps that is why so many were ordained in the later medieval centuries. To St Francis the respect due to the person who handled his Lord in his hand every day, and upon whom even he, Francis, depended for access to Christ's Body, was awe-inspiring, possessing a mystique and power which no amount of preaching and exemplary living could rival.

The image offered by the Eucharist could be widely inclusive or insistently obscure and exclusive. Think of late medieval images of the mill of the host or the mystic wine-press, those images for contemplation and decoration of psalter and bibles of monastic houses of southern Germany. Possessing the habit of allegorical reading of scripture, and with access to the glosses, one could, just as art historians can today, unravel the images and their many layers of meaning, binding the Old and New Testaments through the promise, and then the fulfilment of a Eucharistic Christian history. Their images circulated in these exclusive circles, in monastic houses which in the later Middle Ages also consumed quite avidly a diet of tales and protocols of a quite gory nature, the confessions of Jews in the course of well-known trials for ritual-murder such as the famous case of Trent in 1475,¹¹ host-desecration such as that of Passau in 1477.¹² The details of confessions dragged out of accused persons with torture, and possessing truth value as vindications of Eucharistic claims, were copied and re-copied for no administrative or legal purpose but for the reading and edification, the exemplary and titillating value, of the transgressive and the dangerous.

The Eucharist's enormous power and promise and the centrality of its location within a system at once liturgical and pastoral, allowed for such appropriations, claims and uses to be made around and about it: what is it about the Eucharist that particularly promoted such incessant creativity? By being so centrally positioned, by occupying the centre stage of discussion and emphasis, the Eucharist denuded other symbols and symbolisers of what Lacan called "a second life", of anything beyond the brute existence, where nothing is really at stake, and of which nothing lasts.¹³ The Eucharist's promise was of that second life of meaning, such as Antigone wished to bestow upon her brother; it is that capacity to bear meaning, to transcend, that is denied the Eucharist's perceived enemies.¹⁴ Its foes were the enemies of signification, and thus fell short, were crude, passing and lonely. This qualitative difference was a crucial one for those who embraced campaigns of moral revival and invigoration, those who hoped exactly to animate and imbue Christian European politics with the challenges of renewal and reform. Such voices

were heard repeatedly and strongly between 1350 and 1450 and were ultimately engaged in the processes of refiguration encompassed within the two Reformations.

These movements against corruption, loss of direction and decline—institutional, political, environmental, civic and economic—were mightily involved in the offering of Eucharistic purity as a rallying cry and discipline for their adherents.

In these calls for change made by late medieval reformers ranging from Jean Gerson to Nicholas of Cusa, from Henry of Langenstein to Giovanni da Capistrano—Eucharistic renewal, remodelling of liturgical practice, re-drawing of the boundaries between lay-person and priest—coincided with a resounding call against usury, and often against those rulers whose needs allowed usury to flourish. The type of moral cleansing envisaged was often accompanied by various types of expulsions—of Jews, of beggars, of prostitutes, of Lombards. It is interesting to note the operation of town councils within these politics of moral hygiene. Overbearing and interventionist town-councils after the Black Death and in the ensuing decades of endemic plague, led the way in attempting to provide clean water and clear air. Theirs was the language of good stewardship, good house-keeping, that intersected so fruitfully with the language of moral cleansing, as programmes related to sumptuary legislation and against usury took root. The triumphant Eucharist offered a symbol for the type of political and moral order they desired. If usury and begging were the product of ill-value and the vicissitudes of laziness, of moral turpitude, then the Eucharist was pristine and clean, unchanging in value, utterly reliable. A sub-section of tales about the Eucharist associated it with coinage, as it turned miraculously into coins, or was mistaken for coins. It was after all inscribed like coins and deep thought could develop about the nature of its perimeter, its edges. Probably the greatest exponent of the tension between the Eucharist's properties and the finitude of its geometrical, spherical shape was exploited by St Bernardino of Sienna, a leading reformer, preacher against usury and Jews: in his devotional mind the Eucharist became an emblem, an external sign of great force and coherence, as the Eucharistic host, that sphere came to burn in the colours of blood and flesh, blood surrounded with the circumference of flesh, yet still embossed with the anagram of Christ.

The host desecration narrative and populist vindication of anti-usuary campaigns were clearly intertwined, as the case of Prague in 1389 demonstrates. There *Judenpolitik* stood as a contentious issue between clergy and King, between clergy and the King's men. The synodal statutes of October 1381 railed against usury:

since the sin of usury is a horrible and detestable crime and it occurs frequently nowadays not only among common folk but also among men of high status, in many ways both under the guise of profit and through

counterfeit, which we report with sorrow, because of the things done by the same Jews and by other infidels to taunt us, and this creates great scandal in the hearts of the faithful of God's church.¹⁵

One of the bearers of these complaints in eloquent homiletics and devotional poetry was the Archbishop of Prague, John of Jenstein (c. 1348–1400). In a Christmas sermon delivered some time in the 1380s, he argued that the property which they accumulated and the privileges Jews enjoyed favoured them over clergy; their influence in high places rendered Jews more powerful than magnates and churchmen.¹⁶ The subject of usury immediately followed, and Jews were accused of pauperising prince and magnate alike, and then using their riches in the service of Antichrist their Lord.¹⁷ Another vehement critic of the Jews and their protector was the Augustinian abbot Ludolf of Sagan (d. 1422; abbot from 1394), who saw the king, in a period of grave lapses in justice, rejected by clergy and people, by nobles, townsmen and peasants, and accepted by Jews alone.¹⁸ Thus the treatment of the Jews was seen as leading to pride which resulted in offences against Christians and their Saviour, as expressed in Prague in 1389:

since the Christian people could no longer pretend and bear, in just revenge of the blasphemy (committed) against the Eucharist ... on the feast of Easter, moved by zeal, it burnt those very Jews and their houses by fire.¹⁹

The political context and the anti-Jewish discourse are emphasised in these reports of the city's actions in 1389. Because of the King's absence, the crowd was drawn by the leadership of John (Gesco); the city elders supervised the collection of Jewish property, on expectation of a heavy fine. Moreover, the King placed armed men around the Jewish houses to reclaim them. As mentioned in the "Passion of the Jews", the bodies of the Jews were dug up and burnt, removing evidence and cleansing the city of their "usurious fats". In the face of the loot offered by the Jewish houses, some claimed that this should not be touched as it was the product of usurious gain. The rhetoric of the report on Prague, within the context of clerical complaints which we have already noted, allows the offence of host desecration to reverberate as only one instance of a greater evil, that which was preached regularly and insidiously, Jewish usury.²⁰

It is this anti-usury discourse which structured some of the memories of the massacre. This peculiar association with usury, which intersected with the accusation of host desecration, was carried over into another type of writing, that of the physician and homiletic writer John Lange of Wetzlar (1365–c. 1427). A scholar of the University of Prague and Doctor of Medicine, who wrote texts on the management of epidemics, John also composed didactic and devotional works, the most famous of which is the *Dialogus super Magnificat* ("Dialogue on the Magnificat"), a work of 2668 hexameters

dedicated to the Archbishop of Worms.²¹ John Lange turned the telling of the events of Prague 1389 into a polemic against King Wenzel and his servants, especially Minister Sigmund Huber. The King is cast as a supporter of Jews, while the crowd take just revenge. The King protected his Jews for nefarious reasons:

O kings, kings! Be shamed for such a crime! The usurious gain on the capital which is earned by the accursed people, in which you yourselves are proven to be accursed usurers.

You have done this not on account of them, or because of their virtues, in which they are experts, nor for reason of justice, which attaches to them, rather on account of their vile silver and other gifts of gold. You know that they frequently enact nefarious acts against Christ's faithful, and you have consumed gifts but have worn down the justice of the law again and again.²²

John Lange is confident of the moral opposition which the case of Prague demonstrated—between protectors of Christ's body and protectors of Jews. He accuses the royal councillors of having "sharpened" the king against the citizens of Prague, thus allowing for the all too real possibility that Christ's body be abused again.²³

We see here a local instantiation of the power of the Eucharist to crystallise fear about value, identity and authentic rule. True piety, that of the people, was vindicated against a miscreant ruler. The Eucharist was thus inserted by the power of its unassailable truth into moments of authentication. Its proximity with coins—in shape, in countervailing the character of usury and Jewishness, in its emblematic value—recurs interestingly throughout late medieval culture. Paul Strohm's *England's Empty Throne* contains breathtaking pages about late medieval desire to associate Eucharistic error, such as was preached and practised by Lollards, with counterfeiting, fraud, treason and particularly that of passing bad coins.²⁴ An elaborate metaphor developed around the socially disruptive and inherently evil effect of fraudulent tampering with a country's currency, which received very severe punishment at the hand of the state; it came to express the error of those who tampered with the Eucharist and its value. If coinage and currency was a tangible and communicable token of a real power and majesty, possessive of intrinsic value validated by its symbolic appearance, the Eucharist was similarly both itself valuable and representative of powers and promise extending from it. Yet both were vulnerable: almost anyone could handle each, and repay that generosity of circulation with abuse—clipping, deriding, devaluing. These perpetrators were the mis-guided, and divisive. They could only see immediate profit, short-term gain—usurers,

Jews, coin-clippers, fraudsters, Lollards—oblivious to the system of value and community which their actions eroded. Both deserved swift response action, exemplary punishment, and the images of both interacted and interpenetrated in specific political contexts such as late fourteenth-century Prague, early Lancastrian England, late fifteenth-century Bavaria.

The Eucharist offered not only a mystery to engage minds for life-times, a vocation and badge of difference for priests, the comforting companion for female religious, the focus for anti-clerical sentiment and religious discontent, the banner for reformers and populist leaders of crusades against Jews. It has also offered interesting trails for contemporary scholars in their investigations and explorations of self and vocation. I have already shared with you some of my own experiences leading up to my standing here among you. This conference's organiser, Sarah Beckwith, has combined disciplinary approaches—theology, social theory, literary theory—to produce *Christ's Body*.²⁵ For Sarah Beckwith, the Eucharist crystallises some central dialectics within late medieval social and cultural organisation: that which values the material—work, the body—and yet attempts to transcend their prescriptive contours. She has turned sacramentality into more than an aspect of liturgical practice and into an epistemological category, which characterises, among others, displays of power and the very action of drama. Among us is Eamon Duffy, the author of *The Stripping of the Altars*, in which tens of pages situate the mass within a system of traditional religion, in a sensitive rendering of an ideal type of mass, with an emphasis on aspects of both individual and collective participation.²⁶ For Duffy the Eucharist enabled vast creativity and extension from a set of official versions of liturgy and practice into the many instances of localities and temporalities. David Aers has responded rather vigorously to Duffy's book, seeing in it an interpretation of late medieval religion which pays insufficient attention to inequality of access to symbols, and to the entrenched conformity in social and inter-personal matters which conventional religion forced upon people. According to Aers, Duffy also fails to appreciate the currents of anti-clerical and anti-sacramental sentiment which characterised late medieval communities.²⁷ Although I feel that Aers' and Duffy's positions and sympathies are probably closer than the surface exchange might suggest, we have here the Eucharist and sacramentality used as touchstones, as keys to a whole set of interpretations: for Duffy, to a world alleviated, enriched and informed by the routines which parishioners created around and with conventional sacramental religion; for Aers, to a community expressed through a shared stream of critical engagements with hegemonic religion, one which fundamentally strives for corrective operation of justice, perhaps in keeping with a pre-sacramental Christianity, and which helps bind communities around such creations.

The lamented Bob Scribner, who created the social history of the Reformation, was an adept reader of the lingering sacramentalities of Lutheran culture and practice. He too used the Eucharist as a window upon the social, political and communal worlds of sixteenth-century German people.²⁸

Recently Stephen Greenblatt used the Eucharist as cypher for the understanding of *Hamlet* and for a number of canonical texts of early modern England. The Eucharist's dialectics of presence and absence, authority and power, of faith and betrayal, make it a lingering riddle in a "disenchanted" world obsessed with Protestant identity and authority and in constant polemical tension with Catholicism.²⁹ At the same time, Greenblatt has been writing about his Jewish childhood, just as David Mamet has written about his memories of childhood Passovers.³⁰ I suggest that there is something attractive, both pristine and infinitely inscribable, utterly incomprehensible as a literal entity and thus utterly demanding of other types of interpretation, to those who have not consumed the Eucharist. I suggest further that while those aspects of transubstantiation that have always moved some Christians and many non-Christians to reflection on the cannibalistic, improbable, unsavoury associations with the notion of ingesting a God who was human, remain somewhat repellent, it is the breadth of symbolic possibilities, the simplicity and accessibility of the Eucharist which nonetheless draws to it scholars who are clearly not Christian, or ambivalent Christians. The Eucharist today offers scope for the most fervent intellectual interdisciplinarity, it requires constant association and sharing of associations. Working on it creates communities and demonstrates those aspects of cultural production which are meaningful to many of us engaged in the historicist unravelling of religious cultures.

The Eucharist's plurality of appeal and openness to use—both when a high price had to be paid for expressing one's ideas about it, and nowadays in the relative freedom of intellectual inquiry—offers the pristine slate of representation, total innocence, total power, vulnerability as the potential victim at the hands even of its most fervent adherents. Its utter inscrutability has disconcerted Jews then and now; its malleability has challenged projects of historical ethnographic inquiry; its ability to be regenerated, and endlessly shared, marks a place in our historical subjectivities that, as these collected essays doubtless show, has much to reveal to us about the pluralities of the past as well as those which we inhabit.

NOTES

- 1 For the development of departmental demarcations see A Rein, "History and Jewish History, Together or Separate the Definition of Historical Studies at the Hebrew University, 1925–1935", *The History of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem Origins and Beginnings* [in Hebrew], eds M Heyd and S Katz (Jerusalem Magnes Press 1997), pp 516–540
- 2 *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester (1373–1389)*, ed M A Devlin, Camden series 85–86 (London, 1954), I, sermon 35, pp 148–149, sermon 44, pp 196–197, II, sermon 90, p 411

- 3 Miri Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp 273–275
- 4 C W Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987); André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- 5 C Fabre-Vassas, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians and the Pig*, trans C Volk (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1997)
- 6 Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp 24–25
- 7 M Rubin, *Corpus Christi: the Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p 145
- 8 Moneta de Cremona, *Adversus catharos et valdenses libri quinque*, ed T A Ricchini (Rome: Palladi, 1743), col 335b
- 9 For some of the accusations which might arise around accidents or malpractice see M P Lillich, *Rainbow like and Emerald Stained Glass in Lorraine in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), pp 78–81, 111–112 and pl IV, 4; J Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994), p 84
- 10 D Burr, *Eucharistic Presence and Conversion in Late Thirteenth-Century Franciscan Thought*, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 74/3 (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1984)
- 11 R Po-chia Hsia, *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992)
- 12 R Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), pp 50–56, 81–90
- 13 J Lacan, *Le Séminaire VII: L'Éthique de la psychanalyse*, ed J-A Miller (Paris: Seuil, 1986), pp 285–348, esp pp 337–348; P Guyomard, *La Jouissance du tragique: Antigone, Lacan et le désir de l'analyste* (Paris: Aubier, 1992)
- 14 I am grateful to Louise Fradenburg for her illuminating introduction to this discussion
- 15 “quia tamen hujusmodi usurarii nephas horrendum et detestabile hodie nedum per populares verum etiam per magni status homines multimodis et quaeisitis et fucatis coloribus, quod dolenter referimus, frequentatur, propter quod ab ipsis Iudaeis et aliis infidelibus in improprium nobis objicitur et fidelium cordibus in Dei ecclesia scandala gravantur”, 16 October 1381, *Concilia pragensia, 1353–1413*, ed C Hofler (Prague: Gerzabek, 1862), p 30
- 16 “Nam bene videtis clerum et Christofideles cottidie in suis iuribus et libertatibus supplantari et subici multasque iniurias perpeti et magis synagogam quam Christi proficere ecclesia et inter principes plus unum posse Iudeum quam procerem vel prelatum”, in R E Weltsch, *Archbishop John of Jenstein, 1348–1400: Papalism, Humanism and Reform in Pre-Hussite Prague*, *Studies in European History* 8 (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1968), p 62, n 89
- 17 “Ymmo per usurias inauditas principes et magnates adeo depauperantur, ac si cum thesauris illis suum dominum Antichristum ditare et adiuvare queant”, *Ibid*
- 18 “Non fuit temporibus illis qui vic regia justiciam faceret pupillis et viduis, ymmo nec baronibus, nobilibus et vassalis, quorum pars non modica, querelas emisit, de illata sibi regali violencia Exosus igitur erat clero et populo, nobilibus, civibus et rusticis, solis erat acceptus Iudeis”, in “Catalogus abbatum Saganensium”, *Scriptores rerum silesiacarum* I, ed G A Stenzel (Wrocław: Josef Max, 1835), p 214
- 19 “quia christiana gens dissimulare et ferre non potuit, in vindictam blasphemiam illius, quadam die in sollempnitate paschali zelo mota Iudeos ipsos et domus eorum igne cremavit”, *Ibid*
- 20 Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, pp 135–140
- 21 See entry by E-S Bauer and G Baeder in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1985), cols 584–590, on the *Dialogus*, cols 585–586
- 22 “O reges, reges pudeat vos criminis huius!
Usuras capitis, quas gens maledicta lucratur,
in quo vos ipsos maledictos esse probatis usuratores

... Non propter eos, non propter eorum
 virtutes, quibus expertes sunt, nec ratione
 iusticie, qui subdit eos, sed propter eorum
 argentum vile vel cetera dona vel aurum
 istud fecisti. Tu scis, quod facta nephanda
 sepius intulerant hii Christi fidelibus, et tu
 munera sumpsisti, sed legis preteristi iusticiam crebro",
 E.-S. Bauer, *Frömmigkeit, Gelehrsamkeit und Zeitkritik an der Schwelle der grossen Konzilien. Johannes von Wetzlar und sein Dialogus super Magnificat* Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhiesischen Kirchengeschichte 39 (Mainz: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für mittelhiesische Kirchengeschichte, 1981), pp. 274–276, lines 2084–2087, 2103–2110.

- 23 "... Sed consilliarie nequam
 qui contra cives Pragenses exacuisti
 regem, peniteas nec ultra tam malefidam
 gentem promoveas, ne contra corpus amandum
 Christi tale quid accidat amplius, esurientes
 quo saciat Dominus", *Ibid.*, p. 280, lines 2177–2182.
- 24 P. Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399–1422* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 128–152.
- 25 S. Beckwith, *Christ's Body: Identity, Culture, and Society in Late Medieval Writings* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- 26 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400–c. 1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), esp. pp. 91–130.
- 27 D. Aers, "Altars of Power: Reflections on Eamon Duffy's *The Stripping of the Altars*", *Literature and History* third ser. 3 (Autumn, 1994), pp. 90–105; and the following exchange in *Literature and History* third ser. 4 (Spring, 1995), pp. 86–88 (Duffy), p. 89 (Aers).
- 28 R. W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London: Hambledon Press, 1987).
- 29 This work is yet to be published; he has also written some reminiscences in S. Greenblatt, "Miracles", *The Threepenny Review* Vol. 69 (Spring, 1997), p. 34.
- 30 D. Mamet, *Passover* (London: HarperCollins, 1995).



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.