

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES

AUTHOR Helene Ferris
TITLE Joseph Haken's Emek Habachai: A Comparison
to the 37 Historical Chapters of Samuel Usque's
Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel
TYPE OF THESIS: D.H.L. () Rabbinic (✓)
Master's ()

1. May circulate (yes)
2. Is restricted (w) for ____ years.

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on
theses for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of
my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓
yes no

Feb 5, 1981
Date

Helene Ferris
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed _____
Date

Signature of Library Staff Member

Joseph Hakohen's Emek Habachah:

A Comparison to the Thirty-Seven Historical Chapters
of Samuel Usque's Consolation for the Tribulations of
Israel

Helene Ferris

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of Requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, N.Y.

January 30, 1981

Referee: Professor Martin A. Cohen

PREFACE

The horrors of the Holocaust were manifold; yet we Jews know that throughout our history we have always been targets of hatred and carnage. Unfortunately, the present is no exception to our tragic history. What about the future for us Jews? For other unfortunates? If Joseph Hakohen's medieval world stands accused of indifference to the suffering of humanity described by him in such gory detail, how much more so do we stand accused of the same sin today?

It is my hope that by continually exposing all the atrocities that have been committed against our people and against all humanity, that the world will cry out, "Enough! Never again!" I pray that that day may come speedily, and in our own time.

I thank God for all my blessings and for the privilege of learning Torah and the ways of my People. I thank

my husband and my children for supporting me while I seek this privilege;

my teachers for imparting to me their wisdom along the way;

my advisor for sharing his expertise and insight into the workings of Jewish history;

the library staff for helping me, not only during thesis-time, but throughout my years of study;

and the administration of HUC-JIR for allowing me the opportunity to study here and to realize my goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ii
I. Introduction	1
II. The Historical Data	6
III. Language: Construction and Tone	33
IV. Religious Philosophy	40
V. Historical Philosophy	45
VI. Conclusions	48
Notes	52
Bibliography	59

Safed -- then back to Prague and Italy, where he established himself in Ferrara about 1551.⁵ It was in Ferrara in 1553 that Usque's work was published.

A little more is known about Joseph Hakohen's life, since he gives us some personal data in the Emek. After the institution of the Inquisition in Spain in 1391, his ancestors fled from the city of Cuenca and then settled in Huete about 1394:

ו'צאנו אבות אבות' הכהנ' מקואנקה הע'ר
ב'מ'פ הע'ר'פ הע'ר מנ'ל חמ'ל הע'ר' ו'לכו אס
מ'צד' אוא'ל' ו'צ'פ.⁶

After 1492 Hakohen's father and his family moved to Avignon, where they met his mother's family:

ו'מ'צ'פ אס אס אב' כמ'ר 'הושע מן הכהנ'פ
אס' ו'צ' מ'מ'צ'ד' אוא'ל', ו'לכו אס
ד'ל'צ'ה אס' ע'אס'ה בשנ' 5255 (1495).⁷

Joseph was born in Avignon in 1496. Five years later, his family moved to Genoa:

בשנ' ... 1496 נולד' אס' 'הושע מן
הכהנ'פ אס' אור'ס מסכ'ר גע'ל'פ יוס' א'ח'ד
ד'מ'ג'ל' ... במ'צ'ה פ'ר'ג'נ'צ'א באו'ל'ין אס'ר
ע'ל הע'ר כו'ל', ו'צ'א'נ' אב' מ'ס' וא'נ'
בן חמ'ש ע'נ'פ, ו'ש'ה ב'אב'ל' ע'נוב'ה השו'ב'ה
ע'ל הע'ר ה'פ'ה.⁸

(The last three words here are an enigma, since Hakohen states below that he and his family did not remain in

Genoa until the writing of the Emek.) When the Jews were driven out of Genoa in 1516, Hakohen's family went to Novi, where he married the daughter of a rabbi:

וה' מקץ שנת פ' מ'מ' ואקח את פאולונה
בת כמחל'ר אברהם הכהן ז"ל לאשה ונשא
בנוב' 9

Joseph returned to Genoa in 1538 and practiced medicine for 12 years.¹⁰

When the Jews were expelled a second time from Genoa in 1550, Hakohen settled in Voltaggio:

ונצא מ'נובה... ואשה (הוא) אלו ואה' להם
ד'רפא 87 ענ' 5328 (1568).

Cecil Roth states that the Jews were forced to flee from Genoa because of the jealousy of the people toward Jewish physicians and the ostentatious conduct of some members of the Jewish community.¹² However, the more general factors which undermined the existence of the Jews in Italy throughout the 16th Century were the confusion caused by the Counter-Reformation struggle and the attitude of the Spanish Crown toward its Jewish subjects, which extended to its Italian possessions.¹³

In 1568 when the Jews were expelled from Voltaggio, Hakohen voluntarily moved to Costeletto, even though he had special permission to remain:

וה' אב'ר' לאור 878 בתוכ' ואבואה
לשג' בקאש'ל' 10 איש בגבול' מונפ'רה.¹⁴

In 1571, Hakohen returned to Genoa, where he died

about the year 1575.¹⁵

When Usque's work was published in Ferrara in 1553, Hakohen was in Voltaggio. Hakohen began writing the Emek in 1558 and ended one version in 1564 and the other near the time of his death in 1575. Waxman states that Hakohen was "determined" to write a similiar work to Usque's.¹⁶ And there certainly are similarities in the two works. Both attempt a comprehensive history of the Jewish people and the persecutions they endured: Usque, from Biblical times to 1553; Hakohen, from the aftermath of the Second Destruction to 1575. (The earlier version of the Emek, dated 1564, was later edited by an anonymous Italian scholar, thought by some to be Samuel David Luzzatto. He supplied additional notes and brought the history up to 1605.¹⁷)

While little is known about the life of Usque, much more is known about the sources of his work.¹⁸ Just the opposite is true for Hakohen. Even though the author of the Emek names his sources within his text -- works of Usque, Sebastian Muenster, Almonzi, and a Rabbi Chayim Galipapa --¹⁹ he merely mentions these people in a haphazard fashion. Subsequently, scholars have found it very difficult to agree on all the sources for the Emek. The one that all seem to agree upon is Samuel Usque's Consolation.

However, when I compared the historical events in Hakohen's work to the corresponding 37 chapters of Usque's

Third Dialogue, I found many discrepancies in names, facts, dates and interpretation. Also, while comparing language, style and religious and historical philosophy, I found even greater differences between Usque and Hakohen. My task is to delineate these differences and to try to evaluate them.

II. THE HISTORICAL DATA

The 37 historical chapters of the Third Dialogue of Usque's Consolation cover a 936-year period of Jewish persecutions from 617 until 1553. Of the comparable time-span covered in the Emek, only about one-third of the events recounted by Hakohen parallels Usque. These events do not always follow Usque's order and are interspersed throughout Hakohen's run-on narrative.

The first chapter deals with Sisebut's forced conversion of the Jews in Spain.²⁰ Usque's erroneous date -- 4077 (317) -- is corrected by the translator to 617; Hakohen's date is 4376 (616).²¹ While Usque states that Mohammed was driven from Spain in this time, Hakohen states that Mohammed came to Spain in these days. Usque names Witiza as the son of Sisebut; Hakohen, Sontilla ($\int' (jic)$) as his son, or grandson -- the antecedent is not clear. Hakohen omits the details of the punishment that the Jews were threatened with and the courier's mission to the Pope. He adds the name Isidore as that of the Pope, adds another grandson before Sontilla, and mentions the poisoning of Sisebut. In Usque, there is no link between the capturing of the Moors and the revocation of the Jews' death penalty; however, Hakohen implies that because the Jews helped Isidore to rid Spain of the Moors, they were freed from the death penalty.

In this, as in each subsequent historical event compared, Hakohen omits all Biblical admonitions with

which Usque always ends his chapters. Hakohen's omissions of these admonitions will be discussed in the chapter on Hakohen's religious philosophy.

Usque's second chapter deals with the persecutions in France during the time of Henry VII.²² Usque's date of 4177 (317) is obviously erroneous. Hakohen places the story between events dated 1099 and 1142; he does not say which Henry, only *ה'קכ"ב עד ה'קכ"ד*.²³ Hakohen omits many details found in Usque. He does not mention the background of the story -- that the Jews' serenity and wealth caused the Christians to envy them. He also omits the Easter eve episode between the Christian woman and the pawnbroker and the dialogues that ensue -- one, between the woman and the pawnbroker; the other, between the pawnbroker and the Host. Hakohen eliminates Usque's castigation of the wife for being "weak" and confessing. There are two detailed similarities in the two accounts: The number of *ה'קכ"ב*, and the way the man died -- with the Talmud in his hands. The differences between these two authors found in comparing the details of this Host-hoax story are quite typical of most of the chapters compared below: Hakohen is more succinct and lucid, whereas Usque is more poetic and verbose. A more detailed analysis of the authors' styles will be discussed in the chapter on language.

Usque mentions no date for the atrocities in Toledo recounted in chapter three;²⁴ Hakohen mentions the date

as 711 and places the story before the previous one.²⁵

Usque's "Palm Sunday" becomes ה'יום הראשון אשר לפני פסח.

Hakohen omits details of the war between the Goths and the Moors and the reasoning of the nobles who were against the Jews. His interpretation of the facts are also different from Usque's: Hakohen implies that because Roderick had no heir, the confusion after Roderick's death was a contributing factor toward victory for the Moors. Usque does not even mention that Roderick died without an heir. At the end of his recounting of this event, Hakohen implies that the king saved all the Jews from suffering; Usque says that only the Jews in Toledo were punished.

Another incident in Toledo is recounted in chapter four.²⁶ Usque dates this incident 1163. Hakohen places the incident between two other stories dated 718 and 810.²⁷ Usque states that the Jews suffered because they were blamed for an incident that occurred in Mecca; Hakohen says the name of the city was 'מדינת אל-מדינה. While Usque mentions that the thieves stole precious gems from Mohammed's casket, Hakohen states that they stole a precious stone and holy garments. Usque appends a section on Maimonides at the very end of this chapter -- after the Biblical admonitions. Hakohen's mention of Rambam comes in a much later account.²⁸ There are similarities in certain details: Both accounts state that 40 synagogues were destroyed and that the name of the Jew who was blamed for robbing the casket was Abraham

With the Cloak -- אגדת הארץ, אגדתם.

The blood-libel accusation against the Jews of Paris described by Usque in chapter five is omitted by Hakohen.

Chapter six recounts the carnage in France against the Jews, who were falsely accused of murdering pigs and burying their hearts when they could not obtain Christian hearts! Usque's account is dateless,²⁹ Hakohen places the story between events of 1100 and 1141.³⁰ While the story line and the order of the narrative are quite similar, Hakohen's account is typically more succinct. Hakohen gives no reason why people hated the Jews; Usque says that it was because of the "wretched" profit they made from loans.

Usque relates a massacre in Spain in chapter seven.³¹ His account is not dated. Hakohen's description of this massacre immediately follows the events described above that took place in France and, while dateless, places the events between 1099 and 1142.³² The place of Hakohen's narrative is Navarre; of Usque's, Tabara. Hakohen omits the "jousting" incident and the Christians' claim that the "mad" father bolted their doors and planned to set fire to the city. The story line and order of this event are similar; the differences lie, typically, in the length and the tone of the accounts. (The latter will be dealt with in the chapter on religious philosophy.)

Persia, at the time of the exploits of David Reubeni, is the setting for the next chapter.³³ Usque's account is dated 1164; Hakohen's, 1163.³⁴ The cities seem similar: Hamaria, *המריה*. Usque mentions that the language of Jews was Syriac ("Targum"); Hakohen, *הערבית*. Usque's account contains many more geographical locations than does Hakohen's, although Hakohen, unlike Usque, cites the city of Dagestan, by the river Gozan, as the city where David was imprisoned. Usque only mentions the Gozan as the river upon which David spreads out his turban. Hakohen adds the name of Rabbi Jacob as one of David's teachers; Hakohen omits, however, the name of the Turkish King Sin-el-Din, who granted amnesty to the Jews. In Usque's account it is David's father-in-law who becomes his assassin; in Hakohen's, it is David's son-in-law. Hakohen briefly mentions Rambam at the end of this story only as one who wrote about David's exploits. Usque, however, at the end of his account relates Rambam's "far-out" story of David's belief in his being the Messiah and his "trick" in avoiding a torturous death.

The details, order, and length of this story are quite similar in both works. The unusual lack of brevity in this account of Hakohen is due not only to his following Usque's account fairly closely, but also to his addition of minor facts not found in Usque: The number of Jewish families in the community; the head-tax they

had to pay; David's dreams and his being cast in chains; David's arrogant conversations with the King; and the details in the letter the Jewish community sent to David.

The setting of chapter nine takes place in Vienna in both accounts. Usque places this story between two others dated 1164 and 1183.³⁵ (The editor and translator, however, states that the correct date is 1420.) Hakohen seems to follow Usque's incorrect dating and places his account around 1182.³⁶ In this episode of the burning of three hundred innocent Jews for the accidental drowning of three Christian boys, we see typical similarities and differences between the two authors. While many details of the story are similar -- even the aside of the "Host" accusation and the exact number of Jews burned at the stake -- Usque includes more details and explanations. The only discrepancy in the two accounts is the description of the boys who drowned: Hakohen says they were *ר'ג'ון ר'ג'ון*; Usque, only that they were young. The difference in the two authors' attitude toward their people may be shown by their comments on the murder of the 300 innocent Jews: Usque states that "only" 300 were burned at the stake because of God's mercy; Hakohen writes that 300 innocent people were burned -- the rest were saved because God had mercy on them.

says that the correct date was 1290.) Hakohen also dates his account 1240, but does not include the city of Trani, as does Usque.⁴⁰ The facts and their order are very similar in Hakohen and Usque's stories. Only a few details are dissimilar: Usque states that no temporal payment was sufficient to repay the Jews; Hakohen, that all the gold of Ophir could not repay their kindness. Usque states that the Jews had to convert before a "taper" burned out; Hakohen, before "the burning of a turban." While the facts in these two accounts are similar, there is a difference in the two authors' interpretation of the facts. We learn something of their religious philosophy, which will be discussed in more detail in a later chapter. Usque says that the Jews suffered because God was angry with them for trusting a king who treated them well; Hakohen implies that they suffered because of their haughtiness. Usque seems distressed that so many people converted and praises those who did not convert, for "they passed on to life everlasting." Hakohen, on the other hand, is less judgmental -- he seems to pity the forced converts and praises all those who suffered *כל מי שסבב וסבב וסבב*. Hakohen omits Usque's warning that we must not put our trust in mortals and his statement before the Biblical admonitions that, as a result of the forced conversions, the stock of the nobility of Naples was mixed with Jewish blood.

The setting for Usque's chapter twelve is England, 1242.⁴¹ Hakohen's account is quite similar in sequence and detail, though he dates the event 1241.⁴² Usque describes the 2000 families as "very rich;" Hakohen omits this description. Usque implies that the monk was forced to fall in love with a beautiful Jewish girl; Hakohen states that the monk fell in love with her: *ס'היה מ'ן ארצות שונות ... ויהי ענין ענין ארצות*. Usque describes the monk as rich; Hakohen says that the monk was rich and good and omits the fact that monks sermonized against the Jews. Usque describes the mother as "weak" in character; Hakohen refrains from judgment. In both Usque and Hakohen there seems to be some confusion as to the order of persecutions meted out to the Jews: How could they first be expelled from the land, then forcibly converted? And at what point were the Jewish children wrested from their parents and sent to Northumbria? This common confusion and a common metaphor used when describing the monk's conversion -- Usque's "He donned the garments of Judaism" and Hakohen's *פ'היה מ'ן ארצות שונות* -- point to the probability of Usque as Hakohen's source for this event.

Hakohen continues the next narrative, which is comparable to Usque's thirteenth chapter, directly after the last one.⁴³ Usque's chapter also seems continuous with his previous one.⁴⁴ The events deal with additional persecutions in England -- specifically, the horror story

of the two pavilions. Neither account is dated. While the major facts of the two narratives and their order are quite similar, there are many minor discrepancies: Usque mentions that there were "others" who plotted against England besides the Scots; Hakohen mentions only the Scots. Usque calls the propounder of the evil scheme an "Adversary dressed in human clothing;" Hakohen states: *לכוד פחד פק'י פאק ע'ק פק'י*. Usque discusses the concept of sin vis-à-vis England and the Jews; Hakohen does not discuss sin at all. Hakohen, typically, omits many parts of Usque's narrative: The lands in which Jews had lived before their return to England; their wanting their children back from the "North" and their desire to leave England after finding them; Usque's explanation for the tent "solution" -- "Bodies might contaminate the air;" and the long diatribe against the rulers and the people of England. Both Usque and Hakohen fail to mention the number of Jews killed and whether or not they ever found their children.

Flanders is the scene for chapter fourteen.⁴⁵

While Usque does not date this episode, Hakohen places his account between events of 1251 and 1263.⁴⁶ Hakohen's narrative is extremely terse; he mentions only the "Host" accusation and the persecutions that followed. He omits Usque's description of the prosperous, tranquil life of the Jews in Flanders; the mention of the "Enemy" who

constantly wishes to destroy Jews; the fact that the Jews were burned as well as put to the sword; and the comment about the new generation of converts and their Lutheran beliefs.

Chapter fifteen's events take place in Foreheim, Germany.⁴⁷ Usque's date is 1262; Hakohen's 1263.⁴⁸ The general details of this episode are similar in the two accounts. Hakohen typically omits some exposition and minor details: Why the men were feuding; which son was slain; God's role in the outcome of the event. Curiously, Hakohen does not mention the blood-libel -- the reason why the Jews were accused of murdering the little girl. Hakohen just states that the Jews were accused as usual *לפי רגלם*. It is not clear whether the Jews or their enemies "walked in darkness."

By far, the longest and most complicated chapter is Usque's number sixteen, which he titles "Misfortunes in Many Places."⁴⁹ It relates all the events surrounding the famous Shepherds' Rebellion. Hakohen's account parallels very closely the sequence of events in Usque.⁵⁰ The names of all the towns and the order in which they are mentioned seem to be identical, if Hakohen's Hebraicizing of the Italian words for the French and Spanish towns is taken into consideration. For example, is *לכצ'ל*, Jaca? Bigorre, *לכצ'ל*? *לכצ'ל*, Cordel? While the general unfolding of the events among the major protagonists -- the shepherds, the rulers and

the Jews -- is quite similar in the two narratives, there are some discrepancies. Usque states that another man discovered a cross on the boy's shoulder; Hakohen, that another lad claimed to have found the sign of the cross on his own shoulder. Hakohen states that the shepherds were put in chains; Usque does not mention the chains at all. Usque names the prince of Cordel, Meltsar Tolosa; Hakohen calls him *מלך טולוס* -- Evletsar Tolosa. Later in the story, however, the word *טולוס* appears as the name of the town Usque calls Toulouse. Hakohen mentions that the town of Tudela is in Navarre; Usque does not. Unlike Usque, Hakohen does not differentiate Tolosa and Bigorda as provinces but mentions them as cities, along with Marsan (*מארסן*) and Condom (*קונדום*). As for numbers: Usque states that 120 congregations were destroyed in the provinces of Toulouse and Bigorre; Hakohen, 110 communities. In Usque's account 400 Jews were killed in Jaca when the man with the cross on his shoulder arrived; in Hakohen's, 410 Jews were slain. In most of the accounts it is Usque who uses many more metaphors and descriptive passages than Hakohen. In this account, Hakohen is a bit more verbose than usual. It is interesting to note, however, that Hakohen uses a descriptive passage in the same place as does Usque, yet it is unlike Usque's. Referring to one of the massacres, Usque states that the bodies formed a huge pool of Israelite blood and were a meal for the birds and dogs; Hakohen,

that the corpses were like the dung in the open fields and served as food for the beasts of the fields and the birds of the heavens. A more detailed treatment of both authors' use of language will follow below.

Chapter seventeen is a brief account of a banishment decree against the Jews proclaimed by the Pope's sister in 1321.⁵¹ The setting and date of Hakohen's account is the same as Usque's.⁵² In Usque's narrative the name of the Pope's sister is Sancha; in Hakohen's, ' (J 10 δ ' N ' e (n (J 10 δ 10 ' J) ' (J 10 δ . Usque names the king of Naples and Jerusalem Robert; Hakohen says the king is Frederick, and he is only king of Naples. In both accounts it is not clear whether or not the Jews were expelled. Usque states that when the general exile was proclaimed, God showed kindness through the king, who had the verdict revoked. In Hakohen's report, it appears that the Jews were expelled first and then the king came to their aid.

Chapter eighteen is the narrative of the Lepers' Rebellion of 1321 in France.⁵³ Hakohen states that the Jews in the province of Narbonne were ordered burned, along with the lepers, by orders of King Philip.⁵⁴ There is no mention of king or place in Usque. Typically, Hakohen's narrative omits minor details found in Usque, yet follows the story line. At the end of this account, Hakohen states: ' ~ 103 N 5 " r 5 ' d 10 δ 10 δ 10 δ . There is an intervening narrative in

cliff into the sea. Many facts contained in Usque are omitted by Hakohen: The bribing of the Jews who later converted; the Christian date of the banishment -- St. Magdalene's Day; the paragraph on the forthcoming punishment of the Christians by the Lutherans.

Hakohen adds some facts not in Usque: John was a child and only reigned twenty days, and, at the very end, "Jews have not returned to settle in the land of France to this day."

The persecutions in Valencia, Spain, under Vincent Ferrer are recounted in chapter twenty-one.⁵⁹ Usque's date of 5850 is obviously erroneous; Hakohen's date is 5154 (1394).⁶⁰ This is the first narrative in which so many facts and the order of these facts are so dissimilar. It is likely that Hakohen's family passed on some personal accounts of this episode in their lives, for Hakohen mentions that his ancestors left the city of Cuenca at this time and settled in Huete. This circumstance would explain the many differences in this narrative.

Hakohen mentions the death of Pope Urban --

1357/16 -- (3 should be 2). Usque does not mention Urban by name but does state that there was discord regarding the election of a new Pope. Usque names Ferdinand as the king who favored Brother Vincent; in Hakohen's account there is no mention of the king's name. Hakohen states that the king of Aragon let

Vincent do his evil deeds there. Usque does not state that the king cooperated with Vincent; he just says that there were many converts in Aragon. While Usque tells us that the Jews took refuge in Barbary, Hakohen states that they took refuge in the land of the Moors and Portugal. In describing the places where there were many converts, Usque mentions Aragon (Valencia, Mallorca, Barcelona), Lerida, Seville and other cities; Hakohen just names Catalonia, Aragon and Seville. While both authors mention the number 15,000 as those who converted during this time, Hakohen adds that the number killed was 150,000. Hakohen omits the following in his account: Vincent aroused the mobs with "a crucifix in his hands and a scroll of the Law in his arms;" when the Jews who had converted under threat of death and journeyed from land to land "they returned to the religion of their fathers;" Jews who remained in Spanish lands as Jews were abused, compelled to wear a red badge, forbidden to lend money with interest and to own land.

Besides the personal recounting of his family's moves, Hakohen adds facts that are not in Usque's account. He tells us what happened to those Jews who remained in Spain: Some were murdered, some murdered their sons and daughters so they would not have to convert, and others were converted.

There is much similarity in fact and order in the

accounts of another blood-libel accusation that took place in Spain in 1455.⁶¹ Usque's chapter twenty-two is dated erroneously -- 1215.⁶² Hakohen dates the incident 1456. While a few details are different, Hakohen typically omits much exposition. Hakohen states that the incident took place in Salamanca; Usque, in the territory of Louis of Salamanca. In Usque's account, the boy went out on a holiday; in Hakohen's, *פדו פו'א* -- a Christian holiday. In describing the death of the boy, Usque says that two thieves beheaded him and buried him in an unfrequented place. Hakohen states that two evil men killed the boy and covered him with dirt --

ד'ה'ר י'ס'ו'ע. Hakohen omits mentioning that the lad was the son of a rich merchant; that all Christians were above suspicion; that the Jews used Christian blood for sacrifices principally in Germany. Hakohen also fails to mention Usque's long disclaimer of the blood-libel accusation at the end of the chapter.

The next chapter is dated 1456 in both accounts. Usque⁶³ and Hakohen⁶⁴ deal with two separate stories of false accusations and persecutions in Segovia: The first, a Host-turned-to-blood accusation; the second, a bishop's murder. The order, dates, people and facts are similar in both accounts; only minor discrepancies can be found. Usque mentions King Henry; Hakohen, *י'ג'ו'ע* *י'ג'ו'ע*. Usque states that it was the bishop's cook that killed him; Hakohen, that it was a servant.

Hakohen typically omits details, among them, that Catherine was Queen-Regent of Castile, that the charge against the murdered Jews was found to be false, that their prominence in the Court of Segovia corrupted the Jews.

Aside from a few facts, there is little similarity between the two accounts of the Granada massacre mentioned in Usque's chapter twenty-four.⁶⁵ To begin with, Usque places the events in 1488, while Hakohen places them in 1064!⁶⁶ (Usque's translator says that Hakohen is correct.) Along with the date, the emphasis of the two accounts also seems quite disparate: Hakohen states that the suffering of the Jews was probably caused by the people's envy of Joseph Halevi; Usque tells the story of the massacre and mentions only Rabbi Joseph Levi as one of the victims. In other words, Hakohen's story is about Halevi; Usque's about the suffering of the Jews in Granada. Hakohen does not relate some of the details in Usque's account: The 1500 families who were put to the sword; the Christians' desire to forcibly convert the Jews; the details of their suffering; the fast of Tebet. Hakohen does have some details not found in Usque: The description of the deeds of the Halevi family and the mourning in all the lands after the terrible massacre became known. The only similarities in the two accounts are Granada, the name Halevi, the 9th of Tebet and the terrible fate

of the Jewish community.

Usque's and his family's experiences are said to begin with chapter twenty-five and continue to the last chapter in the Third Dialogue.⁶⁷ It is likely that Hakohen's accounts also contain personal experiences from this period on. This could explain the discrepancies in the two narratives from this point on.

Usque titles chapter twenty-five "The Inquisition in Spain, Year 5251 (1491)."⁶⁸ Hakohen does not mention a date until much later in his discourse.⁶⁹ In comparing these two accounts of the beginning of the Inquisition in Spain we see an extreme example of most of the comparisons of these two authors. Here Usque waxes exceptionally poetic in describing the "monster" and the tribulations it caused his people; Hakohen, on the other hand, is terse and factual in his account. It is interesting to note, however, that Hakohen continues his narrative detailing the sufferings of the people who were expelled from Spain for three more pages beyond the scope of Usque's account. He seems to have been told these stories by his family, because personal accounts of his family are mentioned in the section just before the events in Usque's next chapter. Hakohen also states here the reason why he wrote the Emek:

א'רש' צרפ' והאדמו"ר האר"י והנאמ"ר
היה ה'ר"ר ר' שמואל הכהן הספר ה'ר"ה, ש'תק"ל
ג'ר' 1871 'שקאס' את אשכנזי 1871

70
(Jer. 31:36). פ'א'ר פ'נ'ה הנה כ' הנה פ'א'ר פ'נ'ה

It is understandable that in relating his family's personal suffering Hakohen would feel the need to express himself in this manner.

In comparing the account of the Jews' expulsion from Spain, there are a few minor discrepancies: Usque states that if confesos went to the houses of their richer brothers to ask for a loan and were refused, they would be denounced before the Inquisition; Hakohen says that if a woman asked her neighbor for silver or gold vessels and the neighbor refused, she was denounced. Usque implies that Marranos as well as Jews were expelled. Hakohen states that Jews were expelled from the country.

Hakohen omits from his account: The four-year span between the institution of the Inquisition and the expulsion of the Jews; the dominant role of Isabel; the Jews' prosperity and their achievements at court. As mentioned above, Hakohen adds details not found in Usque: The exact date of the exile -- the 10th day of Ab, 1492; what happened to the people who were expelled; the refugees' sufferings and the lands to which they travelled.

Usque's chapters twenty-six through thirty-one are concerned with the history of the Jews in Portugal.

Usque dates chapter twenty-six in 1492;⁷¹ Hakohen,

72
פ'א'ר פ'נ'ה הנה כ' הנה פ'א'ר פ'נ'ה . This chapter discusses the Jews' short

100
 90
 80
 70
 60
 50
 40
 30
 20
 10
 0

100
 90
 80
 70
 60
 50
 40
 30
 20
 10
 0

100
 90
 80
 70
 60
 50
 40
 30
 20
 10
 0

100
 90
 80
 70
 60
 50
 40
 30
 20
 10
 0

in weeping. In Usque, the babies were torn from their mothers' arms; In Hakohen, from their breasts. The mothers in Usque's account threw themselves at the king's feet; in Hakohen's, they bowed before the king. Hakohen omits some of Usque's passages: The description of the anguish of innocent children and the fears of their parents for them and for each other; the age of the babies as "less than three;" God's seeming condemnation of the parents. Both authors state at the end that a few children were able to save themselves, but both fail to mention how.

The cruelties surrounding the forced conversions in Portugal are the subject of Usque's chapter twenty-eight. Usque dates this chapter 1497.⁷⁵ Hakohen states that this event took place

76. *ה'קצ"ז* פ' *שמיני* *ב' תמוז*
ה'קצ"ז פ' *שמיני* *ב' תמוז*

While the major facts of the two accounts are similar, there are some minor discrepancies: Usque names the Os Estãos palace as the place where the Jews were corralled; Hakohen only states that the Jews were thrown into prison. In Usque, the king threatened the Jews by stating that their estates would be confiscated if they did not convert; in Hakohen, the king said they would be killed. To resist forced baptism, one father in Usque's account covered his six sons with their prayer shawls and then killed them; in Hakohen, the number of sons is not mentioned. A certain couple in

Usque's narrative hanged themselves; in Hakohen's, the husband killed his wife and then fell on the sword himself. The bodies of the Jews in Usque's chapter were burned in the sight of other Israelites; in Hakohen's recounting the corpses were thrown into the sea.

Hakohen's narrative omits some of Usque's details: Descriptions of the king's advisers and of his character; the statement that the Jews were reminded of "lizard" times. Hakohen also does not pass judgment at the end on the result of the Jews' conversion as does Usque: "The bodies of many Jews were made Christian, but no stain ever touched their souls." Hakohen does include some facts not found in Usque: King Emanuel was John's enemy and his successor; King John was poisoned.

The massacre of 4,000 New Christians in Lisbon in 1506 is the subject of Usque's chapter twenty-nine.⁷⁷ The date, facts and order of the two accounts are quite similar; however, there are some minor discrepancies. Usque lists preachers, nobles, city-folk and rustics as the Jews' enemies; Hakohen mentions only the monks.⁷⁸ In Usque's account, the friars wanted to avenge the death of their god; in Hakohen's, they wanted revenge for their Messiah -- *pon'ev*. The friars in Usque's account had crucifixes on their shoulders and attacked the Jews with spears and unsheathed swords; in Hakohen's, they carried crucifixes in their hands and attacked the Jews with swords. The details of the atrocities

are quite different in the two accounts: Usque says that the enemy blamed the Jews for famine, pestilence and earthquakes; Hakohen, that the enemy blamed the Jews for pestilence, war and famine. Usque avers that after killing 4,000 people and robbing them, the enemy maimed men, dashed children against walls and dismembered them, defiled women and girls and then killed them; they also threw pregnant women out of windows. Hakohen states that after killing the 4,000 and robbing them, the enemy raped virgins and women and threw pregnant women out of windows onto spears. Hakohen continues his narrative beyond Usque's. He states that when the king returned, the monk responsible for the atrocities against the Jews was burned to death along with some followers. He also adds that many Jews left Portugal and went eastward; those who remained as New Christians vacillated between their religion and their fear of the God of Israel.

Usque's chapter thirty is concerned with the institution of the Inquisition in Portugal.⁷⁹ It is quite long and emotional, describing the "Monster", the consequences of the Jews' fear, and the author's judgments concerning the reasons for their suffering. Hakohen's account of Portugal's inauguration of the Inquisition is only a few lines, yet it follows Usque's general outline.⁸⁰ There are minor discrepancies of detail: Usque mentions King John III; Hakohen mentions no number, yet states

that John succeeded Emanuel. As for interpretation, Usque implies that the Jews were punished because they were immersed in power and forgot their ancient faith; Hakohen, that the Jews suffered, not because of their sins, but because their enemies accused them of not obeying.

The fate of those who escaped from Portugal in 1531 is the subject of Usque's chapter thirty-one.⁸¹ Hakohen's account is similar in length, facts and order, though not exact.⁸² Usque describes the Inquisition as an animal with fierce claws; Hakohen, as the iron oven. Usque avers that some refugees fled to Flanders; Hakohen, to Piemonte. Usque mentions the suffering of widows in the Alps; Hakohen, the suffering of widows and orphans in the mountains. Hakohen omits some material contained in Usque: The 20,000 who left Europe for Turkey and the land of the Moors; the description of Jean de la Foix as the cruelest persecutor of Israel; the statement that the refugees perished in deserted as well as inhabited lands. Hakohen adds some details not contained in Usque: He portrays the cruelties of '12 12 7 111' stating that he even had Jewish women beaten up so that they would hand over their silver and gold; he had no respect for the aged either. Hakohen continues his narrative beyond Usque's by relating that the Duke of Ferrara, Eraclio (e' 18 77 10), permitted the Jews to live in his land and to return

to the God of Israel by circumcising themselves.

In chapter thirty-two Usque speaks of the Jews' life in Naples and extols the Abravanel family.⁸³ The only similarity in Hakohen is a brief mention of Naples as a refuge for Jews after their expulsion from Spain.⁸⁴

Constantinople in 1542 is the setting for Usque's chapter thirty-three.⁸⁵ There is little similarity in any of Hakohen's accounts to this chapter of Usque. In one narrative dated 1545 and attributed to Almonzi, Hakohen mentions an incident that occurred in Greece in which the Jews were unjustly punished for killing a handyman.⁸⁶ The only similarity in the two accounts is that they both state that the Jewish physician to the Sultan, Moses Hamon, pleaded for an investigation into the unjust murder of his people. Hakohen's narrative comes after the one that corresponds to Usque's chapter thirty-four.

Hakohen's account of the calamitous fire in Salonika in 1545⁸⁷ is atypically much more detailed than Usque's chapter thirty-four.⁸⁸ While Hakohen omits Usque's laudation of Salonika's virtues and treatment of its Jewish population, Hakohen's many particulars obviously point to another source for his narrative. Hakohen mentions the exact day and time for the fire and the name of the Jewish spice dealer, Abraham Catalan, in whose home the fire began. He informs his readers that a plague occurred before and after the

fire and tells us of Catalan's imprisonment and subsequent suicide. Hakohen also enumerates some tragic details: One hundred people were burned to death, 8,000 dwellings, 18 synagogues and many Torah scrolls were destroyed. Hakohen omits Usque's opinion that the fire was a punishment for the sins of the Jews in other lands.

There are no comparable accounts in Hakohen to chapters thirty-five and thirty-six in Usque. Usque's final chapter tells of two synagogue desecrations in the city of Pesaro in 1553.⁸⁹ Hakohen's narrative is typically less detailed than Usque's.⁹⁰ The dates in the two accounts are the same and there is only one minor discrepancy: Usque states that the attack on the second synagogue occurred four nights after the attack on the first; Hakohen, five days later. Hakohen omits Usque's likening the events in his chapter to the profanation of the Second Temple, the fate of the holy scrolls and his description of the other temple as belonging to the Italian Israelites.

The differences in the historical data in Usque's and Hakohen's works have been delineated. I will attempt to account for them in my concluding chapter. In order to do this, however, I believe it useful to try to gain some insight into the two authors by examining their use of language, the tone of their works, and their seeming philosophies of religion and history.

III. LANGUAGE: CONSTRUCTION AND TONE

The title of Hakohen's work, Emek Habachah, "Valley of Weeping" (see Psalm 84:7), is an indicant of the language, construction and tone of the entire work. Hakohen's narratives, unlike Usque's, are similar to the written form of the Torah scroll. They are not set apart from each other and, like the accounts in the Torah, are sober and brief.

Hakohen's grammatical construction is similar to that in the Bible. (Because Usque's original work was written in Portuguese, it is not possible to compare the grammatical style of the two works. Other aspects of language will be compared below.) Throughout his work Hakohen uses ק'ו'ה'ה' /' for his verb forms. His sentence structure is also similar to the Biblical style, along with the order of expressing dates and numbers. And, as in the Bible, the narratives' terseness renders many antecedents unintelligible. The Hebrew is simple and straightforward -- similar to many of the Genesis narratives.

The general style of the two authors is quite different. Hakohen intersperses his narrative with familiar Biblical quotes; Usque places his Biblical passages at the end of each chapter. Usque's passages always chastise the Jews for their "sins" -- for forgetting the God of Israel and the words of the Law, for fearing death, for not listening to the words of the prophets,

and so forth. Most of Usque's quotes are taken from Deuteronomy and the latter prophets. Hakohen's quoted passages reveal his sympathy toward the Jews. (Examples of the passages Hakohen uses will be given in the discussion below of Biblical references.)

Hakohen, unlike Usque, repeats many phrases in his narratives; in doing this I believe he continuously evokes his readers' emotions. Here are some examples of these phrases:

גיוק אף ה
 גר הנחיה ה' ה' א'
 ע' צרה ע' א'
 ג' א' א'
 ו' א' א'
 י' א' א'
 כ' א' א'
 א' א' א'
 ו' א' א'
 ה' א' א'

Hakohen's and Usque's use of verbs is indicative of each author's attitude toward his people, especially on the subject of their converting. Usque uses the active form of verbs to express his belief that the Jews living in the medieval days of horror converted when they should not have! Usque uses expressions such as "forgot their God," "turned their backs to our God," "changed their faith." Hakohen, on the other hand, uses a passive

verb when describing the conversions of the Jews. In this simple way, Hakohen seems to be saying that the Jews converted not because they wanted to, but because they had to. The Jews were "led away" (turned away) from their faith -- *נִסְּפוּ*. When he does use the active form -- *נִסְּפוּ* he adds *וְנִסְּפוּ*.⁹¹

Besides repetitive phrases and verb forms, Hakohen repeats certain nouns which are highly evocative. The enemy is often referred to as אָנְד'אָס; the horror done to the Jews as אָנְד'אָס; the pain of his people, אָנְד'אָס.

The tone of Hakohen's narratives further shows his sympathy for his fellow Jews. While Usque ends his chapters with Biblical quotes chastising his co-religionists for their "sins," Hakohen usually ends the recitation of a persecution with a lament or a prayer for the sufferers and a curse for the persecutors:

כדור ה' והב' ושלם שלם שלם
כדור ו' והוש' ע' מ' נ' 92.

While Usque believes that the horrors perpetrated against the Jews were a result of the Jews' sinning -- gaining favor in the courts, becoming wealthy, assimilating, forgetting their God -- Hakohen rarely states a similar belief. For example, to Hakohen, the wife in the narrative corresponding to Usque's chapter two and the mother of chapter twelve are not judged to have done anything evil to deserve their punishment as

Usque judges them. They are punished by others or because the "times" were bad.

Hakohen's language and written style create some problems for the reader. His narratives' terseness, run-on sentences and run-on stories do not always allow the reader to grasp the emotion underlying each narrative. Hakohen sacrifices clarity in many accounts and creates a certain remoteness. It is possible that these problems are a result of Hakohen's using a language which was not as familiar to him as his native tongue. It was interesting to me to note that Hakohen's narratives seemed to be more terse and less emotional the closer in time they were to Hakohen's own life. Is it possible that these accounts seem more "remote" because Hakohen found it too difficult to relate the stories in which he or his family were personally involved?

The following section gives some examples of the Biblical verses Hakohen uses in his work; however, this is by no means a complete list. Hakohen wove these verses into his story so that even his readers who were only slightly familiar with the Bible would recognize them and, I believe, feel a certain tug on their Jewish emotions. Hakohen repeats these verses often throughout his narratives. Usque, on the other hand, rarely repeats the Biblical verses, nor does he weave them into his narratives -- he saves them for the end of each chapter. The following are examples

of the verses that Hakohen uses when referring to the Jews and their suffering (Only one location is cited for each):

- (Is. 13:14) ⁹³ וְהָיָה כִּצְבָא' מוֹדָח.
 (Ps. 73:2) ⁹⁴ כַּמֶּחֶל נֶטְו' רִאשׁוֹ.
 (Hos. 10:14) ⁹⁵ וְאִם עַל בְּנֵי כְּשֶׁה.
 (Lam. 3:59) ⁹⁶ כְּאוֹר' ה' עֲזָרְתִּי שִׁבְחָה מִשְׁכָּל'.
 (Deut. 28:37) ⁹⁷ וְתָנוּ אוֹתָם לְשִׁמְחָה, לְמִשְׁכָּל, וְלִשְׂמִינָה.
 (Lam. 4:4) ⁹⁸ וְשִׁאוֹן עוֹלָלֵהֶם לֶחֶם וְכוֹרֶשׁ אוֹ'.
 (Deut. 28:25) ⁹⁹ וְנִסּוּ... בַּשָּׂבָע דָּרְכֵיךָ.
 (Deut. 4:20) ¹⁰⁰ אֲחֲרֵי צִוִּיתִי מִכּוֹר הַבְּרָצָה.
 (1 Sam. 2:5) ¹⁰¹ שְׂבָעִים בְּלֶחֶם נִשְׁכְּרוּ.
 (Ex. 1:7) ¹⁰² וַיִּרְבּוּ... וַיַּצְלִיחוּ.

The following phrases are used when Hakohen refers to the Jews' enemies:

- (Deut. 13:14) ¹⁰³ בְּנֵי בָל' עַל.
 (Zeph. 3:3) ¹⁰⁴ כִּזְאוֹב' עֲרֵב.
 (Ez. 32:24) ¹⁰⁵ וְשִׁאוֹ כַּלְמֵת.
 (Gen. 11:9) ¹⁰⁶ בָּלֵל ה' שִׁבְתָּם.
 (Gen. 37:4) ¹⁰⁷ וְלֹא יָכֹן דָּבָרוֹ לְשִׂשְׁוֹן.
 (Deut. 2:15) ¹⁰⁸ וְאִם יִזְהַר ה' ה'תִּיהָ בֶּן לְהִמָּן.
 (Ex. 1:14) ¹⁰⁹ וַיִּמְרְדּוּ אֹתֵי חַיֵּי הֶם.
 אֲנִי ה' חֲטָאתָם... אֵל תִּמְחֶה...
 (Jer. 18:23) ¹¹⁰ בָּרֵךְ אֶפֶס עֲשֵׂה בְּהֶם.

Hakohen's narratives also contain the following repeated verses:

counts.¹²⁷ In a few instances, Hakehen uses part of the

$\rho' n n \gamma \iota \delta n \delta \kappa :$
(p.120), $\rho' n n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$

While, in general, Usque's work is much more poetic than Hakehen's, Hakehen is poetic at times, especially when he sympathizes with his suffering co-religionists. Instead of saying that the Jews converted, he says¹²⁸

$\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n$; and, describing their suffering he writes:

$\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$
¹²⁹ $\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$

and

$\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$
¹³⁰ $\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$

When some rulers eased their harsh stands against the Jews, Hakehen writes:

$\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$
¹³¹ $\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$

The Jews were often killed swiftly -- $\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$ -- and their bodies fed to $\rho' n \gamma \iota \delta n \gamma \iota \delta n$.

The difference between Usque and Hakehen's use of language offers us some insights into the many differences between the works of these two authors and, possibly, between the authors themselves. These differences will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

redirects a king's heart so that he is more lenient with his punishment.¹³⁴ God also allows David Alrey to escape and Maimonides to appear.¹³⁵ God sends princes to quiet the people, kings to pity the Jews, honest judges to overturn cruel verdicts. God even causes the Arabs to help the Jews by putting them in captivity so they would not die of hunger!¹³⁶

When Usque's God acts on His own He punishes the Jews directly. When Hakohen's God acts Himself, He helps the Jews and punishes others. For example, Hakohen's God frees the shepherds,¹³⁷ causes Sin-el-Din's rise,¹³⁸ and saves the remaining Jews in Vienna and Segovia. Hakohen's God punishes the Jews' enemies. Ferdinand and Isabella's daughter and son die, leaving no heirs; Isabella has cancer.¹³⁹ God also punishes the cruel French and English people. Only sometimes, when Hakohen seems at a loss to comprehend the horrors he is describing, does he surrender to emotion and cry out that even God was against the Jews at times --

. n f/c p12

Throughout his narrative, Hakohen prays to God for help for his people. He relates many instances in which prayer is efficacious, but also notes that in some instances it is powerless. Usque, however, believes that, more than engaging in prayer, Jews must act to cease their sinning in God's eyes; they must stop their idolatry, apostasy and assimilation.

Usque's belief that the Jews' sins had brought them to anguish and grief is very different from Hakohen's. To Hakohen, the Jews are righteous -- it is their enemies who sin. Hakohen rarely judges his people. And nowhere in Hakohen's work does one find the concept in Usque's: Even the righteous Jews have to suffer to atone for the sins of the entire community.¹⁴⁰ To Hakohen, God is a witness to the injustice done to the Jews; to Usque, God is a witness to their sins. Only at the end does Usque ask God to help his people stop sinning: "Our iniquities have drained our strength."¹⁴¹ Hakohen implores God to help the Jews' enemies stop sinning. Hakohen's God pities the Jews and punishes their enemies.

Usque and Hakohen's attitudes toward conversion are markedly different. Even though the Jews were forcibly converted under threat of banishment or death, Usque believes that conversion was worse than death and favors those who did not convert. I can only wonder how Usque believed there would have been any Jews left to be readers of his plea in the Consolation, to return to their faith, if all Jews faced with conversion or martyrdom chose the latter! Hakohen appears to reluctantly favor conversion over death since inner feelings seem more important to him. "The love of God in their hearts" seems to be the important factor for Hakohen if Judaism is to endure. Hakohen passes no

judgment on the Marranos who attained respect and assimilated. On the other hand, Usque states that the Marranos "obtained other high dignities which the material world bestows upon those who court it. Those who remained Jews enjoyed their secret favor and also flourished and prospered."¹⁴² Usque believes that even though the Marranos paraded their Christianity it did not save their lives; therefore, what was the purpose in converting? To Usque, the Marranos sinned twice by converting, even though they were forced.¹⁴³ Converts' hearts were not permeated with the love of God. Hakohen is much more sympathetic to the Marranos, for to him, they were still Jews. He tells us that Jews who did not convert were expelled from Spain to prevent them from being an example to the Marranos.¹⁴⁴ In spite of this the Marranos still inwardly remained Jews. Throughout Hakohen's work he pleads for charity in every form to help his suffering co-religionists, for they did not deserve punishment.

The reason for Usque's strong preference for martyrdom over conversion may lie in his attitude on death. Usque strongly believes in an afterlife and differentiates between physical death and death of the soul, whereas Hakohen does not. Hakohen hints at a belief in an afterlife but, unlike Usque, seems to be more pragmatic in his conviction that without a physical presence in this world, there would not be a people Israel.

Suffering in this life is preferable to martyrdom for Hakohen because there is always the hope that the suffering will end. To Hakohen, suffering and death are not God's ways of punishing the Jews but manifestations of the world's evil. Hakohen seems to say: Have faith; God is with you even though it may not seem that way. Those who remain will bear witness.

Hakohen never mentions any thoughts about Protestantism in his account. Usque, however, states that many Protestant groups were joined by Jewish converts. He believes this was "divine retribution," for these Jews were punishing the Catholics for the tortures they inflicted upon them.¹⁴⁵ But was Protestantism a way for the Jews to re-enter the road to their faith? It was a common hope of both authors that former Jews would return to the faith of their fathers -- Usque always believing that the time was now; Hakohen, that the time was whenever it was safe, and that that time was almost at hand.

V. HISTORICAL PHILOSOPHY

Both Usque and Hakohen believe that God is the ultimate determiner of history, but with different underlying reasons. Usque explains the suffering of the Jews in terms of God's punishing them for their sins; Hakohen believes that the Jews are blameless. He does not try to explain the reasons for the Jews' suffering; he seems to believe that in spite of cruel outside forces which make the Jews suffer, God is on our side. Though we cannot comprehend God's ways, we must believe that the future will hold better things in store for us. After all, the Jews have survived in spite of all the cruelties they have suffered so far! For Hakohen, it is "terrible times" -- *דברים נוראים* -- which cause suffering; God does not cause these bad times. When the Jews "win" it is because God strengthens them:

146. *ה' יתנו להם כח וקוצר ימים*

But when the Jews "lose," God is not to blame.

Neither Usque nor Hakohen looks into the underlying causes of the Jews' torments and their relationship to other historical events of the times. In both authors' accounts the Jews are the hub of all the events swirling around them. Neither ever tries to explain the tribulations of the Jews in terms of other forces of history at work in each country or region. The tonal

elements of the population, the various power groups and struggles and the divergent economic, social, political and religious forces are never mentioned in either work. "Why?" is never a question asked by either author of the causes of their related histories, for "God" seems to be the answer. Neither raises any questions; neither answers anyone else's.

Usque and Hakohen sometimes try to explain the Jews' suffering in unsophisticated terms. The Jews were hated in Normandy because of the extreme profit they made from loans.¹⁴⁷ Jews were hated because of David Alroy's mysticism.¹⁴⁸ Jews' wealth and position caused envy and hatred in many instances; and the Jews' religion was always a reason for causing them grief. Jews could be made to suffer for totally irrational reasons, too: They killed Christians in order to use their blood; they desecrated the Host; they debased coins; they forced young monks to convert; they could perform evil magic. Jews caused plagues, pestilence, fires and famine. Both authors truly believe that the above were adequate reasons for the Jews' enemies to persecute them. Neither sees them as superficial -- as covering up any underlying power-plays or other historical forces at work in those times.

Neither deals with the reasons underlying the varying punishments. Why did one ruler want to expel Jews, another to convert them, another to murder

them? And neither deals with other important questions their works raise: Why were some rulers kind? What were some of their problems? Why were the Jews rejected in all lands in Europe? Why were they rejected less in Moslem lands? And what about the extreme horrors of the Inquisition? Neither Usque nor Hakohen tries to explain the underlying reasons for its institution.

In only one narrative does Hakohen mention the struggles within the Church and the election of two Popes;¹⁴⁹ but he never attempts to tie this in with the Jews' problems. In another narrative Hakohen compares the persecutions in France to those in Egypt before the Exodus and hints that the edifices built by Philip may be likened to those built by Pharoah. Hakohen, however, goes no further in his historical "analysis."

Usque and Hakohen's history is a simple report, not unlike a straightforward newspaper story. Were the Jews of their time just as ignorant of the forces of history as Usque and Hakohen? Did they also believe that only God could save them from their wretched plight? Or were they just powerless to do anything to help themselves in the face of the anti-Semitic horrors they had to endure?

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In spite of Hakohen's statement and the agreement of scholars that Usque's Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel was definitely a source for Hakohen's Emek Habachah, we have seen that there are many discrepancies between the two accounts in the material I have compared. Not only are there discrepancies in details such as names, facts and dates, but there are also differences in language, style and religious and historical philosophy. I would like to suggest some possible reasons for these discrepancies and differences.

Hakohen's family left Spain and settled for a while in Avignon, where Joseph Hakohen was born. The author then spent his later years in Italy. Samuel Usque's family went from Spain to Portugal before settling in various other countries of Europe and the East. Usque's native tongue was Portuguese; Hakohen's was probably Spanish or French. Since Hakohen's family never went to Portugal, it is unlikely that he knew the language as well as a native. Therefore, some of the discrepancies may be accounted for by Hakohen's less-than-perfect knowledge of Portuguese.

While Usque might have been one source, there were, of course, other sources for all the stories circulating during the authors' lifetimes. Members of Hakohen's family were, most likely, eyewitnesses to many of the events in Hakohen's accounts. It is

known that they wrote letters to each other and kept in touch with Hakohen.¹⁵⁰ And the horror of some of the events must have been on the lips of the unfortunate eyewitnesses, whose stories spread throughout the Jewish communities. The lack of preciseness of these oral communications might also account for discrepancies in the two narratives.

While Usque collected more details for his chapters, it seems that Hakohen was content to relate just the general outline of the stories, for his narrative recounts many more events than does Usque's in the comparable time period. Hakohen might have believed that the number of events recounted was more important than their details.

It is also possible that the manuscript of Usque's Consolation which Hakohen used was incomplete, damaged, contained printing errors, or was a different version from the edition that has come down to us. And Usque might have been mentioned as a source by Hakohen not because Hakohen had the entire, later-known work available to him but because he had only parts of it, or because he was known to Hakohen through other works. It is also possible that Hakohen cited Usque and the others in his work to distract censors from his real sources.

The differences in the writers themselves are obvious causes for differences in their works. Hakohen

came from a rabbinic family and married the daughter of a rabbi; he, therefore, probably possessed a greater knowledge of Judaica than did Usque. While Usque, in his work, emphasizes the Bible's reflection of the truth of prophetic prediction and its Deuteronomic view of sin and punishment, Hakohen draws his more sympathetic, positive and gentle view of his fellow Jews from a wider range of rabbinic literature and philosophy.

Usque's stated purpose in writing his Consolation was to inspire recalcitrant New Christians to return to the faith of their fathers. Hakohen, on the other hand, states that he is writing his book so that "the children of Israel will know what was done to us." But is it not possible that the two authors had hidden agendas in writing their works? If so, these hidden agendas would account for many of their differences. Was the audience for whom Usque wrote only New Christians? I believe that Usque, writing in Portuguese, might have wanted to reach non-Jewish readers. If this is true, then his thirty-seven historical chapters would necessarily include a great deal of apologetic and polemic for his Christian audience, interspersed within each chapter. Details that might have been unknown to Christian readers had to be included. Hakohen, writing in Hebrew for his more limited Jewish readership, seems to have only one major goal: To bring solace to his fellow Jews in a gentle, optimistic way. Details of the

sufferings of the Jews would not be crucial in his work, for his readers probably knew the details. Certainly more European Jews of the period knew Hebrew than Portuguese. Cecil Roth states that there was a revival of literary Hebrew among the Italian Jews during the Renaissance; all could read it and most could write it. There was also a revival of conversational Hebrew, which helped unite the Jews of Europe.¹⁵¹ Hakohen must have chosen to write in Hebrew, which was probably more difficult for him than writing in French, Spanish or Italian, in order to reach more of his co-religionists with his message of encouragement.

Many more speculations can be made as to the reasons for the differences in the accounts of Usque and Hakohen. However, let us not lose sight of the important commonality in their works: To both authors it must have seemed a miracle that the Jews still survived after so many centuries of persecution; both wanted to see that miracle continue.

NOTES

1. Conversation with Dr. Martin A. Cohen.
2. Hakohen, Joseph, Emek Habachah, Ed. by M. Letteris, Cracow, 1895, p. 78.
3. Ibid., p. 81.
4. Usque, Samuel, Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel, Ed. by Martin A. Cohen, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1977, p. 13.
5. Ibid., p. 14.
6. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 85.
7. Ibid., p. 102.
8. Ibid., p. 109.
9. Ibid., p. 111.
10. Neumann, Edward and Gottheil, Richard, "Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir Hakohen," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII, KTAV Publishing House, N.Y., 1905, p. 265.
11. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 125-126.
12. Roth, Cecil, The History of the Jews of Italy, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1946, p. 183.
13. Milano, Attilio, "Italy: The Crisis," Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. 9, Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, 1972, p. 1123.
14. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 149.
15. "Joseph ben Joshua Hakohen," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 6, UJE Inc., 1942, p. 191b.
16. Waxman, Meyer, A History of Jewish Literature, Vol. II, Bloch Publishing Co., N.Y., 1933, p. 473.
17. Ibid., p. 474. See also p. 155 in Hakohen, op. cit.
18. Usque, op. cit., pp. 269-287.

19. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 78, 79, 81, 98, 121, 138,
144.

The locus for each chapter and event under discussion is given only once in the note at the beginning of each discussion.

20. Usque, op. cit., pp. 167-168.
21. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 17.
22. Usque, op. cit., p. 168.
23. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 35-36.
24. Usque, op. cit., p. 169.
25. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 20-21.
26. Usque, op. cit., pp. 170-171.
27. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
28. Ibid., pp. 63-64.
29. Usque, op. cit., p. 172.
30. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 36-37.
31. Usque, op. cit., p. 172.
32. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 37.
33. Usque, op. cit., pp. 174-176.
34. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 47-48.
35. Usque, op. cit., p. 176.
36. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 56.
37. Usque, op. cit., pp. 177-178.
38. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 56-57.
39. Usque, op. cit., pp. 178-179.
40. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 64-65.
41. Usque, op. cit., pp. 180-181.
42. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

43. Ibid., pp. 66-68
44. Usque, op. cit., pp. 182-185.
45. Ibid., p. 185.
46. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 68.
47. Usque, op. cit., pp. 185-186.
48. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 69.
49. Usque, op. cit., pp. 186-190.
50. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 72-75.
51. Usque, op. cit., p. 190.
52. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 75-76.
53. Usque, op. cit., pp. 190-191.
54. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
55. Ibid., p. 81.
56. Usque, op. cit., p. 192.
57. Ibid., pp. 192-193.
58. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 71.
59. Usque, op. cit., pp. 194-195.
60. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 85-86.
61. Ibid., p. 93.
62. Usque, op. cit., p. 195.
63. Ibid., pp. 196-197.
64. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 93-94.
65. Usque, op. cit., p. 197.
66. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 23-24.
67. Usque, op. cit., p. 269.
68. Ibid., p. 198.

69. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 99-100.
70. Ibid., p. 102.
71. Usque, op. cit., p. 200.
72. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 103.
73. Usque, op. cit., pp. 201-202.
74. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 104.
75. Usque, op. cit., pp. 202-204.
76. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 105-106.
77. Usque, op. cit., p. 204.
78. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 106.
79. Usque, op. cit., pp. 206-207.
80. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 107.
81. Usque, op. cit., p. 208.
82. Hakohen, op. cit., pp. 107-108.
83. Usque, op. cit., pp. 209-210.
84. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 109.
85. Usque, op. cit., pp. 210 -211.
86. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 122.
87. Ibid., p. 121.
88. Usque, op. cit., pp. 211-212.
89. Ibid., pp. 214-215.
90. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 126.
91. Ibid., p. 85.
92. Ibid., p. 37.
93. Ibid., p. 17.
94. Ibid., p. 16.
95. Ibid., p. 85.

96. Ibid., p. 94.
97. Ibid., p. 99.
98. Ibid., p. 103.
99. Ibid., p. 107.
100. Ibid., p. 107.
101. Ibid., p. 108.
102. Ibid., p. 56.
103. Ibid., p. 37.
104. Ibid., p. 37.
105. Ibid., p. 65.
106. Ibid., p. 77.
107. Ibid., p. 24.
108. Ibid., p. 99.
109. Ibid., p. 104.
110. Ibid., p. 127.
111. Ibid., p. 47.
112. Ibid., p. 48.
113. Ibid., p. 48.
114. Ibid., p. 67.
115. Ibid., p. 94.
116. Ibid., p. 20.
117. Ibid., p. 22.
118. Ibid., p. 71.
119. Ibid., p. 85.
120. Ibid., p. 68.
121. Ibid., p. 75.
122. Ibid., p. 75.

123. Ibid., p. 104.
124. Ibid., p. 104.
125. Ibid., p. 106.
126. Ibid., p. 85.
127. Ibid., p. 64.
128. Ibid., p. 17.
129. Ibid., p. 121.
130. Ibid., p. 24.
131. Ibid., p. 74.
132. Ibid., p. 144.
133. Ibid., p. 119.
134. Ibid., p. 17.
135. Ibid., p. 63.
136. Ibid., p. 103.
137. Ibid., p. 73.
138. Ibid., p. 48.
139. Ibid., p. 102.
140. Usque, op. cit., p. 190.
141. Ibid., p. 215.
142. Ibid., p. 198.
143. Ibid., p. 199.
144. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 100.
145. Usque, op. cit., p. 193.
146. Hakohen, op. cit., p. 75.
147. Ibid., p. 36.
148. Ibid., p. 148.
149. Ibid., p. 85.

150. Loeb, Isidore, "Josef Haccohen et les Chroniqueurs Juifs," Revue des Études Juives, Vol. XVI, Paris, 1888, p. 28.
151. Roth, Cecil, The Jews in the Renaissance, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1959, pp. 308-309.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Graetz, Heinrich, History of the Jews, Vol. IV, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1945.
- Hakohen, Joseph, The Vale of Tears (Emek Habacha), Ed. by Harry S. May, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1971.
- _____, Emek Habachah, Ed. by M. Letteris, Cracow, 1895.
- "Joseph ben Joshua Hakohen, "Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 6, UJE Inc., N.Y., 1942.
- Kupfer, Ephraim, "Joseph Ha-Kohen," Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. 10, Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, 1972.
- Loeb, Isidore, "Josef Hacohen et les Chroniqueurs Juifs," Revue des Études Juives, Vol. XVI, Paris, 1888.
- Milano, Attilio, "Italy: The Crisis," Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. 9, Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, 1972.
- Neumann, Edward and Gottheil, Richard, "Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir HaKohen," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII, KTAV Publishing House, N.Y., 1905.
- Roth, Cecil, The History of the Jews of Italy, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1946.
- _____, The Jews in the Renaissance, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1959.
- Usque, Samuel, Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel, Ed. by Martin A. Cohen, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1977.
- Waxman, Meyer, A History of Jewish Literature, Vol. II, Bloch Publishing Co., N.Y., 1933.