

An Elusive Minimal Pair: Taste and Caste in Inquisitorial La Mancha

Madera Allan
Lawrence University

The rich and varied laws governing Jewish consumption have long served to strengthen the bonds of a diasporic community. On the Iberian Peninsula, they have helped foster community not only among Jews, but also among their Christian neighbors, by segregating diners at mealtime. After massive forced baptisms at the end of the fourteenth century blurred the line between these two religious communities, taste continued to play a role in uniting spiritually affine diners. However, its ability to distinguish became far more dubious: while communities of Crypto-Jews used food tactically to maintain difference, founding underground foodways in the process, New Christians often consumed Jewish foods without spiritual intent. When, a century after the first wave of conversions, Ferdinand and Isabel tasked the Spanish Inquisition with reconstituting the dividing line between Christian and Jewish subjects, the thus charged agents nevertheless turned to diet in their search for evidence of religious identity. Jewish food law provided the Spanish Inquisition with religiously charged practices that it utilized in its search for incomplete and inauthentic converts. Adherents to Mosaic Law were subject to dietary regulations with observable manifestations. Ready access to Jewish texts and scholars convinced the inquisitors that they understood the practices without interrogating the accused. Rather than uncover systems of belief, they sought to expose the physical manifestations of already elucidated beliefs. This, however, proved problematic, since large populations of Conversos engaged in practices that had long been divorced from their religious origins. The trial of Juan González Pintado, a Converso courtier from Ciudad Real, illustrates how the inquisitorial emphasis on practice collapsed religious and cultural difference and, consequently, conflated taste and caste.

Kashrut and Iberian Communities of Taste

The books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy contain a plethora of laws governing proper living, the interpretation and codification of which have produced the intricate stipulations of kashrut, or dietary law. Attempts to rationalize the laws—something that factions of Jewish scholars from every era have decried as *a priori* impossible—have run the gamut from symbolic to ethical to medical; according to some, the laws are an arbitrary test of obedience. The latter base their claim on the fact that, while many of the proposed rationales are intriguing, they all ultimately fail to account for the complexity and diversity of the laws. Hygiene is both the oldest explanation and the one most vociferously derided by otherwise inclined thinkers, like the “medieval authority” that Cooper cites as saying that “the dietary laws are not... motivated by therapeutic considerations, God forbid! Were it so, the Torah would be denigrated to the status of minor medical treatise and worse” (Wenham 6; Cooper 18). Maimonides was a proponent of the hygienic argument, but considered it incomplete, asserting that the laws served an ultimately ethical function: “train[ing] us in the mastery of our appetites” (Cooper 18). He, like myriad others, recognized that the rigor demanded of practicants has tangible consequences for those who submit to it.

Gitlitz dubbed the process of keeping kosher “a kind of mantra, a series of infinitely repeated tasks that focus the attention of men and women on their Jewishness” (*Secrecy* 531). The onerous demands of kashrut serve as a constant reminder to Jews of who they are: people with a special relationship to God and members of a community of similarly constrained diners. The

corollary of Jewishness, of course, is non-Gentileness. Indeed, some scholars argue that distinction is the primary purpose of the food laws—that they are principally a means of preventing social adulteration. Gordon Wenham builds on Mary Douglas’s structuralist argument regarding the food laws, which she reads as a blueprint for purity, to show that the division of animals into clean and unclean symbolically mirrors the separation of man into the elect (Israelites) and the rest (14). He says that, “through this system of symbolic laws Israelites were reminded at every meal of their redemption to be God’s people” (11). Whereas Gitlitz focuses on Jewish identity as a positive term, Wenham emphasizes the role of differentiation—of identification in contrast to a ritually impure other—in the formation of community. He goes on to claim that an exacting and spiritually loaded diet “served... to bring to mind Israel’s responsibilities to be a holy nation” (11). An individual consuming carefully inspected, ritually slaughtered, porged, and cleaned lamb is reminded not only of his or her own identity, but also of the responsibility to be a dutiful citizen of a kosher nation. This reminder is of the utmost importance for a community living under foreign rule.

While the nationalist reading of kashrut is controversial, the segregationist tendencies behind the rabbinic and Talmudic elaboration of the laws are widely recognized. After the destruction of the Temple, with the Jews a permanently nomadic people, quotidian practice became vital to maintaining cultural difference. Cooper demonstrates that, historically, the dietary laws have strengthened along with national sentiment; the desire for concrete cultural difference has consistently resulted in the intensification of dietary regulations. For instance, in 66 CE, as revolt against the Romans festered, the rabbinic School of Shammai forcibly promulgated an, until then, unevenly observed injunction against consuming Gentile goods such as bread and olive oil. Although the eighteen ordinances were justified in terms of hygiene (since Gentile pollution corrupted their products), they clearly also served to sever social and economic ties with the Romans that they would soon attempt to overthrow.

Kashrut effects segregation—and, consequently, culinary allegiance—both symbolically, as Wenham argues, and materially, as per Cooper. Gitlitz also recognizes the community-building effect of the dietary laws, without making any claim to its role in motivating their conception. He emphasizes the social consequences of kosher living and notes the laws’ effectiveness in keeping Jewish and Gentile diners separate at mealtimes, calling them a “bulwark against the eroding influences of assimilation” (*Secrecy* 531-2). By barring Jews from dining with anyone other than their coreligionists, the food laws vigorously demarcate communities of taste. In addition to constituting a powerful discursive impediment to integration, kashrut thereby provides a practical obstacle to social interaction between religious groups.

Christians on the Iberian Peninsula were quick to recognize the effectiveness of Jewish food law as a means of promoting communal integrity and to adapt it to their own purposes (Gitlitz, *Secrecy* 532). By the beginning of the fourth century, wary keepers of the Christian faith were taking measures to protect their flock from Jewish taint. Of course, their similarities to the inquisitors who would take up their charge almost twelve centuries later are somewhat illusory. Whereas the latter were acting from a place of religious dominance to excise an established minority, this early group represented a marginal community in a land populated by competing and overlapping religious groups. Their precepts were concerned primarily with paganism and only rarely mentioned Judaism. Nevertheless, the canons published after the Council of Elvira, sometime between 300 and 324 AD, inveigh against myriad forms of religious intermingling. They attest to contemporary cultural proximity and to the ecclesiastical authorities’ already deep-seated fear of interpenetration. The 49th canon, which prohibits farmers from having their fields

blessed by both a priest and a rabbi, is evidence of a peculiar religious fluidity among the Iberian laypeople in the first decades of the century. The 50th canon—the vaguest and most pertinent of all the regulations set forth by the council—stipulates that any cleric or layperson who “eats with Jews” be “kept from communion as a way of correction” (Williamson 43). No period of atonement is set, which presumably means that an errant diner would be free to eat the body of Christ as soon as he or she ceased consuming the ritually cleansed foods of the Jews. This edict was likely intended to prevent Christians from participating in the ritualistic elements of a Jewish meal, but nevertheless failed to specify which foods, rites, or means of preparation were to be avoided and instead proscribed the most basic form of social intercourse, the shared meal (Gampel 12).

An official policy of culinary segregation was put forth nine centuries later in Title XXIV, Law VIII of the seventh of Alfonso X's *Siete Partidas*, which reads, in part: “Defendemos que ningund christiano, ni christiana non combide a ningund judio, nin judia nin reciba, otrosi combite dellos para comer, nin beber en uno, nin bevan del vino que es fecho por mano dellos” (431). This law was never regularly enforced. Indeed, several of its stipulations were persistently ignored: in many parts of Castile, Jews were the only doctors or pharmacists, which was explicitly forbidden; likewise, Jews often held offices that granted them authority over Christians; and early inquisition cases relied heavily on the testimony of Christian servants who worked in Jewish homes, an officially proscribed arrangement. On the contrary, there is evidence that Jews and Christians were segregated at mealtimes as late as the mid-fifteenth century, when Sancho de Ciudad, the *Rabbi Mayor* of Ciudad Real's Crypto-Jewish community—ate apart from his New Christian cohort, but only because Jewish law requires it (Beinart, *Records* 124). In fact, all of this legislation was redundant from a Jewish perspective: sharing meals with practitioners of other religions had been forbidden since at least the talmudic era. Even before that, it was rendered unfeasible by the elaborate requirements of Mosaic dietary laws. The fact that both Jewish and Christian authorities felt compelled to reiterate food legislation indicates that its implementation was less than universal. On the other hand, their insistence bespeaks the efficacy of mealtime segregation in maintaining religious separation.

Kashrut in the Spanish Inquisition

Still in the early stages of political and cultural consolidation, the Catholic Kings created a tribunal which they vested with the task of identifying—and therefore, of necessity, defining—and excising the Crypto-Jewish community. This was no easy task. The Converso community of post-conversion Spain was comprised of people from diverse social, economic, and religious backgrounds, which is not to say that it had no unifying characteristics. Christian and Jewish relatives, who were divided by faith, although rarely by geography, came together to celebrate weddings and holidays throughout the fifteenth century as they had before 1391 (Gitlitz, “Divided” 2). Jews and Conversos therefore continued to engage in the same activities and share the same meals as their ancestors had. Families of Jewish descent tended to practice endogamous marriage throughout the late medieval and early modern periods, thereby maintaining some internal stability (Contreras 136). In fact, Alonso de Espina counted marriage to first-degree relatives among the twenty-five common heresies of the Crypto-Jews (Beinart, *Conversos* 13). Then again, it seems as though intermarriages between Old and New Christians must have been rampant if we are to trust the claims that almost every noble, cleric, and famous personage of the period—including Tomás de Torquemada, King Ferdinand of Aragón, Christopher Columbus and Espina himself—had Jewish blood, as the *libros verdes* claimed. In the same vein, Fernán Díaz claimed that most of the

powerful families in Castile and Aragón had intermarried with Conversos in a letter dated 1449 (Kamen 32).

In some places, these marriages were banned as part of far-reaching legislation that limited Conversos' opportunities for integration and thereby essentially eliminated the possibility of wholesale assimilation, the Crown's purported goal (Beinart, *Conversos* 36-7). The close family units that resulted from internal and external invectives against marriage to Old Christians meant that Conversos were likely to inherit Jewish practices as mere habit, if not as purposeful religious ritual. St. Vincent Ferrer recognized as much in 1411, when he said that no convert would become a good Christian if he maintained contact with Jews (Nirenberg, "Mass" 11). This, of course, was also the pretext for expelling the Jews eight decades later. Fifteenth century Iberian Conversos' primary socialization took place in an environment that inculcated in them a set of dispositions, some of which were culinary, that would forever mark them as outsiders to those who sought evidence of their exceptionality.

Several contemporaries argued that the Jewish practices of the Conversos were a matter of culture rather than faith. In a letter to the Archbishop of Toledo, Queen Isabel's secretary, Hernando del Pulgar, explained that tens of thousands of Conversas, in particular, never left their parents' homes and, consequently, replicated practices ignorantly; he advocated education rather than persecution as the road to authentic conversion (Beinart, *Records* 38). It is unclear whether his detractors disbelieved his argument—that Conversos were eminently convertible, but thus far imperfectly converted—or if they recognized its validity, but nevertheless sought to eliminate the reviled community by means other than assimilation. In lieu of instruction, the crown offered publicly proclaimed lists of heresies that converts might unknowingly commit. During the first decades of the tribunal's operation, the inquisitors would publish an Edict of Grace upon arrival in a new locale, which enumerated heretical practices and announced a set period during which sinners could confess their participation in the proscribed activities, repent, and be reconciled to the Church. Regardless of their own proclivities, and of whether or not they had need to confess, citizens were enjoined to denounce anyone whom they suspected of engaging in the enumerated activities. Possible heresies included preparing Sabbath dinners on Friday, cleaning, defatting, or deveining meat, and avoiding such foods as "pork, hare, rabbit, strangled birds, conger-eel, cuttlefish... eels or other scaleless fish" (Gitlitz, *Drizzle* 4). Anyone privy to suspicious dietary habits was expected to denounce errant diners, whose transgressions ranged from piously avoiding shellfish to cleaning meat over assiduously.

Although some defendants seem to have been devout Jews, there were others, like González Pintado, who show every sign of having being pious Christians, and some, like Juan de Chinchilla, who were religiously ambivalent. Generations of scholars have argued over the Conversos' religiosity: Beinart, Yitzhak Baer, Carl Gebhart, Israel Révah, and others see the Conversos as fundamentally Jewish, while scholars such as Ellis Rivkin, Antonio José Sataiva, Norman Roth, Benzion Netanyahu, and H.P. Salomon reject the inquisitors' findings and consider the defendants Christian (Graizbord 35-6). In the last decade, several scholars, including Yirmiyahu Yovel and Norman Toby Simms, have argued that the Marranos were neither Christian nor Jew—a position stated as early as the 1930s by Cecil Roth—and that their social and spiritual indeterminacy was uniquely modern. Regardless of their ultimately unknowable faith, the defendants, whose gustatory proclivities barred them from participation in the nascent community, offered subtle and varied rhetorical responses to the inquisitorial charge.

Inquisition testimony is, of course, a problematic scholarly source: while Carlo Ginzburg has called inquisitorial records a "goldmine," Netanyahu dismisses them as propagandistic fictions

in service of the Spanish Crown. Moshe Lazar refuted this view, astutely pointing out that the trial records were not intended for public consumption; in fact, no one outside the Spanish Church had access to them until after Napoleon ended the Inquisition in 1834 (Henningesen 54-78). The records cannot tell us with any certainty whether or not those called to confess were Judaizers, since all of the parties involved in their production had a vested interest in lying: the defendants, whether to protect themselves by denying the charges or to confess and garner more lenient treatment; the witnesses, who risked punishment if their testimony was deemed incomplete; and, of course, the prosecutors who sought conviction. Nevertheless, the trial records do provide insight into the tribunal's operations. Furthermore, the complete records of the Ciudad Real Tribunal, meticulously collected and edited by Beinart, offer a panoramic view of the defensive positions taken by the city's Conversos. While the testimony must be regarded cautiously as the recording of coerced and censored discourse, it is indeed a goldmine of information about the power struggles played out in the process of constructing a communal culinary identity.

The Conversos of Ciudad Real

One hundred years before Ferdinand and Isabel issued the decree of expulsion, the Sephardic Jewry was riven by violence. Beginning in Seville in June of 1391, a pogrom rapidly engulfed the peninsula. Tens of thousands of Jews were killed and at least as many forcibly baptized. In several small cities, like Ciudad Real, the Jewish population ceased to exist virtually overnight. The 150 year old city went from housing three distinct religious communities to being exclusively, though far from uniformly, Christian and Muslim in a matter of years, perhaps in a matter of days (Beinart, *Records* 51). In so doing, it prefigured the fate of all of Castile and Aragon where, a century later, Jews would be forced to choose apostasy or expulsion (Kamen 20). Prior to the forced baptisms, the city had been home to a "typical" Jewish community "of medium size, organized as befitted a Spanish Jewish community in those days" (Beinart, *Conversos* 49). It is unclear whether the entire community converted under duress during the gruesome riots that swept the peninsula or if some Jews survived untouched by chrism only to convert in response to the rigorous anti-Jewish legislation of the early fifteenth century (Lea 107; Beinart, *Records* 51). No community remained in 1412, when the Jewish cemetery was gifted to one of the Queen's supporters (Beinart, *Records* 52).

At the time, La Mancha was still very much a borderland—between Castile and Andalusia on one axis and Castile and Portugal on the other—where power relations were being negotiated. Ciudad Real, the region's principal town during the late medieval period, had always been mired in power struggles. It was founded by Alfonso X to check the influence of the Order of Calatrava. During the fifteenth century, the city was beset by revolt: most famously by the Converso-backed rebellion against Ferdinand and Isabel during the civil war, but also by several anti-Converso riots emanating from nearby Toledo. In 1449, attempts by Converso tax farmers in Toledo to collect a sum levied by Alvaro de Luna for border defense incited a riot. Those responsible for the violence wrote the *Sentencia-Estatuto*, a decree declaring Conversos ineligible to hold public office on account of their dubious religious affiliation (Lea 126). The Converso town leadership of nearby Ciudad Real, led by the *alcalde*, *bachiller* Rodrigo, and Juan González, sought to protect their interests and forestall the spread of the hostile legislation by banding together to announce their opposition to the bill. When a commander from the Order of Calatrava was dispatched to maintain peace in the city (or possibly, as H.C. Lea suggests, to defend the Order's claim to it), he was killed in a skirmish outside the gates. His death prompted mass violence. The New and Old Christians

of Ciudad Real fought for two weeks, destroying property and killing 22 people (Beinart, *Records* 55-6). In 1467, another disturbance spread from Toledo, where factions had become ensnared in a vicious contest over their respective rights to the bread from a nearby town called Maqueda (Lea 127). In 1474, the bloodiest anti-Converso riots of the century led to fifteen deaths on the 6th of October alone and another twenty before they petered out at the end of the month.

The brutality of the second half of the century strengthened the community bonds of vulnerable and outraged Conversos. Henry Kamen contends that, while prejudice sometimes drove New Christians to embrace their ancestral religion, “there was not, in the late 1470s, any proven or significant Judaizing movement among the conversos” (40). But the evidence from Ciudad Real indicates that conditions under Enrique IV had strengthened Crypto-Jewish religious sentiment in certain segments of the community. Numerous witnesses testified that, in the decades preceding the establishment of the Inquisition, Conversas gathered to bathe together in cold water on Friday afternoons after cleaning and preparing Sabbath meals; later that evening and the next day, they congregated in the houses of pious Crypto-Jews like Sancho de Ciudad to read prayers and share in kosher repasts (Beinart, *Records* 53).

The rigorous elaboration of suitable meals served as social glue for the city’s clandestine Judaizing community. Keeping kosher meant gaining access to meat that was ritually slaughtered and, for one week a year, bread without leaven. In a city without a Jewish population, like Ciudad Real, this meant participating in underground foodways. According to the town butcher and frequent inquisition witness, Rodrigo de los Oliuos, Sancho de Ciudad sold “*carneros en pie a los conversos desta çiudad*” (Beinart, *Records* 21). The animals that Ciudad provided were slaughtered by several Converso *shohetim*—a somewhat problematic designation, given that these men were unlikely to have been trained and tested by integral Jews, as ritual slaughterers ought to be—including Juan Panpan and Garcia Baruas (Beinart, *Records* 21). These two, along with the unfortunately named “*el Podrido*” were the city’s principal slaughterers. In María Díaz’ trial, a fellow Converso testified that:

Este testigo fue por su mandado... a casa de Pero Gomes, platero, por carne para ellas, disiendo que les diese de la carne que el sabia e non de la que el hasia; e que des que alli non la tenian, que le enbiaua a casa de otro que se llamaua Panpan, e que si en casa de aquellos non les hallase carne, que las llevase pescado (Beinart, *Records* 56).

But other testimony reveals that Díaz did not give up on meat so easily: she also got it from Pero Franco, Alfonso Garçia de los Oliuos, Juan Martines de los Oliuos and, after her other purveyors died, Juan de Torres, her son-in-law (Beinart, *Records* 55; 53).

Most households in medieval Spain did not have ovens, which were both costly and hazardous in the close-packed wooden homes of the era. Instead, women paid to use communal ovens. While Crypto-Jews were far less secretive before the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, they tended not to flaunt their religious observance, for fear of popular ire. This meant that women who wanted to bake matzo had to find sympathetic ovens. María González, for instance, baked hers in an oven owned by Diego Gonsales (Beinart, *Records* 482-3). Díaz, on the other hand, was wealthy enough to have an oven at home, where, as a former servant testified, she cooked *pan çençeño* for Passover (Beinart, *Records* 54). This woman, who was the spiritual leader of the Ciudad Real *Conversas*, likely allowed many of her coreligionists access to the oven, thereby physically enabling an impromptu community of bakers.

The Trial of Juan González Pintado

The Ciudad Real Tribunal of the Spanish Inquisition was a short-lived institution: established in 1483, it was transferred to Toledo in 1485. In his introduction to the collected trial documents from the tribunal, Beinart offers a number of possible explanations for the early establishment of the court in this decidedly peripheral city. He suggests, for instance, that the temporary court served to pave the way for entrance into the Jewish stronghold of Toledo by simultaneously preparing public opinion and obviating the need for Papal permission to establish a court in the more influential neighboring city. However, Beinart insists that the choice of location was at least as political as it was pragmatic (Beinart, *Conversos* xiii). The Conversos of Ciudad Real had risen up against the Catholic Kings in support of their rivals nine years earlier and retribution seems to have motivated the choice not only of locale, but also of early victims, most of who were important civic figures with ties to the aristocracy. The first couple tried, *in absentia*, were Sancho de Ciudad and his wife, María Díaz, who were burnt in effigy after having been found guilty of apostasy. This couple, like most of the early defendants, were wealthy, powerful, and politically connected. They also seem to have been observant Jews. Their piety notwithstanding, an examination of the court records from the Ciudad Real Tribunal reveals a homogenizing impulse that is at least as cultural and political as it is spiritual. In the first slate of trials, there are numerous defendants who seem innocent of the charge of Judaizing, but none more so than Juan González Pintado.

González Pintado was born, probably in Ciudad Real, around the year 1416. At thirteen, he departed for the court under the tutelage of Fernán Díaz de Toledo. He grew up in the raucous environment that surrounded the young monarch, Juan II of Castile, who, although only eleven years his senior, had been king for twenty-three years by the time that González Pintado reached his itinerant court in 1429. He remained at court for forty years: twenty-five under Juan II and another fifteen under his son, Enrique IV, who was only four years old when González Pintado arrived. Both kings employed him as secretary. During twenty-eight of his forty years at court, González Pintado lived with one of the most influential legal scholars of the fifteenth-century, Díaz de Toledo, who held a series of prestigious posts under Juan II, including: royal secretary, *escribano de cámara*, *relator*, refendary, judge of appeals and *notario mayor de los privilegios rodados* (Round 174-75). He was so deeply immersed in daily governance that, by the time that González Pintado joined his household, Díaz de Toledo personally ratified virtually every royal document (Round 20). He had intimate dealings with both the king and Alvaro de Luna—the latter's favors being responsible for his early success—and served as a liaison between the two men during Luna's exile in the early forties. Later, when Juan II turned on his life-long favorite, it was Díaz de Toledo whose counsel he sought. The *Relator* crafted the legal documents and public announcements that would facilitate the ruin of his one-time patron and friend, Luna. He traveled everywhere with the king during the entire ordeal, and so must have his pupils (Round 137). Díaz de Toledo was an erudite tutor to a number of pupils including his sons, González Pintado, and, most likely, Hernando del Pulgar, who lived with him and studied penmanship, orthography, legal composition, and Latin (Nader 141). His household has been called "one of the most influential intellectual schools of Spain" and a "legal academy" of high repute (Nader 176; Round 176).

On November 29, 1483, González Pintado was arraigned on charges of having refused to eat an improperly killed chicken, allowing others to cook foods on Friday that he consumed Saturday, eating eggs and meat during Lent, and buying and porging meat that had been ritually slaughtered from Alfonso de Ferrera (94). The records from his trial chronicle two acts of violence

perpetrated in the midst of the frenzied fight to define a Spanish community of taste: one carried out by the inquisitors, who sent a man to his death; the other by the defendant, who, in adopting the inquisitorial position on the legibility of food, committed symbolic violence against the entire Converso community. González Pintado's testimony betrays the same disingenuous rhetoric regarding an emergent religiously pure, class transcendent community that can be found in the newly minted rhetorical alliance between the crown and the Castilian Third Estate. Throughout the trial, he argues that he is the logical converse of a Crypto-Jew on the basis of dietary evidence and, in so doing, strengthens the inquisitorial claim to knowledge. He implicitly grants the tribunal the right to define a community of taste according to the contentious terms that it has chosen, but does so in a subtle attempt to expand the parameters of the community and thereby create a culinary space for himself and the larger Catholic Converso populace.

Given his close relationship with Díaz de Toledo, it is likely that González Pintado dined with Juan II, who was always in the company of the *Relator* and a phalanx of junior secretaries, Alvaro de Luna, and many other powerful nobles, scholars, and clerics at court (Round 120). He also, and on this point he is extremely insistent, took all of his meals in the presence of numerous servants. The list of questions prepared for the defense witnesses in his trial leads with the following:

Sy saben... que el dicho mi parte estouo en las cortes de los señores Reyes Don Iohan e Don Enrique... e que en los dichos tienpos que el asy biuio con los dichos señores touo criados e familiares, con los quales juntamente, syn faser diferençia, comia de todos los pescados, carnes e caças, asy de los vedados comer en la Ley de Muysen como de otros qualesquier... como otro qualquier catolico christiano comia (Beinart, *Records* 101).

The primary object of the verb “*faser diferençia*” is food. More specifically, González Pintado claims that he did not differentiate between kosher and non-kosher foods. His statement of defense—in which he specifies that he habitually ate rabbit, bacon, partridge (without regard for how it was killed), eel, lamprey, shrimp, octopus, and conger-eel—makes it clear that González Pintado is well versed in Jewish food law. He avers here that, while he recognizes the separate categories into which these many foods, not just the ubiquitous pork products of court poetry, belong, he confounds them vehemently at his own shared table.

However, the quirky syntax of the sentence (“con los quales juntamente, syn faser diferençia, comia”) results in the verb acquiring an alternate object: his servants and dependents. González Pintado is careful to emphasize that not only did he eat forbidden foods, he did so at the same table as his servants. Jewish religious doctrine, secular laws in most municipalities, and Catholic canon law all inveighed against Jews and Christians sharing meals. Likewise, the requirements of keeping kosher sufficed to bar anyone so inclined from consuming gentile meals. Consequently, evidence of having partaken of a Christian meal was in itself evidence of transgression of Mosaic Law. It is, therefore, not surprising that González Pintado chose to emphasize his long history of semi-public ingestion of *treif* foods. What is noteworthy is that, rather than seek witnesses who could recall meals shared with the Kings Juan II and Enrique IV—Queen Isabel's father and half-brother—he chose to speak, and to ask that others speak, of the repasts enjoyed with the help.

González Pintado is insistent on this point. In his statement of defense, he declares unambiguously that he ate all sorts of *treif* meat and fish, but also that the foods were prepared “para mi con mis syrvientes <e> familiares”—not for me *by* my servants, but for me *with* my

servants (97). He does not shy away from pointing out his royal connections: he invokes the *Relator* and former monarchs, *que santa gloria ayan*, at the beginning of each segment (statement, questions, confession) of his defense. But, when it comes to food, he emphasizes his religiously pure, class-heterogeneous meals. In this regard, he fails to practice the distinction proper to his station. As a result, he mimics the democratizing impulse behind the attempted community of taste envisaged by the inquisitors, who have replaced class with religion as the criterion for distinction. Pierre Bourdieu has shown empirically that taste is shaped by economic class and argued persuasively that his theoretic apparatus explains the operation of distinction universally. Intriguingly, the inquisitorial paradigm identified creed, rather than class, as the determining factor in the formation of taste. Class was certainly a determinant factor in the development of aristocratic tastes in medieval Iberia—sumptuary laws, promulgated repeatedly throughout the middle ages, restricted access to certain foods and wines to the wealthiest members of the ruling classes. A contemporary Valencian romance, *Tirant lo Blanch*, features a Moroccan king who serves the protagonist a variety of sumptuous dishes in order to test his palate, and, thereby, his nobility. Nevertheless, the judges conflated taste and caste. While outside inquisitorial jurisdiction, González Pintado's cultural and economic capital endowed him with privilege, the perversely myopic system of differentiation at play in the trial leaves him in a position of abjection. As a means to accede to a more comfortable standing, he casts himself as usually occupying the same position as his servants in a wild coup that, perhaps only illusorily, grants him access to the same rhetorical position that the inquisitors occupy. In a cunning rhetorical maneuver, he theatrically debases himself and consequently assumes politico-culinary *auctoritas*.

From his carefully crafted rhetorical space, he announces his own vision of the appropriate Spanish community of taste, in which religious distinction is recognized in transgression, but there is room for cultural culinary diversity. When the tribunal arrived in Ciudad Real, González Pintado was among the first to voluntarily testify. He did not confess personal transgressions, but rather used the opportunity to explain certain suspicious acts and denounce Judaizing acquaintances, including Sancho de Ciudad, who, he claimed, persistently refused to share meals with him and other devout Conversos. Then, as later, he divided Catholic and Crypto-Jewish Conversos on the basis of diet.

González Pintado, of course, belonged firmly in the former category. In his statement of defense, he describes savoring:

Todas carnes, asy frescas como de montes, conejos, toçino, tasajos, liebres, perdises, quier que fuesen muertas o biuas, e otras aves de qualesquier otras raleas que fuesen, e de todos pescados, anguila, lanpreas, camarones, tollo e pulpo e congrio (97).

His elaborate assertion uses the inquisitors' stipulations to prove his innocence: if a Judaizer is someone who maintains a kosher lifestyle—avoiding shellfish, pork, strangled birds, scaleless fish, and unceremoniously killed meat—then González Pintado is, in all dietary regards, the converse of a Judaizer. His logic is infallible. The tribunal's opening sermon and the Edict of Grace defined apostates as baptized Christians who either engage in specific proscribed activities or fail to engage in such activities as eating "*lanpreas*" (97). He neither sins nor shies away from transgressing Jewish law.

Numerous witnesses confirmed González Pintado's account of culinary piety. Unlike the scores of Conversos whose servants maliciously denounced their former masters, several members of González Pintado's household testified on his behalf. Pedro de Arevalo said that his employer: "comia de todas viandas," "de todo comia como otro cualquier christiano viejo comia e devia

comer,” and “comia toçino” (Beinart, *Records* 104-5). In addition to testifying that González Pintado ordered him to cook on Saturdays, Juan de Pedrosa swore that he personally “traya de comer e lo guisaba para el e que syenpre dixo que traya las viandas de la plaça e de la carniçeria... [y] traya tosino e todas las cosas que devian comer, como verdadero christiano” (Beinart, *Records* 106). A butcher named Alonso Garçia testified that, “el dicho Juan Gonçales comia de todas las viandas e caças” and that he personally “comio con el dicho Juan Gonçales muchas vezes,” while a fish-monger named Mateo Sanches affirmed that the defendant “comia de todas viandas” and “este testigo... le vendio anguilas del rio asas veses,e... gelas vido comer” (Beinart, *Records* 108-9). Likewise, neighbors, friends, and two different priests testified that González Pintado habitually transgressed Jewish law.

In spite of his evident disregard for halakhah, González Pintado did display certain suspicious tendencies. For instance, a prosecution witness claimed that, “de que trayan carne de la carneçeria, que la desensevaban e purghaban todo” (Beinart, *Records* 115). He openly admits that he ordered his servants to clean the meat that they bought at the market. His ninth question, out of the twelve crafted to exculpate him, asks his witnesses to verify that, “mandaua... que lauasen la carne que se traya de las dichas carneçerias porque venia ensangrentada e susia... non a fin ni cabsa de judaysar” (Beinart, *Records* 101). No one offers a satisfactory answer. Overly eager to guard his master from suspicion, Pedrosa asserts that “suçio o linpio, qual este testigo gelo guisava, que tal lo comia el dicho Juan Gonçales” (Beinart, *Records* 107). Everyone else passes over the question in silence. It is a difficult matter to speak on: removing blood from meat is part of the kashering process and no one can know with certainty what motivated the Regidor. For his own part, González Pintado attributes his assiduousness to having been “curial e linpiamente criado en las dichas cortes” (Beinart, *Records* 101).

Although González Pintado’s defense generally echoes inquisitorial rhetoric, he disagrees on the matter of taste. By confessing that he preferred well cleaned meat at the same time that he recounts eating “de todos e cualesquier manjares, asy de carne como de pescado, que todo qualquier fiel catolico christiano come” he implies that the judges ought to distinguish between religiously and culturally marked foods (Beinart, *Records* 118). The two categories were regularly collapsed in polemical writings. For instance, in a poem from 1470, Rodrigo Manrique, the Count of Paredes, accuses Juan Poeta of “converting” a series of religious objects merely by coming into contact with them: a Papal bull becomes a Talmudic text, a church becomes a synagogue, a bust of the Virgin becomes a Torah, a communion cup *wants* to become a knife to cut off a little more of the poet’s foreskin, a paten becomes a casserole full of eggplant and a consecrated altar a bowl of *adafina*. The poet goes on, but the pattern does not vary substantially. Catholic sacred items turn into either Jewish religious objects or food. Although the poet treats all of these entities as if they pertained to the same category, they do not. Eggplant, while ubiquitous in ribald court poetry, has no ritual significance. Nevertheless, it was strongly associated with Jewish culture in the medieval and early modern periods. It is also a key ingredient in several typical Spanish dishes. Adafina is a casserole, usually made with chickpeas, spices, and lamb. Sephardic Jews prepared it on Friday afternoons and kept it on coals overnight, so that they could celebrate the Sabbath with a warm meal without working or lighting fires. Its origin is, therefore, markedly Jewish. On the other hand, a dish very much like it survives as the contemporary *cocido*—essentially *adafina* with pork. That dish attests to the shared culinary culture of medieval Spain and the lasting Jewish influence on Spanish gastronomy. It also belies the presumptive distinction between the Jewish and Christian communities of taste.

González Pintado not only recognized the religious ambiguity of dishes like *adafina*, he exploited it and implicitly urged the inquisitors to follow suit. He characterized his table as a gathering place for “onbres de muchas naçiones, asi vizcaynos como de otros” and a breeding ground for faithful converts (Beinart, *Records* 118). Among the *otros* were several suspected Judaizers, including his own wife. A woman who had served in Beatris Gonçales’s neighbor’s house claimed that “de casa de Juan Gonçales Pintado le trayan el viernes guisado para que comiese el sabado” (Beinart, *Records* 113). He never denies having sent food to his wife’s relative, nor having done so on a typically Jewish calendar. However, he contends that, on Friday afternoons, he sent her “algunos panesillos de camarones”: non-kosher foods (Beinart, *Records* 98). He participated in Converso kinship networks in a manner that allowed him to induce others to transgress Jewish food law. This claim reverses the direction of influence in the scheme presented by both Manrique and the inquisitors. While the former emphasize the threat of Jewish contagion, González Pintado portrays his own virtuous eating habits as infectious.

Because the inquisitors relied exclusively on practice, rather than intent, in determining guilt, they condemned hybrid subjects whose culinary practices belied the binary they sought to impose. When Pedrosa affirms that his master “comia de todas las viandas sin empacho alguno,” he indicates both that his master ate everything without complaint and that he was physically able to eat non-kosher foods. (106). David Nirenberg has argued that anti-Semitism as a form of racial (as opposed to religious) discrimination emerged in the fifteenth century, after the messianic hopes behind the forced conversions of 1391 proved fruitless (“Enmity” 137; “Figures” 400; “Mass” 6). He shows that by mid-century people were perplexed by the new category of citizens who were formally part of the body of Christ, but were nevertheless seemingly outside it. He shows how lineage stepped in to explain what religious categories failed to account for. At that point, Conversos acquired a character—an assumed set of attributes—that competed with that of their unbaptized kin as a counterpoint to the true Spain of their Old Christian compatriots. The traits that this polymorphous population assumed were, of course, manifold and contradictory. Nevertheless, certain behaviors, including pork avoidance, became definitively associated with Conversos. While González Pintado, and similarly inclined thinkers, would argue that Conversos often disliked pork because they had not acquired a taste for it, early proponents of genealogical—or proto-racial—explanations attributed the “empacho” that kept Conversos from consuming bacon to inborn difference. By prosecuting people on the basis of their dietary dispositions, the Spanish Inquisition inadvertently allied itself with the latter group.

By relying on evidence of culinary practices to identify Crypto-Jews, inquisitorial agents in the late fifteenth century attempted the violent enforcement of an imagined community of taste. González Pintado accepted the imposed structure and sought only to influence its parameters. He presents himself as an ally in the struggle to assimilate Conversos, whose efficacy derives from his piety and his Converso (not Jewish) habits. In spite of the preponderance of exculpatory evidence in his trial, he was found guilty. On the 23rd of February, 1484, after months of incarceration, González Pintado confessed to all of the charges against him. Because the judges deemed him unrepentant, claiming that he confessed only to “huyr la pena,” he was judged a heretic and apostate, excommunicated, and relaxed to the secular arm, so that he could be executed (130).

Works Cited

- Alfonso X. "Las siete partidas." *Los Codigos Españoles Concordados Y Anotados*, Madrid: Imprenta de La Publicidad, 1848.
- Beinart, Haim. *Conversos on Trial: The Inquisition in Ciudad Real*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1981.
- , ed. *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Ciudad Real*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1977.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Richard Nice trans. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Contreras, Jaime. "Family and Patronage." In *Cultural Encounters: The Impact of the Inquisition in Spain and the New World*. Mary Elizabeth Perry and Anne J. Cruz eds. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Cooper, John. *Eat and Be Satisfied: a Social History of Jewish Food*. New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1994.
- Gampel, Benjamin R. "Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Medieval Iberia: *Convivencia* through the Eyes of Sephardic Jews." In *Convivencia: Jews, Muslims, and Christians in Medieval Spain*. Vivian B. Mann, Thomas F. Glick, and Jerrilynn D. Dodds eds. New York, NY: George Braziller Inc., 2007.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*. John and Anne Tedeschi trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Gitlitz, David M. and Linda K. Davidson. *A Drizzle of Honey: The Lives and Recipes of Spain's Secret Jews*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Gitlitz, David M. *Secrecy and Deceit: The Religion of the Crypto-Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- . "Divided Families in Converso Spain." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 11.3 (1993): 1-19.
- Graizbord, David. "Religion and Ethnicity Among 'Men of the Nation': Toward a Realistic Interpretation." *Jewish Social Studies* 15.1 (2008): 32-65.
- Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Lazar, Moshe and Stephen Haliczer eds. *The Jews of Spain and the Expulsion of 1492*. Lancaster: Labyrinthos, 1997.
- Lea, Henry Charles. *A History of the Inquisition of Spain*. 4 vols. New York: MacMillan, 1906.
- Manrique, Rodrigo. "Coplas del Conde de Paredes a Juan Poeta en una perdonança en Valencia." In *Cancionero de obras de burlas provocantes a risa*. Frank Dominguez ed. Valencia, Spain: Albatros, 1978.
- Martorell, Joanot and Martí Joan de Galba. *Tirant lo blanc*. Trans. David H. Rosenthal. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
- Melammed, Renée Levine. *A Question of Identity: Iberian Conversos in Historical Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Nader, Helen. *The Mendoza Family in the Spanish Renaissance, 1350-1550*. Piscataway, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979.
- Netanyahu, Benzion. *The Marranos of Spain: From the Late 14th to the Early 16th Century*. New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966.

- Nirenberg, David. "Enmity and Assimilation: Jews, Christians, and Converts in Medieval Spain," *Common Knowledge* 9:1. Duke University Press, 2003. 137-55
- . "Figures of Thought and Figures of Flesh: 'Jews' and 'Judaism' in Late Medieval Spanish Poetry and Politics." *Speculum* 81.2 (2006): 398-426.
- . "Mass Conversion and Genealogical Mentalities: Jews and Christians in Fifteenth-Century Spain." *Past and Present* 174 (2002): 3-41.
- Roth, Cecil. *A History of the Marranos*. 2nd rev. ed. Philadelphia: Meridian Books, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959.
- Round, Nicholas. *The Greatest Man Uncrowned: A Study of the Fall of Don Alvaro de Luna*. London: Tamesis, 1986.
- Simms, Norman Toby. *Masks in the Mirror: Marranism in Jewish Experience*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, 2005.
- Wenham, Gordon. "The Theology of Unclean Food." *Evangelical Quarterly* 53.1 (1981): 6-15.
- Williamson, Clark M. "Doing Christian Theology With Jews: The Other, Boundaries, Questions." In Roger A. Badham ed. *Introduction to Christian Theology: Contemporary North American Perspectives*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Know Press, 1998.
- Yirmiyahu Yovel. *The Other Within: The Marranos: Split Identity and Emerging Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.