

Toledot Yeshu in Context

The Jewish “Life of Jesus” in Ancient,
Medieval, and Modern History

Edited by

Daniel Barbu and Yaacov Deutsch

Mohr Siebeck

Daniel Barbu, born 1981, is a Researcher at the French National Centre for Scientific Research, Paris-Sciences-et-Lettres Research University, Laboratoire d'études sur les monothéismes (UMR 8584).

orcid.org/0000-0003-2137-4186

Yaacov Deutsch, born 1966, is the head of the History Department at David Yellin College and also teaches at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

orcid.org/0000-0003-1403-102X

ISBN 978-3-16-159300-0 / eISBN 978-3-16-159301-7

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159301-7

ISSN 0721-8753 / eISSN 2568-9525 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	V
DANIEL BARBU and YAACOV DEUTSCH	
Introduction: Reading <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> in Context	1
WILLIAM HORBURY	
Titles and Origins of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i>	13
DANIEL STÖKL BEN EZRA	
On Some Early Traditions in <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> and the Antiquity of the “Helena” Recension	43
GAVIN MCDOWELL	
The Alternative Chronology: Dating the Events of the Wagenseil Version of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i>	59
GIDEON BOHAK	
Jesus the Magician in the “Pilate” Recension of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i>	81
SARIT KATTAN GRIBETZ	
The Mothers in the Manuscripts: Gender, Motherhood, and Power in <i>Toledot Yeshu</i>	99
ALEXANDRA CUFFEL	
<i>Toledot Yeshu</i> in the Context of Polemic and Sīra Literature in the Middle East from the Fatimid to the Mamluk Era	131
JONATAN M. BENARROCH	
“A Real Spark of Sama’el”: Kabbalistic Reading(s) of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i>	169
DANIEL BARBU and YANN DAHHAOUI	
The Secret Booklet from Germany: Circulation and Transmission of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> at the Borders of the Empire	187
STEPHEN BURNETT	
Martin Luther, <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> , and “the Rabbis”	219

EVI MICHELS	
Yiddish <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> Manuscripts from the Netherlands	231
CLAUDIA ROSENZWEIG	
The “History of the Life of Jesus” in a Yiddish Manuscript from the Eighteenth Century (Ms. Jerusalem, NLI, Heb. 8° 5622)	263
YONATAN MOSS	
“I Am Not Writing an Apology”: Samuel Krauss’s <i>Das Leben Jesu</i> in Context	317
List of Contributors	341
Index of Citations	343
Index of <i>Toledot Yeshu</i> manuscripts	348
Index of Themes, Names, and Places	352

The Secret Booklet from Germany: Circulation and Transmission of *Toledot Yeshu* at the Borders of the Empire*

DANIEL BARBU and YANN DAHHAOUI

The 1429 prosecution of the Jews of Trévoux – a small city some 30 km north of Lyon, today in the Ain department in eastern France – is not one of the most famous episodes of the Jewish-Christian conflict. It is but a small skirmish in the campaign against the Talmud and other Jewish books in the late Middle Ages. Yet this particular case, for which we possess original documentation, grants us a very close look at the sort of historical accidents that bring *Toledot Yeshu* to the surface, and allows us to discuss the reception, transmission, and circulation of the work in the late medieval context. Indeed, this prosecution against the Jews of Trévoux led to the unexpected discovery of a small “booklet,” whose content directly pertains to the life of Jesus. Most extraordinarily, for us, the prosecutors had the booklet translated; or at least, they chose to include a Middle French text of *Toledot Yeshu* in the records of the prosecution, providing us with an exceptional manuscript witness of that work in a period for which we possess little if any Hebrew (or Aramaic) manuscript evidence.

In what follows, we wish to offer some remarks on the events of 1429 and on the documents pertaining to these events, based on a fresh examination of the manuscript in which they were preserved (Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722). These documents were first described and partly analysed by Isidore Loeb in the late nineteenth century.¹ The manuscript – especially the text of *Toledot Yeshu* – has

* Our very deep thanks go to Romain Cavallero, Jérémy Delmulle, Lore Derail, Yaacov Deutsch, Cristiana Facchini, Yan Greub, Justine Isserles, Franck Mercier, Nicolas Meylan, Franco Morenzoni, Jean-Claude Mühlethaler, Martine Ostorero, Eva Pibiri, Michael Rand, James Adam Redfield, Jean-Pierre Rothschild, Juliette Sibon, and Colette Sirat for the kind and generous help they provided us at the different stages of this research and/or for having read and commented this ensuing text. All remaining shortcomings are, however, strictly ours. An edition and translation of the text of *Toledot Yeshu* preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 has been published along with further comments on the 1429 investigation of the Jews of Trévoux in Daniel Barbu and Yann Dahhaoui, “Un manuscrit français des *Toledot Yeshu*: Le ms. lat. 12722 et l’enquête de 1429 sur les juifs de Trévoux,” *Henoch: Historical and Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Judaism and Christianity* 40 (2018): 223–88.

¹ Isidore Loeb, “Un épisode des juifs de Savoie,” *Revue des études juives* 10 (1885): 32–59; see also idem, “Josef Haccohen et les chroniqueurs juifs (suite et fin),” *Revue des études juives* 17 (1888): 247–71, at 255. More recent studies, by Thomas Bardelle, as well as by Frank Mercier

however attracted little attention ever since.² In the present paper, we will also consider this text, and examine the interest of this textual evidence for the history of *Toledot Yeshu*.

The Events of 1429 and the Jews of Trévoux

On 23 March 1429, thirteen Jews of the town of Trévoux were summoned to the house of the castellan's lieutenant by two commissioners working on behalf of the duchess of Bourbon, Marie of Berry. The Jews were arrested while their houses were searched for suspicious books.³ The two commissioners, Jean Namy, "juge des appeaulx" of Beaujolais, and Jean Chalon (representing Pierre Charpin, the Official of Lyon), along with a Jewish convert, Ayme of Chambéry, and a royal tabellion and juror named Pierre Balarin, had indeed been sent to Trévoux in

and Martine Ostorero, shed light on the historical and political context of the events, as well as on the relation between the 1429 prosecution against the Jews of Trévoux and other such cases in contemporary Savoy. See Thomas Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland: Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in Savoyen-Piemont bis zum Ende der Herrschaft Amadeus VIII.* (Hannover: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1998), in particular 243–307; Martine Ostorero, "Itinéraire d'un inquisiteur gâté: Ponce Feugeyron, les juifs et le sabbat des sorciers," *Médiévales* 43 (2002): 103–17; Frank Mercier and Martine Ostorero, *L'énigme de la Vauderie de Lyon (c. 1429): Enquête sur l'essor de la chasse aux sorcières entre France et Empire (c. 1430–c.1480)* (Florence: Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2015), 199–274. See also Chen Merchavia, "A Spanish-Latin Manuscript on the Fight against the Talmud in the Early 15th Century," *Kiryat Sefer* 45 (1970): 271–86, 590–609 (in Hebrew).

² Loeb's article is not mentioned in Meerson and Schäfer's recent critical edition of *Toledot Yeshu*. See however William Horbury, *A Critical Examination of the Toledoth Jeshu* (PhD diss., Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1971), 6–7; Jean-Pierre Osier, *L'Évangile du Ghetto* (Paris: Berg International, 1984), 10, n. 9; Yaacov Deutsch, "Toledot Yeshu" in *Christian Eyes: Reception and Response to "Toledot Yeshu" in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (MA Thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1997) [in Hebrew], 44. Horbury's observation that (p. 6) "Toledot citations given in [legal] evidence have never been studied systematically, although they are valuable for their firm dating" remains valid. Another illuminating example is provided by Paola Tartakoff, "The *Toledot Yeshu* and the Jewish-Christian Controversy in the Medieval Crown of Aragon," in *Toledot Yeshu ("The Life Story of Jesus") Revisited: A Princeton Conference* (ed. Peter Schäfer, Michael Meerson, and Yaacov Deutsch; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 297–309.

³ A summary of the events – strongly biased by anti-Jewish prejudice – can be found in Guillaume Paradin, *Mémoires de l'histoire de Lyon* (Lyon: Antoine Gryphus, 1573), 245–47, at 245. Paradin's account is the source of Louis Aubret's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Dombes*, written before 1748 but published only in the nineteenth century (ed. M.-C. Guigüe; Trévoux: J.-C. Damour, 1868), vol. 3:528–29. Aubret is himself the source of Jean-François Jolibois, *Histoire de la ville et du canton de Trévoux* (Lyon: Aimé Vingtrinier, 1853), 12–14, whom Loeb had read. The episode is also reported (via Paradin) by A. C. N. de Lateyssonière, *Recherches historiques sur le département de l'Ain* (Bourg: Bottier, 1838–1844), vol. 4:195–96. On Paradin's probable use of the documents preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, see below.

order to investigate the books of the town's Jewish community.⁴ The commissioners, trained clerics in all likelihood, familiar with a (by then) longstanding tradition of anti-Talmudic polemics and trials, certainly knew what they were looking for and where to look for it. Assisted by a "native" informant (Ayme), their mission was to identify, in the Talmud as well as in other Jewish religious books, specific passages concerned with the "idoltrous nations" and, at least in their eyes, likely to be interpreted as hostile references to Christians or Christianity.⁵ The Jews were first interrogated as to whether they used the Talmud.⁶ Through one of their leaders, a certain Peyret, they answered that they had been granted privileges allowing them to use the Talmud. They nonetheless agreed to put all of their books at the disposal of the commissioners, and to be further questioned on their content. The Talmudic writings were set aside and impounded for further examination, while the biblical texts were returned to their owners. The Jews were then released, but were required to remain at the disposal of

⁴ At a later stage of the investigation, the group was supplemented by Jean Roux, ordinary judge of Beaujolais (Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 127r). From 14 April 1429 onward, Croppet, another secretary, worked alongside Ayme of Chambéry. He was responsible for transcribing the blasphemous/heretical conclusions identified in the books of the Jews and translated by Ayme (fol. 122v). In Beaujolais, since the thirteenth century, justice was rendered by the "juge des appeaulx" and the ordinary judge, rather than by a "bailli" or a "sénéchal" as was the case in Bourbonnais and Auvergne; see Olivier Mattéoni, *Servir le prince: les officiers des ducs de Bourbon à la fin du Moyen Âge (1356–1523)* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1998), 149–50. The documents preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 do not allow us to know what prompted the investigation. According to Paradin, *Mémoires de l'histoire de Lyon*, the citizens of Trévoux, "outraged by the infinite and huge superstitions and diabolical stubbornness" of the Jews, had lodged a complaint against them with the archbishop of Lyon and the duchess of Bourbon. For the political entanglements that set the stage of the duchess's action against the Jews, see below.

⁵ That such passages, either in the Talmud or in the liturgy, were indeed read by medieval Jews as pertaining to Christianity was notably argued by Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006). Part of the commissioners' mission was also to identify passages showing "erroneous" theological propositions, e. g. that God consulted the angels before creating man (*b. Sanh.* 38b), or that Ham either castrated Noah, his father, or had sexual intercourse with him (*b. Sanh.* 70a). On the conclusions drawn from the investigation, see below and Loeb, "Un épisode," 38–41.

⁶ On the Talmud as a "heretical" and "blasphemous" work in late medieval Christian thought, see Amos Funkenstein, "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 2 (1971): 373–82; idem, *Perceptions of Jewish History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 189–96; Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982), 51–76; idem, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jews in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999): 317–63; Alexander Patschovsky, "Der 'Talmudjude': Vom mittelalterlichen Ursprung eines neuzeitlichen Themas," in *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters* (ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Franz-Josef Ziwe; Berlin: Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beiheft 13, 1992), 13–28; Yvonne Freedman, "Anti-Talmudic Invective from Peter the Venerable to Nicholas Donin (1144–1244)," in *Le brûlement du Talmud à Paris 1242–1244* (ed. Gilbert Dahan; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 171–89.

the commissioners under threat of heavy fines. The examination of their books lasted until June 1429 (see *Appendix 1*). During that time, representatives of the Trévoux Jewish community were regularly summoned for further interrogations. Peyret, in particular, was interrogated again on 13 April. After admitting to possessing other books than those already confiscated, he was questioned on a series of 116 blasphemous and/or erroneous propositions. A week later, a new search was conducted at Peyret's house, as well as in two other Jewish households and in the "school of the Jews." In May, while the Jews had produced a number of documents in their defence (including the aforementioned privileges), they were summoned again and asked to reply to 159 articles. They strongly contested a number of points raised by the commissioners in their conclusions, including the systematic translation of the word *goyim* into "Christians." Following the examination of the books discovered during the second search, the debates seem to have however suddenly taken a new and unexpected turn. In a short note dated 20 May, the commissioners wrote this cryptic sentence: "Peyret confessed to having written what is beside (*dever*) the booklet (*petit quarnet*) and mentions the passion of Jesus."⁷

The search must indeed have been rewarding, the commissioners having apparently found an original text of *Toledot Yeshu*. On the following day (21 May), a number of Jews were specifically questioned regarding their knowledge of this booklet. Six of them solemnly swore that they knew nothing of it, and that they had never seen nor read it. One claimed to have never seen this story in writing, but to have nonetheless heard something similar on several occasions. Asked if the story referred to the God worshiped by Christians, he, however, answered that it did not.⁸ Interrogated again, Peyret admitted to possessing the booklet for some fifty years, stating that he had it copied by a certain Acquinet, the son of R. Josmant, from Germany, and that he had himself written what was beside (*dever*) it.⁹ He added that, whereas he himself had indeed seen, read, and held the booklet, he had in fact never shown it to anyone.¹⁰ His claim was corroborated by his son, Leonet, who maintained that he had never seen the booklet. He nonetheless admitted having already heard that Jesus was not born of a virgin.¹¹

⁷ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 126v: *Item Peyret a confessé qu'il a escript ce qui est dever le petit quarnet faisant mention de la passion de Jhesus etc.* (All translations are our own unless otherwise stated).

⁸ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 125v: *Sermuel Gabriel ... dit qu'il ne le vist oncques par escript, mais il <dit/sait?> bien qu'il l'a oÿ dire, ainsi qu'il est contenu au quarnet, en plusieurs lieux, tant en Savoye comme ailleurs. Interrogié se il entend que ce soit le dieu que les chrestiens adorent, dit que non.*

⁹ *Ibid.*: *Peyret ... dit qu'il a L ans passés qu'il a le quarnet. L'escript le filz de Rabi Josmant, qui s'appelloit Acquinet et estoit d'Alamagne, et depuis il a escript ce que est dever. Il dit plus qu'il feist escripre ledit quarnet oudit Acquinet.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: *Ne le monstra jamais a nully. Bien est vray qu'il l'a veu, leu et tenu.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*: *Leonet, filz de Peyret, ... dit que jamais il le vist jusques il ly a esté montré par messieurs. Item dit qu'il a oÿ dire que Jessus n'est point yssy de vierge.*

The outcome of the prosecution is difficult to determine. Was there a trial? Where the Jewish books burnt? We simply do not know. A sixteenth-century historiographer addressing the events claimed that, following the prosecution, the Jews were expelled from the city.¹² There is however reason to doubt this claim, as we know that Jews continued to live in Trévoux at least until the last quarter of the fifteenth century.¹³

If there was a ban in 1429, it was only enforced for a short time, as we can see from another dramatic episode, occurring only two years later. In 1431, ten or eleven Jews from Trévoux were taken hostage by a local warlord – François de La Palud – who unsuccessfully tried to seize the city. These Jewish hostages were mistreated, and a few of them died before any ransom could be paid. Still, the names of these hostages partly coincide with those of the Jews arrested in 1429 – including Peyret – confirming that the latter were still (or again) present in Trévoux shortly after the investigation.¹⁴ At any rate, a number of

¹² Paradin bases his assertion on letters patent issued by Amédée VIII in 1429, through which the duke “took under his protection the Jews, who then lived on his lands, except those whose trial had been conducted in Châtillon and in Trévoux, in Dombes, who had been charged with and convicted for heresies and blasphemies” (*Mémoires*, 247). Paradin probably misunderstood the long and intricate vidimus of letters patent (19 February 1429), which is preserved in the very Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 (fol. 105r–108r); see the French summary in Loeb, “Un épisode,” 51–54. Through these letters, the Duke of Savoy mitigated the sentence pronounced by the inquisitor Pons Feugeyron in a trial (1426) against the Jews of Savoy (see below). The duke, however, explicitly excluded from his mitigation the Jews of Bresse, Revermont, Dombes and Valbonne against whom a trial had recently been initiated by his commissioners, the castellan of Miribel and Ayme of Chambéry, and who would be found guilty of having misused their books (fol. 107r: *exceptis tamen et ab hujusmodi quitacione exclusis judeis in patria nostra Breysisie, Reversimontis, Dombarum et Vallisbone degentibus, videlicet pro et super illis in quibus forte reperierunt in usu suorum librorum delinquisse per processum nuper inchoatum per castellanum Mirbelli et magistrum Amedeum de Chamberiaco, neophitum, commissarios nostros*). For some inexplicable reason, the potential exclusion of the Jews living in Dombes from the duke’s mitigation was read by Paradin as a sign that the Jews of Trévoux had been expelled from their town. For his part, Louis Aubret, a later historiographer and a reader of Paradin, suggested that the Jewish books examined in Trévoux were eventually burned and the Jews condemned to a penalty, “as was customary”; see Aubret, *Mémoires*, vol. 2:529, followed by Jolibois, *Histoire*, 13–14. Jewish books were indeed burned in Chambéry (1416–1417), Châtillon-sur-Chalaronne (1417), the baillage of Bresse (1417), and other neighbouring towns in 1416, 1418, and 1426; see below and *Inventaire sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Côte-d’Or. Archives civiles. Série B* (Paris: P. Dupont, 1863–1894), vol. 3:147; with Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 275–76. On Pons Feugeyron’s role in that context, see Ostorero, “Itinéraire d’un inquisiteur gâté.”

¹³ See Samuel Guichenon, *Histoire de la souveraineté de Dombes* (Lyon: Aug. Brun, 1874 [orig. 1662]): 138, who notes that the Bourbons could not bring themselves to expel the Jews, as these were an important source of income. According to Aubret, *Mémoires*, vol. 3:69–70, the city accounts attest to the presence of Jews in Trévoux until 1488, although they had officially been expelled in 1467. See also Lateyssonnière, *Recherches historiques*, vol. 5: 7, 50; Loeb, “Un épisode,” 33.

¹⁴ Guichenon, *Histoire*, 291–94, and the editor’s note, quoting from the original settlement of the case listing the names of the hostages. See also Aubret, *Mémoires*, vol. 2 :533–37, followed

Jews originating from Trévoux also migrated to Piedmont in the early fifteenth century, and took the surname of Trabot, or Trabotti.¹⁵ In particular, one Perez Trabot – on whose relationship to the man mentioned in the records of the 1429 prosecution we can only speculate – authored a Hebrew-Italian glossary in which he referred to his previous tribulations and mentioned the expulsion of the Jews from France in 1394.¹⁶ In one manuscript of that work, Perez “the French” referred to his tribulations, recalling that he had been expelled, imprisoned, and sold as a slave.¹⁷ In his prologue, he encouraged Jewish parents to teach biblical Hebrew to their sons, lest the “heretics” triumph and the youth be led to apostasy. He is also identified as the author of three poetic laments preserved in an Italian fast-day liturgy, hymns that, as Susan Einbinder notes, “give way to images of harassment, book burning, conversionary pressure, and seasonal violence,” documenting “the impulse to commemorate the experience of a specific community.”¹⁸ It is not impossible to think that a similar impulse could have encouraged a member of just such a community to take the pains to copy, read, and maybe teach *Toledot Yeshu*.

The Historical Background(s) of the 1429 Prosecution against the Jews of Trévoux

Before we turn to the records of the 1429 prosecution, the broader historical setting of the events must be described. First, the (already mentioned) expulsion

by Jolibois, *Histoire*, 14–15; Henri Costa de Beauregard, *Souvenirs du règne d'Amédée VIII, premier Duc de Savoie* (Chambéry: Puthod fils, 1859), 78–86; Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 303–4. For the details of the ransom payment, see Gabriel Jeanton, “Les Juifs en Mâconnais,” *Annales de l'Académie de Mâcon*, 3rd series, XX (1916–1917): 369–406, at 396–401. On François de La Palud, see Jacques Paviot, “François de La Palud, seigneur de Varambon. Un encombrant seigneur du XV^e siècle,” in *Hommes, cultures et sociétés à la fin du Moyen Âge: Liber discipulorum en l'honneur de Philippe Contamine* (ed. Patrick Gilli and Jacques Paviot; Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2012), 257–92.

¹⁵ *JE*, s. v. “Trabot (Trabotti)”; Henri Gross, *Gallia Judaica: Dictionnaire géographique de la France d'après les sources rabbiniques* (Paris: Léopold Cerf, 1897), 219–23. See also Susan L. Einbinder, *No Place to Rest: Jewish Literature, Expulsion, and the Memory of Medieval France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 137–57.

¹⁶ Joseph Perles, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien* (Munich: Theodor Ackermann, 1884), 113–30; Adolf Neubauer, in *Revue des études juives* 9 (1884): 152–54, 316; Ernest Renan, “Les écrivains juifs français du XIV^e siècle,” in *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1893 [Nendeld, Liechtenstein: Krauss, 1971]), vol. 31:351–789, at 713–16. The work was published by Moïse Schwab, “Le Maqré Dardeqé,” *Revue des études juives* 16 (1888): 253–68; 17 (1888): 111–24, 285–98; 18 (1889): 108–17.

¹⁷ Adolf Neubauer, “Additions et rectifications,” *Revue des études juives* 9 (1884): 316–17, at 316.

¹⁸ Einbinder, *No Place to Rest*, 139 ff., at 140, 141. The hymns are preserved in Ms. Parma, BP, 1883 (De Rossi 485).

of the Jews from France in 1394 gave way to an important migratory movement of Jews seeking refuge in the neighbouring imperial provinces or in the neighbouring states of Savoy; a movement of individuals, but also a movement of knowledge, traditions, and texts.¹⁹ In that context and maybe as a result of the further expulsion of the Jews from Lyon in 1420, the previously small Jewish community in Trévoux grew to a more substantial size.²⁰ Second, the Western Schism and the division of Western Christendom. That context, in which rival claimants to the papal crown competed for the title of Champion of the Faith, allowed for a new wave of trials and disputations against the Jews.²¹ The Avignon Pope Benedict XIII had long been active in promoting the mission to the Jews, and notably sponsored the disputation of Tortosa in 1413/14.²² Following the disputation, Benedict issued a bull (*Etsi doctor gentium*) condemning the Talmud as a satanic work and forbidding anyone to hear, read, or teach its content.²³ The bull also forbade any Jew to “read, hear, or possess this little book composed in order to insult our Redeemer, which they call *Mace Ihesu*.”²⁴ Benedict’s confessor, who was none other than the Dominican preacher and zealous

¹⁹ On the 1394 expulsion and its aftermath, see Isidore Loeb, *Les expulsions des Juifs de France au XIV^e siècle* (Paris: Durlacher, 1887); Roger Kohn, *Les Juifs de la France du Nord dans la seconde moitié du XIV^e siècle* (Leuven: Peeters, 1988), 251–75; Juliette Sibon, *Chasser les juifs pour régner: Les expulsions par les rois de France au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Perrin, 2016); and the studies gathered in *L’expulsion des juifs de France: 1394* (ed. Elie Nicolas and Gilbert Dahan; Paris: Cerf, 2004).

²⁰ Jolibois, *Histoire*, 11, followed by Loeb, “Un épisode,” 33. See, however, Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 296, n. 266.

²¹ See Salomon Grayzel, “The Talmud and the Medieval Papacy,” in *Essays in Honor of S. B. Freehof* (ed. Walter Jacob et al.; Pittsburg: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1964): 220–45, at 234–35; Simon Schwarzfuchs, “Yohanan Trèves et le dernier refuge de l’école talmudique française après l’expulsion de 1394,” in *L’expulsion des juifs de France* (ed. Nicolas and Dahan), 83–94, at 89. In the wake of the Council of Constance and the burning of Jan Hus the Jews were also accused of conspiring with the Hussites in Austria, leading to the 1420/21 massacres known as the Wiener Geserah. On the Wiener Geserah, see the references in n. 85.

²² On the Tortosa disputation, see Yitzhak Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Skokie, IL: Varda Books, 2001 [1st ed. 1961]), vol. 2: 170–243; Aaron W. Godfrey, “The Tortosa Disputation: A 15th-Century Christian-Jewish Dialogue and Its Aftermath,” in *Old and New in the Fifteenth Century* (ed. Clyde L. Miller; Binghamton, NY: SUNY Press, 1993), 143–52; Heinz Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (13.–20. Jh.)* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1995), 455–81; Samuel Krauss, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy: From the Earliest Times to 1789*, vol. 1 (ed. William Horbury; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 169–76; Francisco A. Roca Traver, “San Vincente Ferrer y los judíos: la ‘disputa’ di Tortosa,” *Boletín de la Sociedad Castellonense de Cultura* LXXXV (2009): 205–28.

²³ Schlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: Documents: 1394–1465* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1989), 593–602 (N° 538).

²⁴ *Ibid.*: *Ceterum, quia dissimulare illius obprobria non debemus, qui probra nostra deluit, statuimus, ut nullus Iudeus de cetero libellum illum, qui apud eos Mace Ihesu nominatur, quique in contumeliam Redemptoris nostris affirmatur compositus, legere, audire aut apud se retinere presumat; quod si contrafecerit, eo ipso tanquam convictus de blasfemia puniatur*. See Riccardo di Segni, *Il vangelo del Ghetto. Le ‘storie di Gesù’: leggende e documenti della tradizione medievale ebraica* (Rome: Newton Compton, 1985), 23.

missionary to the Jews, Vincent Ferrer, was also active in Savoy and Piedmont in the early fifteenth century, illustrating the connections between the two realms in that context.²⁵ Another close relative of Benedict, Andrea de Escobar, visited Savoy in 1416, and may in fact be linked to the campaign undertaken by the newly elevated Duke of Savoy Amédée VIII (and later anti-Pope Felix V) to impeach the Talmud in his lands – a question to which we will return.²⁶ In 1409, the short-lived anti-Pope Alexander V – who, in the words of Solomon Grayzel, was “anxious to prove that he intended to cleanse Christianity more thoroughly than ... his rivals”²⁷ – also attacked the Talmud and other Jewish books accused of “fouling and confusing the hearts of the simple-minded.” He did so in an edict empowering the Franciscan inquisitor Pons Feugeyron to proceed against the Jews of Provence and Avignon.²⁸ Martin V, elected at Constance in 1417, while abrogating a number of restrictive measures promulgated by his predecessors and reissuing the famous *Sicut iudeis* bull in defence of the Jews, nonetheless reiterated Alexander’s commission to the inquisitor Pons Feugeyron just a few months after his election.²⁹ Furthermore, the latter (Pons Feugeyron) soon extended his range of action, taking an active part in another investigation on Jewish books undertaken in Savoy in 1426 (just three years before the Trévoux prosecution), while also becoming a central actor of the early repression of witchcraft in the Alpine area.³⁰ The third significant historical datum we need to

²⁵ See Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 86–89, 108–10, 280; see also M. Gerson, “Notes sur les juifs des États de Savoie,” *Revue des études juives* 8 (1884): 235–42, at 236; Paul-Bernard Hodel, “Sermons de Saint Vincent Ferrer à Estavayer-le-Lac en mars 1404,” *Mémoire dominicaine* 2 (1993): 149–93; Jean-Daniel Morerod, “La maison de Savoie et les juifs en Suisse Romande à la fin du moyen âge,” *Équinoxe* 13 (1995): 65–79, at 76; idem, “Les étapes de Vincent Ferrer dans le diocèse de Lausanne,” in *Mirificus praedicator. À l’occasion du sixième centenaire du passage de saint Vincent Ferrer en Pays romand. Actes du colloque d’Estavayer-le-Lac, 7–9 octobre 2004* (ed. Paul-Bernard Hodel and Franco Morenzi; Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 2006), 257–84.

²⁶ Merchavia, “A Spanish-Latin Manuscript,” 590–91, with Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 267–68, n. 123, and 281, who however doubts that claim. In an anti-Talmudic treatise written in the wake of the disputation of Tortosa, *Tractatus de publicatione heresum sive vanitatum et abusionum contentarum in libris talamud iudeorum*, Andrea de Escobar also reproduced Benedict’s 1415 bull, including the prohibition to hold and teach the book called *Maze Ihesu*; see Merchavia, “A Spanish-Latin Manuscript,” 284, based on Ms. Karlsruhe, Cod. Reichenau, pap. 140, fol. 139r.

²⁷ Grayzel, “The Talmud,” 234.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 235; Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See ... Documents: 1394–1465*, 658–60 (N° 583). On Pons Feugeyron and the Jews, see Ostorero, “Itinéraire d’un inquisiteur gâté.”

²⁹ Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See ... Documents: 1394–1465*, 667–69 (N° 590). The bull is reiterated by Eugene IV in 1435; cf. *ibid.*, 824–27 (N° 705). Following a petition by the Christian community in Avignon, and a complaint lodged by the Jews themselves, Martin V nonetheless sought to limit the inquisitor’s excesses in 1418 and 1421; see *ibid.*, 673–74 (N° 593), 674–77 (N° 594), and 700–3 (N° 610); see also Ostorero, “Itinéraire d’un inquisiteur gâté,” 111.

³⁰ See Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 284–94; Ostorero, “Itinéraire d’un inquisiteur gâté.”

take into account is the elevation by King Sigismund of the states of Savoy to the status of duchy, and the grandiose ambition of Duke Amédée VIII to create a powerful, strictly regulated, and above all, morally superior state.³¹ In part, the duke's imperialist project (possibly encouraged by the fact that the French monarchy was then weakened by its devastating war with England) and the ensuing conflicts at the immediate borders of his lands, provide the proximate context in which the 1429 prosecution against the Jews of Trévoux took place. Indeed, the prosecution, ordered by the duke's neighbour and rival, Marie de Berry, can be seen as a reaction to his centralizing efforts, as well as to his claim to be the rightful defender of the Christian faith.³²

The context of the 1429 prosecution against the Jews of Trévoux is indeed one of ongoing tensions between the duke of Savoy and the duchess of Berry over the ownership of the Dombes territory (culminating in the brief take of Trévoux by one of the duke's liegeman, François de La Palud, in 1431, an episode we already mentioned).³³ The Jews, in that context, probably played an unfortunate role, as symbols of jurisdictional control over a contested area. In the early fifteenth century, Trévoux and the Dombes stood at the border between the kingdom of France, the Bourbon states, and the duchy of Savoy. Technically, the territory was part of the Empire – thus the duke's claim of sovereignty given his title of imperial vicar. The Bourbon family, for its part, claimed suzerainty over these lands, which had been sold to them by the last lord of Villars – a claim that was eventually recognized by the duke's son in 1441.³⁴ It is thus likely that the 1429 prosecution of the Jews was also a way for the duchess of Bourbon to assert her authority over Trévoux; and, for both the duchess and the archbishop of Lyon, a way not to be outdone in the duke's endeavour to present himself as the only protector of Christian orthodoxy in the area.³⁵

³¹ See Rinaldo Comba, "Les *Decreta Sabaudiae* d'Amédée VIII: un projet de société?" in *Amédée VIII–Félix V premier duc de Savoie et pape (1383–1451). Colloque international, Ripaille-Lausanne, 23–26 octobre 1990* (ed. Bernard Andenmatten and Agostino Paravicini Bagliani; Lausanne: Bibliothèque historique vaudoise, 1992), 179–90. The *Statuta Sabaudiae*, promulgated in 1430 in order to unify the dukedom's various law codes, extensively legislated on the status, rights, and obligations of the Jews. See the studies gathered in *La loi du Prince: Les Statuts de Savoie d'Amédée VIII de 1430: Une œuvre législative majeure* (ed. Franco Morenzoni and Mathieu Caesar; Turin: Palazzo Carignano, 2019), and in particular, Mathieu Caesar's contribution to that volume: "Les Juifs et le Prince: entre législation et conflits de juridiction dans le duché de Savoie à la fin du Moyen Âge" (357–73). We thank the author for sending us a copy of this article before its publication.

³² Mercier and Ostorero, *L'énigme de la Vauderie de Lyon*, 241–42.

³³ See n. 14.

³⁴ Mattéoni, *Servir le prince*, 82.

³⁵ So Mercier and Ostorero, *L'énigme de la Vauderie de Lyon*, 241–42.

Confiscations of Jewish Books in Savoy in the Early Fifteenth Century

The prosecution of 1429 can also be linked to a series of similar actions undertaken in the states of Savoy in the early fifteenth century to inventory, inspect, and expurgate the books of the Jews.³⁶ Confiscations of Jewish books are indeed already attested in July of 1416, just a few months after the duke's elevation.³⁷ In particular, the prosecution against the Jews of Chambéry, which took place in the autumn of that year, is well documented; it allows us an insight into a procedure that was to become – if it was not already – the standard in such inquiries.³⁸ Two Jewish converts received the assignment to read certain Hebrew books and extract the erroneous and/or blasphemous conclusions they contained. Here we learn that the two converts were also doctors and had in fact been baptized only shortly before the start of the investigation.³⁹ During the procedure, they were also supervised by members of the Franciscan convent of Chambéry – one of them being the confessor of the duke himself. For as long as the investigation lasted, the principal members of the Jewish community of Chambéry were kept prisoners in that city's castle. One of the two converts working on the examination of the Jewish books apparently regretted his unfortunate role, and fled from the inn in which he was staying.⁴⁰ In the nearby city of Montmélian, in 1416, another Jewish convert, moreover godchild of the duke, named Amédée of Évian also acted as a translator in a similar inquiry.⁴¹ Several investigations of this kind took place at the duke's very own court in 1416⁴², in Châtillon-sur-Chalaronne⁴³, where Jewish books were burnt in 1417, and again in Chambéry in 1426 – this time under the supervision of the inquisition, represented by Pons

³⁶ Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 243–94. See also Merchavia, “A Spanish-Latin Manuscript,” 590 and following; Renata Segre, *The Jews in Piedmont* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1986), vol. 1: xiv; Schwarzfuchs, “Yohanan Trèves,” 89–92.

³⁷ Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 267–68, quoting Torino, Archivio di Stato (AST), Inv. 41, Reg. 43, fol. 11v. Segre, *The Jews in Piedmont*, vol. 1: xiv, also suggests linking these events to the disputation of Tortosa.

³⁸ Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 268–69.

³⁹ *Ibid.* On these converts, see Auguste Dufour and François Rabut, “Louis de Nice, juif converti, filleul et médecin du duc Louis de Savoie et directeur des Salines de Tarentaise au moment de l'éboulement de Salins (1445–1474),” *Mémoires et documents de la Société savoisienne d'histoire et d'archéologie* 15 (1875): 5–51, at 50–51.

⁴⁰ AST, Inv. 16, Reg. 62, fol. 98v. (Dufour and Rabut, “Louis de Nice,” 49–50; Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 269)

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 105r. On Amédée of Évian's baptism, see Dufour and Rabut, “Louis de Nice,” 7–8, 29–30.

⁴² Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 269–70.

⁴³ *Inventaire sommaire*, vol. 3:147.

Feugeyron.⁴⁴ From February 1429 onward – that is, while the Trévoux investigation was also taking place – another prosecution was going on in Miribel, the main town of a Savoy castellany.⁴⁵ In most of these cases, the same names occur in different places. For instance, the translator who worked in Trévoux, Ayme or Amédée of Chambéry (again a namesake of the duke) was simultaneously active in Miribel as a commissioner of the duke of Savoy.⁴⁶

From one case to the other, we observe a similar *modus operandi*: learned Jewish converts closely linked to the duke collaborated with trained theologians in extracting and qualifying the reprehensible theses found in the books of the Jews, while the representatives of the Jewish communities were kept in prison. Most of these investigations were explicitly aimed at the Talmud. The commissioners' knowledge of the work was certainly facilitated by previous investigations; but these could also rely on scholarly compendia, listing the Talmud's main liable theses. These treatises – such as Andrea de Escobar's *Tractatus de publicatione heresum sive vanitatum et abusionum contentarum in libris talamud iudeorum* written in 1417 – had taught the investigators to look for specific kinds of assertions, such as those allegedly pertaining to Christian churches or cemeteries, or referring to Christians as “idolaters.”⁴⁷ It is worth mentioning that one document brought forth by the Jews of Trévoux while they were prosecuted in 1429 – a sentence delivered by the lord of Thoire-Villars, renewing their privileges for three years and allowing them to use the Talmud and its glosses – suggests that the Trévoux community had eagerly sought the protection of its overlord in 1417, maybe after the duke of Savoy had ordered the first investigations, fearing that the actions undertaken against their coreligionists in the neighbouring towns of Savoy would soon extend beyond Savoy's borders.⁴⁸ As we know, their fears were justified.

⁴⁴ See the references in n. 12.

⁴⁵ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 107r, quoted in n. 12.

⁴⁶ Guillaume Saffon, the Jewish convert active in Chambéry in 1416, travelled at least once from Chambéry to Montmélian during the investigation, in order to examine the books of the Jewish community there as well; see AST, Inv. 16, Reg. 62, fol. 105r, quoted by Dufour and Rabut, “Louis de Nice,” 50. Pierre of Varambon officiated in both in Montmélian and Châtillon-sur-Chalaronne in 1417. On Ayme of Chambéry's participation in the Miribel trial, see n. 12.

⁴⁷ See Merchavia, “A Spanish-Latin Manuscript,” followed by Bardelle, *Juden in einem Transit- und Brückenland*, 269–71. An early example of such an anthology of blasphemous and/or heretical passages in the Talmud is provided by the *Extractiones de Talmut*, compiled in the wake of the Paris disputation of 1240 (see references in n. 71). The *Extractiones* were notably used in the widely circulated *Pharetra fidei contra Judeos super Talmuth*, of which at least one copy was bound together with Escobar's *Tractatus*, along with other polemical work, in one fifteenth-century manuscript (Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek, Aus. Cod. st 498). On the *Pharetra*, see Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 335–36.

⁴⁸ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 126r.

Tracing the History of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 and of the Records of the 1429 Prosecution

In his 1875 article, Loeb asserted that the records of the 1429 prosecution preserved in our manuscript were likely to be copies of the original acts, which he presumed were preserved in Turin.⁴⁹ It is our impression, however, that the records contain original transcripts and documents, and are thus not copies of an earlier dossier. This is suggested by several codicological clues as well as by the history of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722.

In its current form, the manuscript is indeed a collection of three different units gathered in the same binding – the second unit being the dossier of the 1429 inquiry of Trévoux. It is difficult to know precisely when and why the three units were bound together. On the basis of codicological clues, we are able to ascertain that the first two units were originally part of a larger codex, and were united with the third unit only at a later stage. Indeed, a fragmentary table of contents of a no longer extant volume in possession of Claude Bellièvre (ca. 1487–1557), a member of a prominent family of Lyon magistrates and distinguished antiquarian, shows that this codex contained the first two units of the current Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, in the same order and with the same foliation. This likely turns Bellièvre into the first known owner of the documents that interest us here.⁵⁰ The binding of our manuscript also reveals that it was previously part of

⁴⁹ According to Loeb, “Un épisode,” 34, Jolibois “seems to have consulted” the original documents in the archives (of the duchy of Savoy) in Turin. Jolibois, *Histoire*, 13, indeed quoted from the “minutes” of the investigation a passage absent from Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722. This quotation, however, was in all likelihood taken from Aubret, *Mémoires*, vol. 2:529, to whom Jolibois owed his information on the investigation. Aubret himself uses Paradin’s *Mémoires*, as cited in n. 4. More surprising is Loeb’s suggestion that the original sources were preserved in Turin: just as well as Paradin and Jolibois, Loeb knew that the investigation had been commissioned by the duchess of Bourbon, and he was certainly familiar enough with the political context of the region in the early fifteenth century to know that none of the actors, except for Ayme of Chambéry, were related to the duke of Savoy. It may be suggested that Loeb inferred that the duke had taken part in the Trévoux prosecution due to the presence, in the dossier, of the letters patent issued by Amédée VIII (see n. 12).

⁵⁰ This fragmentary table of contents is preserved in a codex entitled *Varia parva*, which also belonged to Bellièvre: Ms. Paris, BnF, Fr. 17526, at fol. 214v. It was partially published in Claude Bellièvre, *Souvenirs de voyages en Italie et en Orient: Notes historiques. Pièces de vers* (ed. Charles Perrat; Genève: Droz, 1956), 122–24. The codex containing the first two units of the current Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, bore the title *Liber grossus cui pro titulo est signum ꝛ [crucis]*. The foliation of the two first entries of the table of contents matches exactly the older foliation (in Roman numerals) of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722. We identified the remaining quires of Bellièvre’s *Liber grossus* as being the current Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12868. The *Liber grossus*, a collection of originals and copies of documents concerning the ecclesiastical history of Lyon (hence the choice of the sign of the cross as its title), does not appear in the inventory of Bellièvre’s library, published by Lucien Auvray, “La bibliothèque de Claude Bellièvre (1530),” in *Mélanges offerts à M. Émile Picot par ses amis et ses élèves* (Paris: Libr. D. Morgand, 1913), 333–63. This could mean that this collection of documents was only gathered after 1530.

the library of Achille III de Harlay (1639–1712), the first president of the Parliament of Paris.⁵¹ As it is, Achille's mother was a member of the Bellièvre family.⁵² Thus our tentative hypothesis: the first two units of the actual Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 were first in possession of Claude Bellièvre and later passed into the Harlay library through Achille's mother. Achille then dismantled the original codex, binding its first two units together with another set of documents that had beforehand circulated separately (and that now constitutes the third unit of our manuscript). Part of the Harlay library later entered the library of the Saint-Germain-des-Prés abbey, whence it was transferred to the Bibliothèque nationale following a fire that partly destroyed the abbey in 1794.⁵³ How the documents left the archives of the officiality of Lyon and where they had been preserved before entering Bellièvre's library still needs to be clarified. We may note, however, that the Bellièvre family had close connections with the Church of Lyon and its officiality.⁵⁴ Before leaving Lyon, the documents pertaining to the 1429 inquiry against the Jews of Trévoux, along with other documents preserved in the Bellièvre library, were also read and used by Guillaume Paradin, in his *Mémoires de l'Histoire de Lyon*. Paradin's description of the events, titled "Trial led against the Jews of Trévoux by his lordship Amé de Thalaru [the archbishop of Lyon], and by lady Marie of Berry, duchess of Bourbonnais," closely matches with the commissioners report preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, at points even sticking to the commissioners words.⁵⁵ Once the documents had left Lyon, local historians, unaware of their fate, had no choice but to use Paradin's account of the events.⁵⁶ Only in nineteenth century did historians return to the original documents preserved in the manuscript, mainly out of interest for its first and third units, respectively pertaining to the trial of Joan of Arc and to the Western Schism.⁵⁷ Isidore Loeb was the first to attend to the middle section of the manuscript concerning the Jews of Trévoux.

⁵¹ The earlier class mark, "S. G. ^H 51.II," written on the first guard-leaf of the manuscript refers to the Harlay collection in the library of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. This information was kindly provided by Jérémy Delmule.

⁵² Achille's mother, Jeanne-Marie de Bellièvre († 1657), was the great-granddaughter of Claude Bellièvre. See Léopold Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1874), vol. 2:100.

⁵³ On the history of the Harlay library, see Alfred Franklin, *Les anciennes bibliothèques de Paris* (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867), vol. 1:122–23. On the history of the Saint-Germain collection in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, see Delisle, *Le cabinet*, vol. 2:100–3.

⁵⁴ See *Claude Bellièvre* (ed. Perrat), i–vii.

⁵⁵ Paradin, *Mémoires*, 245–47. Paradin's use of documents belonging to the Bellièvre's archive, to which he had access through Claude Bellièvre's nephew, was already noted by Auvray, "La bibliothèque," 359; and Charles Perrat, "Claude Bellièvre et Étienne Dolet," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 4 (1944): 138–43, at 138.

⁵⁶ See n. 3.

⁵⁷ See Jules-Étienne Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc, dite la Pucelle* (Paris: J. Renouard, 1841–1849), vol. 5:498; Pierre Lanéry d'Arc, *Mémoires et consultations en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc, par les juges du procès de réhabilitation*,

A closer look at the pieces contained in the manuscript provides further arguments in favour of their authenticity, implying that we are probably dealing with a collection of original documents, written or copied in the immediate context of the 1429 prosecution.⁵⁸ These include: (1) the report of the commissioners, including the details of the interrogations and the commissioners' progress in extracting and translating a number of blasphemous and/or erroneous theses found in the books of the Jews; (2) documents brought before the commissioners by the Jews of Trévoux, namely a *protestatio* against the systematic translation of the *goyim* as "Christians,"⁵⁹ together with two documents connected to the earlier 1426 investigation; (3) finally, two distinct lists of conclusions extracted from the books of the Jews. Why two lists? A comparison shows that the second list is in fact an updated copy of the first, in which a number of corrections and comments written either in the margins or between the lines of the first list, have been included. In the first list, the theses are ordered book by book, so that some appearing in several books were copied more than once. This redundant information is absent from the second list. Also, in the first list, the word "Christians" is frequently crossed out and replaced by "people of the world" (*gens du monde*) – a correction obviously connected to the above-mentioned discussion of

d'après les manuscrits authentiques (Paris: A. Picard, 1889), 18, 36, 56, 92; Franz Plazidus Bliemetzrieder, "Sermo des Bischofs Petrus Girardi bei der Übergabe des Kardinalshutes an Pileus de Prata und Galeotto de Petramala," *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und dem Cistercienser-Orden* 30 (1909): 52–60; idem, "Traktat des Johannes de Florenzia über Urbans VI. Wahl (Sommer 1378) mit Glossen eines Klementisten," *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und dem Cistercienser-Orden* 30 (1909): 561–66; idem, "Über die Konzilbewegung zu Beginn des großen abendländischen Schismas, mit vier handschriftlichen Belegen," *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und dem Cistercienser-Orden XXXI* (1910): 389–410; idem, *Literarische Polemik zu Beginn des grossen abendländischen Schismas (Kardinal Petrus Flandrin, Kardinal Petrus Amelii, Konrad von Gelnhausen)* (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1910), 3–71, 91–111.

⁵⁸ The content of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 is described in *Appendix 2*.

⁵⁹ See Loeb, "Un épisode," 46–48. The Jews of Trévoux advanced arguments similar to those already used – in the context of the 1240 trial against the Talmud – by R. Yehiel of Paris, who insisted on the distinction between the ancient "Gentiles," i. e. *goyim*, mentioned in the Talmud and the contemporary Christians; see "The Disputation of Rabbi Yehiel of Paris," transl. John Friedman, in *The Trial of the Talmud: Paris, 1240* (ed. John Friedman, Jean Connell Hoff, and Robert Chazan; Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012), 126–68, at 148–52. It is likely that either R. Yehiel's *Vikkuah* (of which, however, only three manuscripts are extant) or other compendia of Jewish arguments in defence of the Talmud were also widely circulated among late medieval Jewish communities, further illustrating their preparedness to counter Christian accusations; see, for instance, Joseph Schatzmiller, *La deuxième controverse de Paris: Un chapitre dans la polémique entre chrétiens et juifs au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Peeters, 1994), 20–22; on the Hebrew account of the 1240 disputation, see Judah Galinsky, "The Different Hebrew Versions of the 'Talmud Trial' of 1240 in Paris," in *New Perspectives on Jewish-Christian Relations: In Honor of David Berger* (ed. Elisheva Carlebach and Jacob J. Schacter; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 109–40; Piero Capelli, "Editing Thirteenth-century Polemical Texts: Questions of Method and the Status Questionis in Three Polemical Works," *Henoch: Historical and Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Judaism and Christianity* 37 (2015): 43–52.

the meaning of the word *goyim*. Again, the second list integrates these changes. A few short marginal notes found in the first list of conclusions further document similar discussions taking place between the Jews and the translator. The second list shows that at least some of these discussions were taken into account, and some of Ayme's translations accordingly modified.⁶⁰ All this suggests that the first list of conclusions was edited in the context of the investigation itself, the secretary recording, book by book, the translation proposed by Ayme of Chambéry and the ensuing discussions with the Jews.

A discreet inscription found on the inside margin of the first folio of the second unit provides moreover a conclusive argument in favour of its authenticity. The inscription, hardly readable today, indicates that the documents were originally intended for the Official of Lyon.⁶¹ The latter, as we have seen, had been appointed by the duchess for the investigation, but was only intermittently present in Trévoux, being most often represented by a lieutenant. It is therefore safe to assume that the documents today included in the artificial collection that makes up the second unit of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 is the original file sent to the Official of Lyon by the commissioners at work in Trévoux to report on their activity.

The Middle-French Text of *Toledot Yeshu* Preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722

Inserted within the second list of conclusions extracted from the books of the Jews, we find a Middle French version of *Toledot Yeshu*. The text covers four

⁶⁰ In conclusion 139 (fol. 96v), for instance, the discussion centres on the translation of the Hebrew *aguillenyn*. The Jews claimed that the word meant “the empty margins of books, in which nothing is written” (i. e. *gilyonim*); but the translator – *magister Amedeus* – contested this interpretation, claiming that this was another name for the Gospel (i. e. *Avon gilayon*): *Et dicunt quod “aguillenyn” sunt margines librorum in quibus nichil est scriptum. Magister Amedeus dicit quod “aguillenyn” est liber ewangeliorum*. The second list of conclusions includes a summary of the debate, in French translation (fol. 134r). Obviously, Ayme of Chambéry was aware of this ambiguous pun, attested in *b. Shabb*. 116a, through which the Greek word *evangelion*, “Gospel,” was deformed into *aven gilayon*, “empty writings”; see the discussion in Yaacov Y. Teppler, *Birkat haMinim: Jews and Christians in Conflict in the Ancient World* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 250 ff. The pun is explicit in the Huldreich version of *Toledot Yeshu*, where Simon Kepha is credited in providing the disciples of Jesus “books of falsehoods” (*sfarei kasvim*), which he called “Avon Killayon”; see Ms. Amsterdam, UBA, Ros. 442, fol. 4r in Michael Meerson and Peter Schäfer, ed., *Toledot Yeshu: The Life Story of Jesus* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), vol. 1:319 (English) and vol. 2:250 (Hebrew). See also Amulo, *Liber contra Judaeos* 10 (PL 116: 146–47); and *Sefer Nizzahon*, § 154 (ed. David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of Nizzahon Vetus* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979, 167).

⁶¹ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 69r: *Vobis venerabili et scientifico domino officiali Lugdunensi dantem (?) hec*.

and a half folios of the manuscript (fol. 135r–140r). It precedes an alleged anti-Christian “curse,” referred to by the name “Samatha,” i. e. *shamta*’ (ban).⁶² The translation of *Toledot Yeshu* is introduced with the following title:

A conclusion found by the commissioners of the lady of Bourbon ... in some books in the house of one of the said Jews of Trévoux.⁶³

It is difficult to ascertain that the text is indeed based on the booklet found in Peyret’s house and discussed during the proceedings – although this seems a reasonable assumption. The ternion containing the translation of *Toledot Yeshu* and the “Samatha” prayer seem to have been added to the last quire of the second list of conclusions, the final document of the dossier sent to Lyon. The irregular position of this ternion, interrupting the sequence of the conclusions, suggests that the text of *Toledot Yeshu* may have been discovered only at a later stage of the investigation. It was then hastily transcribed (there is no corrected version of the text, contrary to the list of conclusions) and added to the quire containing the second list before the whole dossier was sent to Lyon.⁶⁴ It is also difficult to determine whether we are dealing with a copy of an earlier translation or with the transcript of a translation carried out (orally) in the immediate context of the inquiry. A few indecisive signs lead us to favour the second option.⁶⁵

⁶² As the commissioners indicate, this “curse” was extracted from a book of prayers (*livre d’oracion*, presumably a Maḥzor) found in another Jewish house; cf. Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 140r: *Après cecy ait ung livre d’oracion, trovés en la ville de Treyvoux enchiez certain juifz per messieurs le<s> commissaires certaines maledicions contre les crestiens. S’appelle en eubrem ‘Samatha’*. The text transmitted in a muddled mix of transliterated Hebrew and French is in fact a short liturgical poem of the *rahit* type, originating in the (uncensored) Yom Kippur liturgy, calling upon God to annihilate the Gentile nations – including the “Edomites” and “Romans,” i. e. in all likelihood, Christians. See our discussion and further references in Barbu and Dahhaoui, “Un manuscrit français,” 250–51, n. 102.

⁶³ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 135r: *Ycy ensigant une conclusion trovee par messieurs lez commissaires de parrt ma dame de Borbon ... troveit en certens livres en l’ostel d’ung dezdzitz juiz de Trevest* (Barbu and Dahhaoui, “Un manuscrit français,” 262).

⁶⁴ The text accommodated on this ternion is also written in a bigger module and with a darker ink, which again point toward a different hand to the one responsible for the updated list of conclusions.

⁶⁵ These are chiefly scribal (mis-)spellings. Thus for instance, on the third line of the *Toledot Yeshu* text, the clerk wrote the word *milliar*, then stopped, crossed the word out and wrote *Miriam* instead. The confusion between the liquid phonemes *l* and *r* may indicate a mishearing rather than a misreading. Further down, the text quotes Ps. 49:15, “For he will take me. Selah.” The clerk, apparently unfamiliar with the word “Selah,” seems to have confused it with the French word *ciel* (heaven), writing: *Qui me prendra et halceray sa main ou ciel* (“who will take me and raise his hand to heaven”). An oral translation could explain this mistake, the scribe transforming the word he heard into another, more familiar one, and sounding more or less the same, in order to make sense of something he had not understood. These two cases, however, in a text that covers more than ten pages, can hardly be considered definitive proof of the oral character of the translation. We may add that a few other words were first written down phonetically, before being rectified by another hand, more sensitive to the correct spelling.

The text of *Toledot Yeshu* itself begins with the story of Jesus's conception and ends, rather abruptly, with the "passion," not including Jesus's execution proper. It is possible that the text the translator was using was incomplete or that he simply chose not to include the end of the narrative. Even so, what we have is a quite faithful rendition of the "Helena" recension of *Toledot Yeshu*.⁶⁶ In fact, the French text preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 largely matches the Hebrew text of the famous Strasbourg manuscript.⁶⁷ And although it is not in the original language, the text preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 may provide one of the earliest manuscript witnesses to this particular version of the narrative.

Allegedly, the Strasbourg text of *Toledot Yeshu* was copied in the late eighteenth century by one Moses, *hazzan* of the Karaite community of Halicz, in eastern Galicia (present-day Ukraine).⁶⁸ But as recently highlighted by William Horbury, it can be shown to be much older and to have already circulated in France and in Spain in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁶⁹ We may thus observe that, while the Hebrew account of the 1240 trial against the Talmud in Paris seems to

⁶⁶ For this classification, see Riccardo di Segni, "La tradizione testuale delle *Toledot Yeshu*: Manoscritti, edizioni a stampa, classificazione," *Rassegna Mensile di Israel* 50 (1984): 83–100; idem, *Il Vangelo del Ghetto*, 29–42.

⁶⁷ Ms. Strasbourg, BnU, 3974 (héb. 48), fol. 170r–175v. The text was originally edited with a German translation by Samuel Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen* (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1902), 38–64; see now Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 166–84 (English) and vol. 2: 82–95 (Hebrew). Another English translation is provided by Hugh J. Schonfield, *According to the Hebrews* (London: Duckworth, 1937), 35–61. The text was also translated into French (Jean-Pierre Osier, *L'Evangile du Ghetto* [Paris: Berg international, 1984], 67–83) and Italian (di Segni, *Il Vangelo del Ghetto*, 51–66, with a useful commentary). On the history of the manuscript and the Strasbourg text of *Toledot Yeshu*, see William Horbury, "The Strasbourg Text of the 'Toledot,'" in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited* (ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch), 49–59; see also Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 31; vol. 2: 79–81, who label this particular recension "Ashkenazi A."

⁶⁸ Horbury, "The Strasbourg Text," 50–53. See however Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra's contention, in this volume, that the text might be dated to the seventeenth century on palaeographical grounds. The manuscript was first described by Samuel Landauer, *Katalog der hebräischen, arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlichen Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg* (Strasbourg: K. J. Trübner, 1881), 68–70.

⁶⁹ Horbury, "The Strasbourg Text," 53–56. Of course, the text itself may largely predate that period. See Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 271–72; Horbury, *Critical Examination*, 275–81; idem, "The Strasbourg Text," 56. Examining the Aramaic list of Christian festivals preserved in the Strasbourg manuscript, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra has sought to demonstrate that the text faithfully transmitted certain traditions dating back as early as the late fourth or early fifth century; see Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "An Ancient List of Christian Festivals in *Toledot Yeshu*: Polemics as Indication for Interaction," *Harvard Theological Review* 102 (2009): 481–96, at 493; idem, "Interaction et différenciation: Quelques pensées sur les rôles des fêtes juives, chrétiennes (et 'païennes')," in *L'oïseau et le poisson: Cohabitations religieuses dans les mondes grec et romain* (ed. Nicole Belayche and Jean-Daniel Dubois; Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2011), 23–37. See Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 107–8. Unfortunately, this specific unit is not present in the Paris manuscript, which does not contain the "Acts of the Apostles" narrative. The same recension of *Toledot Yeshu* is also attested in the Islamic world as early as the thirteenth or fourteenth century; see Miriam Goldstein, "Judeo-Arabic Versions

betray knowledge of a similar “Helena” version of *Toledot Yeshu*, the Latin anthology of blasphemous and/or heretical theses found in the books of the Jews in that context almost doubtless refers to the very same text we find in the Strasbourg manuscript as well as in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722.⁷⁰ The *Extractiones de Talmut* indeed mentions a book that “the blasphemous and treacherous Jews fancifully and deceitfully contrived in order to destroy the Gospel and the entire Christian faith” and began with the phrase *Inicium creationis Ihesu Nazareni*.⁷¹ This incipit, considered by Horbury to be a “hit” at the Nicene Creed (*credo in ... Christum ... genitum non factum*), runs parallel to the opening words of the Strasbourg text (*teḥilat beriyato shel Yeshu*);⁷² and it is also the title the translator attributes to the book quoted in our manuscript: “First, in the said book

of *Toledoth Yeshu*,” *Ginzei Qedem* 6 (2010): 9*–42*, and Alexandra Cuffel’s contribution in this volume.

⁷⁰ See Isidore Loeb, “La controverse religieuse entre les chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge en France et en Espagne,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 17 (1888): 311–37; 18 (1888): 134–36, part. 1: 329, n. 3, with Horbury, “The Strasbourg Text,” 53–54. For instance, in the Hebrew account of the 1240 disputation, Yehiel of Paris argued that the Talmudic Jesus was distinct from Jesus Christ, as shown by the fact that he lived in the days of Queen Helena; see Friedman, “The Disputation of Rabbi Yehiel of Paris,” 113. Note that the same argument was advanced by the Jews in the context of the 1429 prosecution; see Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 124v: to the unspecified article 81, Josson and Leonet *confessent qu’il est ainsi escript, mais ilz dient qu’il n’y a pas Jhesus, ains Jessu*. On the “two Jesus” argument in medieval Jewish historiography, see Loeb, “Josef Hacohen,” 254–66; and Gavin McDowell’s contribution in this volume. It may be suggested that additional allusions to episodes specific to *Toledot Yeshu* (such as Jesus’s hanging on a cabbage stalk, or the aerial battle between Jesus and Judas) in other high medieval anti-Christian Jewish polemics, may also (albeit not necessarily) derive from a “Helena”-type text. For such allusions, see Yaacov Deutsch, “The Second Life of the Life of Jesus: Christian Reception of *Toledot Yeshu*,” in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited* (ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch), 283–95, at 293; see also Sarit Kattan Gribetz, “Hanged and Crucified: The Book of Esther and *Toledot Yeshu*,” in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited* (ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch), 159–80, at 173–74; Michael Rand, “An Anti-Christian Polemical *Piyyut*.” For *Nizzahon Vetus*, in particular, see Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, 202–4 (§ 202 and § 205).

⁷¹ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 16558, fol. 14c: *Si quis catholicus aures habet ad audiendum multa plura nephanda querat et legat librum qui incipit “Inicium creationis Ihesu Nazareni” quem blasphemus et perfidus iudei ad destructionem ewangelii et totius fidei christiane fabulose et mendaciter confixerunt*. On the *Extractiones*, see Loeb, *La controverse sur le Talmud*; Judah M. Rosenthal, “The Talmud on Trial: The Disputation at Paris in the Year 1240,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47 (1956): 58–76, 146–69; Chen Merchavia, *The Church versus Talmudic and Midrashic Literature (500–1248)* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1970), 249–348 [in Hebrew]; Schreckenberg, *Die Christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*, 98–134. On the author of the *Extractiones*, see Alexander Fidora, who names Nicolas Donin as their author; see his “The Latin Talmud and Its Translators: Nicholas Donin vs. Thibaud de Sézanne?,” *Henoch. Historical and Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Judaism and Christianity* 37 (2015): 17–28; and on this passage see Federico Dal Bo and Alexander Fidora, ““Inicium Creationis Iesu Nazareni”: *Toledot Yeshu* in the Thematic Version of the *Extractiones de Talmud*,” *Henoch. Historical and Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Judaism and Christianity* 40 (2018): 206–22.

⁷² Horbury, “The Strasbourg Text,” 53. Cf. also Deutsch, “*Toledot Yeshu*” in *Christian Eyes*, 34.

‘Beginning of the generation of Jesus the Nocery’.⁷³ Regrettably, the compiler of the *Extractiones* chose not to translate the work, writing: “I really would have included this little book (*libellum*) in my work would it not have been a possible stumbling block for the weak.”⁷⁴ His description however makes it clear that he had access to a complete *Toledot Yeshu* narrative circulating in France in the early thirteenth century; a narrative in all likelihood already including both the birth story of Jesus and the “Acts” of Peter and Paul. As he writes:

[In this book] one finds true and astonishing blasphemies, which are shameful to utter, horrible to hear, and abominable to conceive against He who is *the brightness of God’s glory and the figure of his substance* [Heb. 1:3] and against the unsullied Virgin his mother, and specially against the glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and generally against all those who believe in Christ.⁷⁵

As is well known, roughly two generations later, the Dominican friar Raymond Martini extensively quoted a Latin translation of *Toledot Yeshu* in his *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judæos*.⁷⁶ Martini’s text is a shorter (and maybe trun-

⁷³ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 135r: *Premierement, ou dit livre “Encommencent la nation de Jhesu le Nocery”* (Barbu and Dahhaoui, “Un manuscrit français,” 262).

⁷⁴ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 16558, fol. 14d: *Sane predictum libellum presenti interseruissem opusculo sed forsitan aliquibus esse posset offendiculum infirmis*; quoting 1 Cor. 8:9.

⁷⁵ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 16558, fol. 14c–d: *Ibi repperiet miras et inexcogitatas blasphemias quas pudor est dicere, horror audire, abhominacio cogitare contra illum qui splendor est glorie et figura substantie Dei et intemerata virginem, matrem eius, et specialiter contra gloriosos apostolos Petrum et Paulum, generaliter autem contra omnes in Christum credentes*. The mention in the *Extractiones* of the attacks against the “unsullied Virgin” contradicts the notion that the birth narrative did not exist as such prior to the end of the thirteenth century, as was suggested by di Segni, *Il Vangelo del Ghetto*, 32, followed by Peter Schäfer, “Jesus’ Origin, Birth, and Childhood According to the *Toledot Yeshu* and the Talmud,” in *Judaea-Palaestina, Babylon and Rome: Jews in Antiquity* (ed. Benjamin Isaac and Yuval Shahar, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 139–64, at 144; Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1:14, 50 and *passim*. So too Deutsch, “The Second Life of the Life of Jesus,” 289. The presence of the birth narrative in the Judeo-Arabic manuscripts of *Toledot Yeshu* further speaks against the episode being a late medieval addition; on these, see Miriam Goldstein, “Judeo-Arabic Versions of *Toledoth Yeshu*,” as well as Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra’s remarks and the text edited by Alexandra Cuffel in this volume. For another reference to the fact that the Jews “are not ashamed to claim that Jesus’s mother conceived him in adultery from a certain man whom they generally call Pandera” in the *Extractiones*, see Rosenthal, “Talmud on Trial,” part 2: 160 – although this may be derived from either Origen, *C. Cels.*, 1: 28 or *b. Shabb.* 104b; *b. Sanh.* 67a. See also William Horbury’s contribution in this volume for a discussion of the dating of the birth narrative.

⁷⁶ *Raymundi Martini Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judæos, cum observationibus Joseph de Voisin et introductione Johann Benedicti Carpzovi* (Leipzig: sumpt. haeredum F. Lanckisi, 1687), 362–64; now translated into English in Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 10–12. On the *Pugio* and its context, see Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: History*, 313–14; Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, 129–69; idem, *Living Letters of the Law*, 342–58; Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 115–36. Raymond Martini already alluded to *Toledot Yeshu* in his earlier anti-Jewish treatise, *Capistrum Iudaeorum* (ed. Adolfo Robles Sierra; Würzburg: Corpus Islamo-Christianum, 1990–93), at 1: 282, 286; cf. Cohen, *Living Letters*, 349.

cated) version of the Strasbourg text, not including the conception narrative and ending (more or less like our text) with Jesus's demise at the hands of the Sages. Martini's work had a lasting impact on later Jewish-Christian polemics, and his text of *Toledot Yeshu* encountered an unexpected destiny, becoming (via Alfonso de Espina) the first printed version of *Toledot Yeshu*, and later being translated into German (via Porchetus Salvaticus) by none other than Martin Luther.⁷⁷ Yet we know nothing of the origins of the text he was quoting, and we can only speculate that it was perhaps found among the numerous Hebrew books the Jews had to submit to the friars following the Barcelona Disputation of 1263.⁷⁸

Excerpts of a Strasbourg text were also quoted, in Spain, ca. 1325, by Alfonso of Valladolid (formerly Abner of Burgos), a convert to Christianity and anti-Jewish polemicist, in his *Moreh tzedek/Mostrador de justicia*.⁷⁹ Alfonso freely cited from two distinct versions of *Toledot Yeshu*. He claimed to have found the second in a book entitled *Del fecho de Jhesu, fijo de Pandera* (On the deeds of Jesus, son of Pandera) written in the "Chaldean language," i. e. Aramaic; it is closely related to the early version of the narrative as we find it in the Aramaic manuscripts of *Toledot Yeshu* and as it was already known to Agobard, bishop

⁷⁷ See Deutsch, "The Second Life of the Life of Jesus," 288; and Stephen Burnett's contribution in this volume. On the reception of Martini's *Pugio*, see Alexander Fidora, "Ramon Martí in Context: The Influence of the *Pugio fidei* on Ramon Llull, Arnau de Vilanova and Francesc Eiximenis," *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 79 (2012): 373–97.

⁷⁸ Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 10. Indeed Martini himself was named to the panel appointed in that context by King James I for examining and censoring the Jewish books in Aragon. See Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, 129; Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, 115–16, who refers to Jean Régné, *History of the Jews in Aragon: Regesta and Documents, 1213–1327* (ed. YomTov Assis; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978), 47, N° 249. In general, see Robert Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond: The Disputation of 1263 and its Aftermath* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

⁷⁹ The work, first published in Hebrew, survives only in a Castilian translation. The only extant manuscript of this translation is preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Ms. Paris, BnF, Esp. 43; originally from the library of Benedict XIII); see Isidore Loeb, "Polémistes chrétiens et juifs en France et en Espagne," *Revue des études juives* 18 (1889): 43–70, 219–42, at 53–63. The text was edited by Walter Mettmann (2 vols.; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994–96), vol. 2:136–37, 158–59, and 322 for the relevant passages. See also Carlos Sainz de la Maza, "El *Toledot Yeshu* castellano en el Maestro Alfonso de Valladolid," in *Actas II Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (ed. José M. Lucía Megías, Paloma García Alonzo, Carmen Martín Daza; Alcalá: Universidad de Alcalá, 1992), vol. 2:797–814. Corresponding excerpts from the Hebrew original are preserved in ShemTov Ibn Shaprut's *Eben Bohan* ("Touchstone"), written ca. 1400. See Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 146–49, with a German translation; for an English translation, see now Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1:13–14. See also Horbury, *Critical Examination*, 113–21, 476–78. On Abner of Burgos/Alfonso de Valladolid, see Ryan Szpiech, "Abner of Burgos/Alfonso of Valladolid," *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History IV. 1200–1350* (ed. David Thomas and Alex Mallett; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 955–76; idem, *Conversion and Narrative: Reading and Religious Authority in Medieval Polemic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 143–73; see also Moshe Lazar, "Alfonso de Valladolid's *Mostrador de justicia*: A Polemical Debate between Abner's Old and New Self," *Edad Media: Revista de Historia* 6 (2003–2004): 121–34.

of Lyon, in the ninth century.⁸⁰ He took the first from a book entitled *Del fecho*, or *De fazienda de Jhesu Nazareno* (On the deeds, or On the creation of Jesus of Nazareth).⁸¹ This book detailed, among other things Jesus's shameful conception, and dated him to the time of Queen Helena, mother of Constantine.⁸²

Much closer to our context, however, is another witness to the same variant of *Toledot Yeshu*, namely the text produced by Thomas Ebendorfer, a professor of theology in Vienna.⁸³ Ebendorfer indeed also included a Latin translation of *Toledot Yeshu* in his *Falsitates Judeorum* (Lies of the Jews). The exact date of Ebendorfer's work is uncertain: it may have been composed in the 1450s, in order to counter the efforts of King Frederic V (later Emperor Frederic III) at improving the situation of Austrian Jews.⁸⁴ However, it may also have been composed at an earlier date, when a number of Jewish books were confiscated following the "Wiener Geserah," in 1420/21, at which time the Jews of Vienna were expelled from the city after an accusation of host desecration, and between one hundred and four hundred burned at the stake.⁸⁵ It is indeed possible that the books

⁸⁰ Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 1: 13.

⁸¹ See *Mostrador de justícia* VII, 7, fol. 201r–v, quoted in Sainz de la Maza, "El *Toledot Yeshu*," 802–3: ... *assi es escripto en el Libro que es publicado entre los judíos del fecho de Jhesu Nazareno ... assi lo dize en el Libro que es conpuesto en lengua caldea del fecho de Jhesu fijo de Pandera*; and IX, 47, fol. 222r (ibid., 804): *et esto assi como el Libro que conpusieron sobre la fazienda de Jhesu Nazareno, e que dixieron que Él acaesgió en tiempo de la reina Elena; et assi el otro Libro que conpusieron en lengua de Jherusalem de fazienda de Jhesu fij[o] de Pandera, et que dize que fue en tiempo de Tiberio Çesar*. For Ibn Shaprut's rendition of this passage, see Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 146. The titles preserved by the latter are 'Ovada de-Yeshu bar-Pandera for the second book and Ma'aseh shel Yeshu ha-Nozri for the first. On these titles, see William Horbury's contribution in this volume.

⁸² *Mostrador de justícia* VII, 17, fol. 211v, quoted in Sainz de la Maza, "El *Toledot Yeshu*," 803: *ca quando era Jhesu Christo de .xx. annos començó a mostrar sus signos et sus miraglos ante las gentes como lo cuenta el Libro que es publicado entre los judíos de fazienda de Jhesu, que diz que los judíos peleavan con Él quando amostrava razones de la Ley ante su maestro, et apusiéronle que merecía muerte por ello; et que se levantó uno de los sabios, que dizen que avié nombre Rabí Simón ben-Satáh, que les dixo que bien avié veinte annos que vino a él Rabí Yohanan, marido de María, et quel' dixo que era concebida María en adulterio; et desde entonce fixó Jhesu de entre los sabios et ovo mester a fazer miraglos*. To the best of our knowledge, this passage and the title witnessed here (*De fazienda de Jhesu Nazareno*, i. e. *Toledot Yeshu*) is not preserved in the text of Ibn Shaprut.

⁸³ Cf. Brigitta Callsen, Fritz Peter Knapp, Manuela Niesner, and Martin Przybilski, ed., *Das Jüdische Leben Jesu Toldot Jeschu. Die älteste lateinische Übersetzung in den Falsitates Judeorum von Thomas Ebendorfer* (Vienna: R. Oldenbourg, 2003); Daniel Barbu, "Feeling Jewish. Emotions, Identity, and the Jews' Inverted Christmas," in *Feeling Exclusion. Religious Conflict, Exile and Emotions in Early Modern Europe* (ed. G. Tarantino and C. Zika; London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 185–206.

⁸⁴ The date of the work is discussed by Niesner, "Einführung," in *Das Jüdische Leben Jesu Toldot Jeschu*, 25–33. See also Ruth Mazo Karras, "The Aerial Battle in the *Toledot Yeshu* and Sodomy in the Late Middle Ages," *Medieval Encounters* 19 (2013): 493–533, at 497–99.

⁸⁵ On this, see Samuel Krauss, *Die Wiener Geserah vom Jahre 1421* (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1920); and more recently, Shlomo Spizer, *Bne Chet: Die österreichischen Juden im Mittelalter. Eine Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1997), 79–98; Klaus Lohrmann,

acquired in that context, either by the University of Vienna or by Ebendorfer himself, formed the basis of his work.⁸⁶ Except for a number of minor textual differences, both the text of Ebendorfer and that included in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 clearly bear witness to the continuing circulation of a Strasbourg-type text in the early fifteenth century, on the western and eastern borders of the Holy Roman Empire.⁸⁷ Peyret's booklet – if that is indeed what our text is – thus provides us with another important link shedding light on the history of what appears to be an almost “canonical” *Toledot Yeshu* text in the late Middle Ages.⁸⁸

The text of *Toledot Yeshu* preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 is interesting on a number of counts, but mainly on account of its non-originality. Indeed, while there are few very small textual divergences between the text in the French translation and that of the known Hebrew manuscripts, Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 is a clear testimony to the textual stability of the Strasbourg version.⁸⁹ Is there, however, anything in particular we can say with regard to this text, in comparison with the other known testimonies to the same version? First, we may say

Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter (Berlin: Philo, 2000), 155–73. Ebendorfer himself reported the events in his *Cronica Austrie*; see Thomas Ebendorfer, *Cronica Austrie* (ed. Alphons Lhotsky; Berlin: Weidemann, 1967), 370–71. According to Niesner, “Einführung,” 27, the events of 1420/21 constitute a *terminus post quem* for the transcription of Cod. 4701, as the manuscript contains a marginal annotation (fol. 38r) referring to the *xera Australica*, i.e. the “Austrian Geserah,” or “Austrian persecution.” On accusations of host desecration, see Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999).

⁸⁶ See Karras, “Aerial Battle,” 498–99, who notes: “A number of Hebrew manuscripts now in the Austrian National Library were likely once part of the University Library, and two scholars, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and Peter of Pulkau, both teachers of Ebendorfer, were commissioned in 1421 to acquire for the University Hebrew books that were available as a result of the pogrom”; see Arthur Z. Schwartz, *Die Hebräische Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien* (Vienna: Strache, 1925), ix. Interestingly, a large number of book bindings made in Vienna and Lower Austria the 1420s and 1430s also contain Hebrew fragments, pointing to another use of the Hebrew works confiscated in that context; cf. Almut Laufer, “Überlegungen zu Relevanz und Zielsetzung des Projekts ‘Hebräische Handschriften und Fragmente in österreichischen Bibliotheken’ aus jüdischer Sicht,” in *Fragmenta Hebraica Austriaca* (ed. Christine Glassner and Joseph M. Oesch; Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), 33–48, at 34.

⁸⁷ Karras, “Aerial Battle,” 498, points to another version of *Toledot Yeshu* circulating in the same region in the fifteenth century, and witnessed through a Hebrew fragment included in the binding of a Latin manuscript copied about 1432. In a discussion dated 9 June 1419, and addressing an alleged coalition of Jews and Hussites, the Acts of the Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna also mention “certain execrable books that they possess (?) in insult of the Creator and blasphemy to Christ and all the saints and the great injury of all Christians;” see Paul Uiblein, *Die Akten der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wien (1396–1508)* (Vienna: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft Österreichs, 1978), vol. 1:137, quoted by Karras, “Aerial Battle,” 497; also Niesner, “Einführung,” 26–27. It is however difficult to know if this is a reference to the Talmud or to a version of *Toledot Yeshu*.

⁸⁸ So too Willam Horbury, “The Strasbourg Text,” 55.

⁸⁹ See the discussion in Barbu and Dahhaoui, “Un manuscrit français,” 253–60 as well as the notes to our edition of the Trévoux text.

that in contrast to Ebendorfer's translation, the text of the Paris manuscript contains very few explanatory glosses. Also, no Hebrew word is ever given in the original, be it in Hebrew characters or in transliteration. Even the phrase *Shem ha-Meforash* (the Ineffable Name), which both Martini and Ebendorfer chose to transliterate, is here unassumingly translated into "the name of God" (*le nom de Dieu*). Interestingly, the translator even refers twice to the synagogue simply as a "church" (*église*). Jesus, for his part, is consistently referred to under his proper name, albeit being once named a "bad man" (*mauvaix hon*) and thrice "Jesus the felon" (*fellon Jhesus*), in all likelihood translating the Hebrew *ha-rasha'*. The translation is thus very literal, often following the order of the words found in the Hebrew original or sticking to its idiomatic syntax, as in the phrase "he put his eye in her" (*natan 'eynav bah*) to express Pandera's desire for Mary. Here, however, it is not impossible that the translator understood this to refer to some form of erotic magic, as the text adds: "so as to get her to fulfil his desire."⁹⁰ Similarly, the translation seems to suggest that the two copper dogs guarding the Temple had been enchanted to prevent the theft of the Name – a notion possibly paralleled in Ms. Budapest, MTA, Kaufmann A 299.⁹¹ For the most part, however, the text corresponds verbatim to that of the Strasbourg manuscript, albeit here and there following variants from other witnesses.⁹²

Among these variants, the most important is undoubtedly the explicit reference to Judas Iscariot raping Jesus during the aerial battle:

Then came Judas Iscariot, who said the name of God and rose above Jesus. They were flying like eagles and all those who saw them were astounded. Judas flew over Jesus and embraced him and said the name of God to topple him to the ground. Jesus said the name of God to prevent them from falling. Neither could overcome the other, for the name of God was amongst them. When Judas saw that he could not make him fall, he bugged

⁹⁰ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 135r: *Joseph donnit grant entencion et mist son euyl en elle de troveir meniere que elle fasit son plisir* (Barbu and Dahhaoui, "Un manuscrit français," 262).

⁹¹ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 137r: [*Les maistres*] *firent deus chiens de queurez pendus sus deux pilles de fers contre la porte du temple. Et tous ceulz quy entrens dedens et esprenient les lectres, quant il sallient dehors, lez chiens l'esbaïent par la force dez conjuracions qui estien faictes surs eulx et quant il veient lez chiens, lez lectres que il avient aprins, il lez obliient de leurs cuers* (Barbu and Dahhaoui, "Un manuscrit français," 266). See Ms. Budapest, MTA, Kaufmann A 299, fol. 109r, in Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshu*, vol. 2:84 [1r].

⁹² E. g. Mary is here married and not betrothed to Yoḥanan, as in Ms. New York, JTS, 1491; in her confession she admits to having thought that Pandera was her son's father, as in Ms. Budapest, MTA, Kaufmann A 299 and Ebendorfer; in the "disclosure" episode, Jesus learns that his mother "whored," and that the reason he is liable to the death penalty is because he lectured in front of his masters, again as in Ms. Budapest MTA, Kaufmann A 299 and Ebendorfer. The translator also seems to avoid repetitions: Mary's verbal exchange with Yoḥanan thus appears only once (the text only says: "he told him [i. e. Simon ben Shetaḥ] the whole story"), contrary to the Strasbourg manuscript or to Ebendorfer's version; and the details regarding how exactly one steals the Ineffable Name from the Jerusalem temple are not recapped when it is Judas's turn to do so.

Jesus from the rear and both were sullied and fell to the ground. Christians confirm and certify this by lamenting the fact on the night of their Easter.⁹³

Although the phrasing of the text is more straightforward than that of Ebendorfer, the Paris manuscript here confirms Ebendorfer's version of events. Indeed, in Ebendorfer's text, Judas "*kilkel masaf ymo (qilqel ma'asaw 'ymo)*, corrupted his deed with him, that is, he had intercourse with him, *ve tyeb osos bo miskaf socho[r]* (*we-ti'ew oto be-mishkav zakhur*), that is, dishonourably had male–male intercourse with him until he ejaculated and thus both were sullied and fell to ground."⁹⁴ Noticeably, the second part of Ebendorfer's sentence closely corresponds with what we find in our text, corroborating that the precision concerning the details of Judas's endeavour must already have been present in the Hebrew text Ebendorfer was translating. The Strasbourg text interprets the words *qilqel ma'asaw* somewhat more moderately, indicating that Judas "spoiled his dealing and urinated on Yeshe and he was polluted and he fell to the ground and Judah (Judas) with him."⁹⁵ Many versions of *Toledot Yeshe* seem to content themselves with the motif of Judas urinating on Jesus, although a few nonetheless highlight that the aerial battle between Judas and Jesus had a sexual component (Judas touching Jesus's penis and/or ejaculating on Jesus),⁹⁶ and a number of manuscripts, now made accessible through the online *Toledot Yeshe* Database, clearly stipulate that Judas engaged in *mishkav zakhur* (male–male intercourse) with Jesus. The motif is also attested in the work of another fifteenth

⁹³ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 139r–139v: *Adoncque vint Judas Scarioth et nommat le nom de Dieu et montat par desurs Jhesus. Et voullient comme egles et tous le monde que lez voient en furent esbaïs. Judas voulast par desurs Jhesus et l'embrassa et nommast le nom de Dieu qu'<i>cheüssient a terre et Jhesus nommast le non de Dieu que ilz ne cheüssient poient, tant que l'ung n'a poi<n>t guencié l'autre car le non de Dieu estoit ou mietant d'eus deus. Quant Judas vit qu'il ne le povest faire choizre, adoncque le dit Judas bougonnat avec ledit Jhesus par deriere et furent pollus tous deus et chezirent a terre. Et lez crestiens en portent garentie et certificacion de cecy et en pleuren<t> la muyt de leurs pasques* (Barbu and Dahhaoui, "Un manuscrit français," 270).

⁹⁴ Callsen et al., *Das jüdische Leben Jesu*, 56: *kilkel masaf ymo (qilqel ma'asaw 'ymo)*, *corruptit opus suum secum, id est, concubuit cum eo, ve tyeb osos bo miskaf socho[r]* (*we-ti'ew oto be-mishkav zakhur*), *id est indignum eum fecit concubitu viri vsque ad emissionem seminis, et sic ambo maculati corruerunt in terram*. See Karras, "Aerial Battle," 509–13 whose translation we partly follow. Regarding the word *sochod (zakhur)*, the translator here seems to have confused a *resh* for a *daled*.

⁹⁵ Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshe*, vol. 1: 174 (English), vol. 2: 89 (Hebrew). Ms. Budapest, MTA, Kaufmann A 299 simply indicates "and Judas polluted him." *Leqalqel ma'aseh* as a sexual sin is attested in *Gen. Rab.* 28:5; see Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshe*, vol. 1:295.

⁹⁶ See in particular "Ashkenazi B" in Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshe*, vol. 1:195 (English), vol. 2:104 (Hebrew), where Judas pollutes Jesus with urine, then touches his penis, defiling him a second time, and a third time by ejaculating on him. Judas also ejaculates on Jesus in "Italian B," "Late Yemenite A," "Slavic A" and "Slavic B." See also Samuel Krauss, "Une nouvelle recension hébraïque du Toldot Yesu," *Revue des études juives* 103 (1938): 65–90, at 81. "Italian A" in Meerson and Schäfer, *Toledot Yeshe*, vol. 1: 247 (English) and vol. 2:172 (Hebrew), combines Judas's urinating on Jesus with his performing anal sex with him.

century author active in Germany, the Dominican friar Petrus Nigri (Schwartz), who reviewed *Toledot Yeshu* in his anti-Jewish treatise *Contra perfidos Judaeos de conditionibus veri Messiae* (Against the perfidious Jews on the condition of the true Messiah), published in 1475.⁹⁷ As suggested by Yaacov Deutsch, “[i]t is likely that this particular detail was changed by [the] people who read and transmitted the text of *Toledot Yeshu*, probably [in] accordance to how secure they felt”; as such, the text of the Paris manuscript is further testimony to the fact that, “already in the fifteenth century, some Jews felt secure enough to insert [this motif] into the text.”⁹⁸ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 clearly shows that the motif – which was unknown to, or ignored by, Raymond Martini in the thirteenth century – was not introduced by Ebendorfer, as was recently claimed by Ruth Mazo Karras.⁹⁹

Conclusions

Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 is not only a testimony of the transmission, circulation, and reception of a specific version of *Toledot Yeshu* in the late medieval world; it is also an extraordinary testimony of a *Toledot Yeshu* text in context. Indeed, the manuscripts of the 1429 prosecution of the Jews of Trévoux allow an insight on the work “in situ,” as archaeologists would have it. In this chapter we have sought to explore the site of this discovery. Indeed, we believe that cases such as the one documented in the records of the 1429 prosecution, allow one to go beyond textual issues, and provide concrete evidence of the place of *Toledot Yeshu* in the late Middle Ages, as well as consider the stakes at work with regard to this text for both Christian clerics seeking to validate their scholastic interpretation of rabbinic Judaism as an anti-Christian religion, and Jews, fighting to uphold their identity in the face of Christian enmity and confronted with the constant deterioration of their living conditions in the late medieval Western world.

⁹⁷ Petrus Nigri, *Contra perfidos Judaeos de conditionibus veri Messiae* (Esslingen: Konrad Fyner, 1475), fol. 33v, quoted in Karras, “Aerial Battle,” 513: *asserunt a menstruate matre per adulterium conceptum ac a quodam alium sodomiticum actum compassum, hec et alia nefandissima in eum confingunt*. See Deutsch, “*Toledot Yeshu*” in *Christian Eyes*, 50–51; idem, “The Second Life of the Life of Jesus,” 291. In his German treatise, *Stern Messiah* (Esslingen: Conrad Fyner, 1477), Nigri also summarized *Toledot Yeshu*, but claimed he could not reveal how Jesus lost his powers because the deed was “unspeakable” (*unausprechlich*) and “unnatural” (*wider die ganze natur*).

⁹⁸ Deutsch, “The Second Life of the Life of Jesus,” 291. The motif is also attested in a number of early modern Yiddish manuscripts; see Michael Stanislawski, “A Preliminary Study of a Yiddish ‘Life of Jesus’ (*Toledot Yeshu*): Ms. New York, JTS 2211,” in *Toledot Yeshu ... Revisited* (ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch), 79–87, at 84, as well as Evi Michels’s contribution in this volume.

⁹⁹ Karras, “Aerial Battle,” 513.

The evidence provided by the records of the prosecution also reminds us that *Toledot Yeshu* is not only a text, but also a physical artefact – a booklet (*quarnet*) – hidden by the Jews in their homes, copied from one generation to the next, circulating with its owners from one city to the next, and passing from one community to the next. It is of course possible to think that Peyret, confronted with the discovery of the booklet, sought to deflect the attention of the commissioners at work in Trévoux by claiming that it had been copied a long time ago by a relative living far away. In all likelihood, the stakes were rather high, even if often only financial. But certainly, none of the Jews doubted that the investigation, once launched, would follow a pre-ordained scheme, in which the roles of winners and losers were already assigned. The other Jews interrogated by the commissioners denied any knowledge of the booklet, claiming to have seen nothing and read nothing, probably seeking to shield the rest of the community from the consequences of this dangerous discovery. Yet, although he claimed never to have seen the booklet, one of the Jews – significantly Peyret’s son – dared to say, maybe not without mischievousness, that the fact that Jesus was not born of a virgin was not something unheard. Another, Salmin de la Tour, probably an older man who seems to have travelled frequently, plainly told the commissioners that he had heard the story found in the booklet several times, in Savoy and elsewhere. Peyret’s booklet is lucid evidence that, whatever the stakes, some Jews risked copying, holding, and reading a copy of *Toledot Yeshu*, if not teaching the Jewish story of Jesus.

The investigation of Trévoux offers to our eyes an intricate and unequal fight between two or even three groups. First, there were the investigators, trained clerics empowered by the commission granted by the duchess of Bourbon – i. e. the overlord of Trévoux – and closely connected to the highest ecclesiastical authority in the region, the archbishop of Lyon. Strangely enough, their voice is not so perceptible in the procedure, appearing only in their report and their marginal annotations. In the former, they confine themselves to an account of both the Jews’ and their own actions, emphasizing their own compliance with the procedure. The latter signal the investigators’ interventions in the actual debates and sanction their perspective. In the first list of conclusions (the draft version), next to almost each debated statement extracted from the books of the Jews, an unidentified hand added a theological qualification in Latin: “heretical conclusion” (*heretica conclusio*), “unnatural” (*contra naturam*), “against the precepts of the law” (*contra preceptum legis*), “reprehensible” (*dampnable*), “error” (*error*), “insane” (*fatuum*), “unbelievable” (*incredibilia*). These various qualifications, though anonymous, probably aimed at helping the commissioners as well as the Official of Lyon evaluate the threat the Jewish books posed to the faith, and decide on further steps to be taken. In the second list of conclusions, the annotations, though much scarcer, show the elaboration of their arguments against the Jews.

The second group that proved instrumental in the investigation was under pressure from both sides: the Jewish converts, responsible for cataloguing, extracting, and translating the books of the Jews, in our case, Ayme of Chambéry. As we have seen, converts like Ayme were often hired and put to work by the duke of Savoy, or, as in Trévoux, by neighbouring powers. The pressure experienced by these individuals, involved in the trial and prosecution of their former coreligionists, is clearly evidenced in the Trévoux affair: on 14 April, Ayme told the investigators that he feared for his life. A decision was reached that the castellan should provide him with bodyguards, and several Jews were ordered not to harm him.¹⁰⁰

Last but not least, there was the Jewish community, represented through its householders and religious leaders. The report of the commissioners, the discussions over Ayme's translations, and the documents pertaining to previous investigations show that the Jews of Trévoux, confronted with the seizure of their books and the possibly dramatic consequences of their prosecution, were actively trying to resist the duchess of Bourbon's envoys. Not only did they contest, from the very first day, the legitimacy of the prosecution, but they also gathered within two months numerous documents issued from either lay or ecclesiastical authorities in order to support their claims. Apparently well aware of the political entanglements of their time, they also tried playing the duke against the duchess, in particular when they produced a letter in which the duke authorized their books to "his" Jews. They also sought to appeal the investigation, claiming that it violated their privileges. Their appeal, however, came to nothing, the investigators telling them straight away "they didn't care a fig about it."¹⁰¹ Yet they did not give up, either contesting Ayme's translations, or producing arguments challenging them, sometimes even quoting Christian canon law.¹⁰² Indeed, the marginal annotations in the first list of conclusions show them competing with Ayme over his expertise in Hebrew.

In short, the documents make it clear that the Jews of Trévoux tried, in every possible way, to put an end to the threatening spiral in which they were now

¹⁰⁰ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 122v: *Et pour ce que ledit maistre Ayme se doubte, ilz l'ont baillé en garde et sauft conduit au chastelain qui l'a prins en garde seurement et le laissera aller et fera accompagner la et quant il voudra ... Et a esté deffendu au juifs es personnes de Peyret, son filz Caquellat, Josson, Samuel, sur poyne de xx mars d'argent qu'ilz ne offensent maistre Ayme;* see also Loeb, "Un épisode," 42.

¹⁰¹ Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 118v: *Et oultre, tant qu'il fait contre leurs privileges, ont appellé de une voix et nous leur avons respondu que a leur appellacion come favole (a bean or a fable?) nous ne deportons en riens.*

¹⁰² In the text of the undated *protestatio*, which is copied in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722, fol. 103r–104v, the Jews of Trévoux list six *rationes* explaining why the Hebrew *goyim* should not be translated by "Christians"; see Loeb, "Un épisode," 46–48. The preamble of this document, which was probably written by a Christian notary, quotes not only the *Digest*, but also Johann Andreae's *Novella*.

caught, even seeking to use their opponent's own weapons (privileges, canon law). The secret booklet regrettably unearthed in one of the Jews' homes is but another testimony to the same readiness for cultural resistance.

Appendix 1: A Calendar of the Investigation

The numbers in parenthesis followed by the foliation refer to the documents listed in *Appendix 2* (Second unit)

1429

23 March (Holy Wednesday)

The commissioners mandated by Marie de Berry, duchess of Bourbon, arrive in Trévoux. The two commissioners, Jehan de Namy, “juge d’appeaulx” of Beaujolais, and Jean Chalon, lieutenant of Pierre Charpin, the Official of Lyon, are accompanied by *magister* Ayme of Chambéry, a “neophyte,” and Pierre Balarin, royal tabellion and juror at the Forez court. The castellan being out of town, they introduce themselves to his lieutenant, Hubert Anserme. In the latter’s house they summon twelve Jews who are put under arrest while their houses are searched. All the books found in their homes are transferred to Anserme’s house and impounded. The Jews are asked whether they apply a written or an oral law and whether they use the Talmud. The Jews answer, through Peyret, that they hold privileges granted to them by the successive overlords of Trévoux and that, in addition to the twenty-four books of the Bible, they do indeed use the Talmud. However, they never used it against nature nor against the law. The Jews are freed but requested to present themselves the next day. The impounded books are gathered and given to Ayme of Chambéry for examination. The books of the Talmud are set apart from the other books (6., fol. 117r–118r).

24 March (Holy Thursday)

The Jews are asked if they possess other books than those already impounded. Some of them admit possessing other books, either books of the Bible or books destined to the education of children. All would willingly bring these books to the commissioners. The commissioners return the books of the Bible to their owners and have the books of the Talmud locked in a chest in Anserme’s house. The Jews are summoned to return for further interrogation on 13 April. They however announce that they will appeal against the investigation as it infringes their privileges. The commissioners answer that they do not care a fig about their appeal (6., fol. 118r–118v).

April to June

Ayme of Chambéry reads the books of the Jewish community and extracts the conclusions he considers blasphemous (9., fol. 127r).

13 April

In Anserme's house, the Official (Jean Charpin), the ordinary judge, and the "juge d'apppeaulx" (Jean Namy) interrogate Peyret on 116 articles¹⁰³ (6., fol. 119r–122v).

14 April

The commissioners entrust Ayme of Chambéry to list and examine all the books. Croppet (another notary) is to work with him and record the conclusions and the inventory of the books. Ayme fears for his life, and the commissioners ask the castellan to provide him with an escort. Some Jews are ordered not to harm him. The Jews are summoned to return on 27 April (6., fol. 122v).

22 April

The commissioners order a new search in the houses of Peyret, Caquellet, Samuel Gabriel, as well as in the "school of the Jews" (1., fol. 102r–102v).

18 May

The Jews of Trévoux produce eight documents testifying to their privileges (6., fol. 123r).

20 May

The Jews of Trévoux appoint Leonet, son of Peyret, and Josson as their representatives. Leonet and Josson are interrogated on 159 articles. They contest several of Ayme's translations (8., fol. 123v–125v). (On the same day?) Peyret confesses to having written what is *dever* (besides) the booklet and mentions the Passion of Jesus (8., fol. 126v).

21 May

Nearly all of the twelve Jews interrogated on 23 March are questioned with regard to their knowledge of Peyret's booklet (8., fol. 125v).

¹⁰³ The casual mention of the content of these articles as well as Peyret's answers make it difficult to establish a connection between the questions and the conclusions extracted by Ayme of Chambéry. It is therefore debatable whether Peyret's interrogation is based on a list of conclusions not preserved in Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722 as Loeb suggested ("Un épisode," 42). The commissioners could just as well have used a list of articles elaborated during a previous investigation or from a compendium of problematic Talmudic passages; see n. 47.

Appendix 2: The Contents of Ms. Paris, BnF, Lat. 12722

First unit: fol. 2r–67v (previously fol. 1r–LXVv). Memoirs and other documents gathered for the rehabilitation trial of Joan of Arc (1456).

This part of the codex belonged to Jean Bréhal, inquisitor for the kingdom of France and one of the judges in charge of the trial. He probably copied some of these documents himself.¹⁰⁴

Second unit: fol. 69r–141r (previously fol. LXVIII–CLIIr). Documents written and gathered during the investigation on the books of the Jews of Trévoux (1429).

1. fol. 70r–102v (previously fol. LXVIII–CV): First list of conclusions extracted from the books belonging to the Jews of Trévoux.

Numerous corrections. The supplementary foliation in the top centre of the folios (1–XXXIII) confirms that this list of conclusions was originally an independent unit. The conclusions are organized by book examined (each book is given a serial number). The books examined were seized during two searches (see *Appendix 1*) and were found in the houses of Peyret (at least two sacks of books), Deot Quaquet, Gabriel Cohen, Samuel Gabriel, and in the “school of the Jews.” This is likely to be the list established by Ayme of Chambéry and Croppet in the immediate context of the Trévoux investigation.

Lacuna of fourteen folios (previously fol. CI–CXIV).

2. fol. 103r–104v (previously fol. CXVI–CXVIIr): Copy of a *protestatio* of the Jews of Trévoux giving six *raciones* and *cause* why the word *gohen* (*goyim*), in the Talmud, does not refer to Christians but to idolaters.

Undated document. Only the preamble, the *narratio* and the *dispositio* have been copied, making it impossible to know by which authority it was recorded.

3. fol. 105r–108r (previously fol. CXVIII–CXXr): Copy of a *vidimus* (8 March 1429) by the council of the duke of Savoy of letters patent (19 February 1429) by which Amédée VIII alleviates the sentence of Ponce Feugeyron (25 February 1426) relating to the trial of the Jews of Savoy.

The duke of Savoy allows “his” Jews to make use of their books provided the abjured conclusions are erased from them, with the exception of the books called *Samata* and *L’official*. The notary responsible for this copy, a certain *Cholerii*, left his notarial mark at the end of the document.

4. fol. 109r–112r (previously fol. CXXI–CXXIIIr): List of thirty-four conclusions abjured by the Jews of the duchy of Savoy.

¹⁰⁴ Philippe Contamine, “La réhabilitation de la pucelle vue au prisme des *tractatus super materia processus*. Une propédeutique,” in *De l’hérétique à la sainte: Les procès de Jeanne d’Arc revisités, Actes du colloque international de Cerisy (1^{er}–4 octobre 2009)* (ed. François Neveux; Caen: Office universitaire d’études normandes, Université de Caen Basse-Normandie, 2012), 177–96.

The list bears marginal illustrations.¹⁰⁵

5. fol. 112r–116r (previously fol. CXXIIIr–CXXVIIIr): List of twenty-nine further conclusions abjured by the Jews of the duchy of Savoy.

Continued illustrations. A note on fol. 115v indicates that these conclusions (either N^o 5 only or N^{os} 4 and 5) have been extracted from the sentence of Ponce Feugeyron (25 February 1426) and copied by *Henricus Dautanens*, a notary and juror at the courts of the Official of Lyon and of the judge of Bresse, on behalf of “certain Jews” (*pro parte nonnullorum judeorum*).

6. fol. 117r–126r (previously fol. CXXVIIIr–CXXXVIIIr): Report of the investigation on the books of the Jews of Trévoux by the commissioners of the duchess of Bourbon.

The report documents the commissioners’ activity in Trévoux from 23 March to June 1429. It records the different steps undertaken by the commissioners, the Jews’ reactions, and the different interrogations of their representatives (see *Appendix I*). The format of the quire(s?) is slightly smaller (277 x 198 mm) than that of the others in the dossier.

7. fol. 126r (previously fol. CXXXVIIIr): Copy of the sentence (29 June 1417) by the lord and lady of Trévoux absolving the Jews established in the lordship of Thoire-Villars from a heresy trial.

Only the *narratio* and the *dispositio* have been copied. The sentence allows the Jews, among other things, to use their “books of Talmud” with the glosses.

8. fol. 126v (previously fol. CXXXVIIIv): List of names of the Jews of Trévoux; deed (20 May 1429) through which the Jews appoint Leonet and Josson as their representatives; Peyret’s confession.

The deed bears the signature of Leonet (in Hebrew characters), suggesting that this is indeed the original document.

9. fol. 127r–134v and 141r (previously fol. CXXXVIIIr–CXLVv and CLIIr): Finalized list of the conclusions extracted from the books belonging to the Jews of Trévoux.

10. fol. 135r–140v (previously fol. CXLVIr–CLIV): Middle French *Toledot Yeshu*; “Shamta” curse in a mix of Middle French and transliterated Hebrew.

The text of *Toledot Yeshu* mainly corresponds to the Hebrew version of that narrative preserved in Ms. Strasbourg, BnU 3974 (héb. 48), fol. 170r–175v. The narrative breaks off after his opponents capture Jesus. It is likely to be the text found in Peyret’s booklet, mentioned in his confession of 20 May (see *Appendix I*). The “Shamta” curse on fol. 140r–140v is copied from a book of prayers. The text corresponds to an alleged anti-Christian *piyyut*, *Veha-goyim eimim*, attributed to R. Kalonymus the Elder.

¹⁰⁵ These require further examination. The marginal drawings seem to illustrate the conclusions (e. g. a penis illustrates Noah’s castration by Ham; a donkey next to the mention of Baa-lam’s she-ass, etc.). They may have had either a mnemotechnic function or serve a classificatory scheme. The presence of similar illustrations in other manuscripts previously belonging to Claude Bellière could also suggest that they were drawn by the sixteenth-century antiquarian.

Third unit: fol. 146r–308v. Memoirs and other documents on the resolution of the Western Schism.

This part of the manuscript was added to the first two units at a later stage (probably when the manuscript received a new binding in the seventeenth century). Unlike the first two units, this one did not belong to Claude Bellière's *Liber grossus*.