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ABSTRACT
Religion is a very important factor to take into consideration in discussions about the identity of the conversos [converts] or New Christians, an emerging group in 15th-century Castile. Some historiographers believe they were really Jews who practised their religion in secret, while others consider that the Jewish identity of the conversos was stimulated by the Spanish Inquisition, and that most were in fact true Christians. But the question of the converso identity is even more complex, as the case of Teresa de Cartagena shows. She was a nun who lived in Castile during the 15th century and who practised Christianity in an orthodox way without renouncing her Jewish origin (though it is never declared explicitly).

In the mid 15th century, Christians in the Iberian Peninsula considered conversos to be of Jewish lineage, which, for them, was more important than the fact they were Christians. In this context, Teresa de Cartagena’s reflections about her people and her father’s house (which she identifies with her family) are highly significant. She refused to hide her origins and never pretended to be an old Christian, although this attitude would have resulted in stigmatization from Christian society.

This chapter examines Teresa de Cartagena’s testimony and compares it with that provided by Christian society and other conversos. This enables us to reflect about the importance of religion in defining individual and collective identity, oppositions between society and individual when identity is established, and about ways in which individual identity is reaffirmed.

SUMMARY
A raíz de los pogromos desatados en la Península Ibérica a partir del año 1391, se inició un proceso de conversiones masivas, que alcanzó su punto culminante con el edicto de expulsión de los judíos castellanos y aragoneses en 1492, con el desalojo de los judíos portugueses...
en 1496, y con la expulsión de los judíos navarros en 1498. A través de este proceso se fue constituyendo un nuevo grupo social, el de los conversos o cristianos nuevos, formado por los judíos convertidos al cristianismo y sus descendientes, a los que no se permitió integrarse en la sociedad cristiana, pues la asimilación hubiera supuesto reconocer a los conversos los mismos derechos que tenían los cristianos viejos, que se sentían amenazados por el éxito de los cristianos nuevos.

Una parte de la historiografía considera que los conversos eran verdaderos judíos que seguían practicando el judaísmo en secreto. De ahí que se utilicen expresiones como judaizantes o cripto-judíos. Otra parte de la historiografía, en cambio, considera que fue la propia Inquisición española, creada en 1478, la que avivó la identidad judía de los conversos, la mayoría de los cuales eran en realidad verdaderos cristianos, mientras que los judaizantes constituían una pequeña minoría. Pero la cuestión de la identidad de los conversos fue algo más complejo, tal y como podemos apreciar a través de la obra de Teresa de Cartagena, una monja de familia conversa que vivió en la Castilla del siglo XV, practicando el cristianismo de forma ortodoxa sin querer renunciar a sus orígenes judíos, aun cuando no lo diga de forma explícita.

La sociedad cristiana de mediados del siglo XV consideraba a los conversos como descendientes del linaje de los judíos y negaba el valor de las conversiones. Por ello resulta fundamental analizar la reflexión que Teresa de Cartagena hizo sobre lo que significaban para ella familia y linaje en una de sus obras, La Arboleda de los enfermos. En ella Teresa expresó su opinión al comentar el Salmo 44:11 (en la versión de la Vulgata). Teresa se negó a asumir el significado literal del mismo, y se mostró reacia a renunciar tanto a su pueblo como a la casa de su padre, que ella identificaba con su familia. Una familia y un padre que eran conversos, y que la sociedad de la época identificaba con el linaje judío. Por tanto, ella era una mujer cristiana que, por su origen converso, también era considerada como una judía y estigmatizada por ello por la sociedad cristiana de su tiempo. Pero a pesar de ello no dudó en reivindicar ese origen judío.

Nuestra contribución se ocupa de analizar la opinión de Teresa de Cartagena, contrastándola con la de la sociedad cristiana de su tiempo, pero también con la de otros conversos. Mientras que los cristianos viejos consideraban que los conversos pertenecían al linaje de los judíos, y los propios conversos intentaban suprimir las barreras entre cristianos viejos y cristianos nuevos, Teresa de Cartagena se negaba a renunciar a sus orígenes. Este análisis nos permitirá reflexionar sobre la religión como factor utilizado para definir la identidad individual y colectiva, sobre la oposición entre sociedad e individuo a la hora de establecer la identidad, y sobre la reafirmación de la identidad individual.

INTRODUCTION

The mass conversion of Jews to Christianity began in the Iberian Peninsula following the pogroms of 1391. It culminated in the expulsion order of Castilian and Aragonese
Jews in 1492, Portuguese Jews in 1496, and the Jews of Navarre in 1498. Through this process, a new social group emerged, known as the *conversos* [converts] or *cristianos nuevos* [New Christians], which consisted of Jews converted to Christianity and their descendants. These were not permitted to fully integrate into Christian society, because assimilation would have meant accepting that the *conversos* had the same rights as *cristianos viejos* [Old Christians], who felt threatened by them.

Converso identity is not a very common topic in historiography. As Ladero Quesada has pointed out, most historians interested in Hispanic converts have preferred to focus on topics such as true conversions versus crypto-Judaism; the converts’ religious practices; their impact on Hispanic literature; their economic and social situation; Inquisition proceedings against them; certain *converso* families and individuals; the publication of source texts related to converts, such as Inquisition documents; and their role in the local communities. Perhaps the most discussed topics related to converso identity have been the issue of whether they should be considered a cultural caste or a social class, the hostility of Spanish society towards the converts, and the “purity of blood” statutes, which were enforced from the end of the 16th century to avoid the social promotion of converts.

These issues all relate to the way in which the *conversos* were seen by others. Their perception of themselves has drawn much less attention from scholars, although identity, as Hernández Franco says, is “the representation that a group makes of itself and offers to society from an interested selection of its historical memory.” This means that the identity of a group is established not only by others, but also by the group itself, in this case, the converts. Finally, individuals also play a role, because, as Seweryn and Smagacz wrote in their contribution to the first volume of CLIOHRES TWG5:

Identity of an individual contains a set of relations, representations and images which an individual has of oneself, which others give him, that determine the capacity of recognising oneself and being recognised.

On the topic of how the *conversos* viewed themselves collectively and individually, the role played by women is particularly interesting. Analyses have already been carried out on the work of crypto-Jewish women, who were usually responsible for preserving Jewish customs and habits, as described by 15th-century chroniclers such as Hernando del Pulgar and Andrés Bernáldez. Inside the home, crypto-Jewish women were in charge of children’s education, and ensured observation of the Sabbath and other Jewish celebrations, and compliance with dietary laws and Jewish funeral rituals, as Inquisition records show. However, there has been little interest until now in the role played by convert women that openly practised Christianity. This was the case of Teresa de Cartagena, a nun of *converso* origin who lived in Castile in the 15th century.

Teresa de Cartagena’s works have, till now, mainly been studied by feminist historiographers. Her defence of women writers (which she engaged in to counter bad reviews she had received) has been valued, and there is also some research related to the Jewish her-
itage in her works. But nobody has yet related her with the *converso* identity, in spite of the fact that in one of her works, *La Arboleda de los enfermos* [Grove of the Infirm], there is a significant extract on this subject. Her interpretation of Psalm 44:11 (Vulgate version) led her to ponder the meaning of family and lineage, which in her case implied reflection about her Jewish origins. She was a Christian woman from a *converso* family, which meant that she was considered Jewish by contemporary Christian society. And although she was a true Christian, she did not renounce her origins. Thus, the case of Teresa de Cartagena offers an important perspective on the relevance of religion in defining individual and collective identity, the mechanisms that society and individuals use for forming the identity, and the ways in which individual identity is reaffirmed.

**Teresa de Cartagena and her works**

Teresa de Cartagena lived in 15th-century Castile. Her place and date of birth and death are not known, though according to Cantera Burgos, she was born between 1420 and 1435. More recently, Seidenspinner-Núñez and Kim have argued that her date of birth must have been around 1425. What has been firmly established is that she was born into a prominent *converso* family. She was the daughter of María de Saravia and Pedro de Cartagena, who was one of four children of the Burgos rabbi, Šelomó ha-Leví (ca. 1352-1435), who had converted, together with other members of his family, on 21 July 1390 (according to Cantera Burgos) or on 21 July 1391 (according to Netanyahu). He had then changed his name to Pablo de Santa María. After studying in Paris, Teresa de Cartagena’s grandfather was appointed bishop first of Cartagena and later of Burgos, serving different Castilian kings. Indeed, he was executor of Henry III’s will; tutor to John II, and chancellor of Castile under that king. One of Teresa’s uncles, Alonso de Cartagena – also called Alonso García de Santa María (1385-1456) – was also bishop in Cartagena and Burgos, after achieving his doctorate degree in Salamanca.

Alonso de Cartagena’s will (1453), in which he left Teresa a legacy of a hundred florins, mentions that she became a nun. She also declares this in her *Admiraçión Operum Dey* [Wonder at the Works of God], although the name of the religious order was deleted. Seidenspinner-Núñez and Kim have recently confirmed that she was a nun in the Clare Convent at Burgos in 3 April 1449, when her uncle asked for her to be transferred to a Cistercian or Benedictine community for some unspecified reason, suggesting the Convent of Las Huelgas at Burgos as a possibility. Before becoming a nun, she had studied at the University of Salamanca, which was unusual, given that women were not formally allowed to attend university courses. But it would have been possible for Teresa as her uncle, Gonzalo García de Santa María, was a professor there. We also know that she later suffered from deafness, and under the patronage of Juana de Mendoza, a lady in the court of Isabella I, Teresa decided to use writing as a form of escapism, following the literary tradition of consolatory treatises.
Two of her works have been preserved: *Arboleda de los enfermos* [Grove of the Infirm] and *Admiraçión Operum Dey* [Wonder at the Works of God]. According to Cantera Burgos, the first was written between 1453 and 1460, though Seidenspinner-Núñez and Kim date it to 1475-1476, while Hussar suggests 1477-1478. The second work was composed later, because it refers to the bad reviews that the first had received. In any case, both were written before 1481, when Pero López de Trigo, a friend of Teresa’s father, copied them into a manuscript to be kept in the library of the Monastery of El Escorial. It is in the first of these works, *Grove of the Infirm*, that Teresa de Cartagena’s notion of her *converso* identity is revealed. Although the text is presented like an autobiography, there is in fact little information about her, not even her name or the date of writing. It merely mentions that she was a nun and suffered from deafness. That is why Hussar considers that the objective of this work was not to console Teresa but to show solidarity with Jews and New Christians, victims of the violence unleashed in Toledo in January 1449, and ideologically expressed in Pero Sarmiento’s Sentence-Statute. Jews and converts would be the infirm whom she aimed to console (though her writings are unlikely to have offered much relief as they merely recommend patience). However, while not explicitly referring to Jews or New Christians, Teresa de Cartagena does defend her Jewish origin, as I shall explain.

**Jewish Lineage as a Defining Element of the Converso Identity**

Traditional historiography, as represented by scholars such as Roth, Baer and Beinart, has generally considered the converts really to have been Jews who practised their religion in secret. Hence, they use expressions such as “judaizers” or “crypto-Jews”. On the other hand, scholars such as Rivkin and Netanyahu have declared that the Inquisition actually rekindled the Jewish identity of converts, because most of them were in fact true Christians, while judaizers were a minority. The question of which group was in the majority is of little interest here, particularly because it will certainly have varied at different times and in different places. I am more concerned to show how the Jewish identity of New Christians could not be attributed only to the action of the Inquisition, because the identification between converts and Jews existed before 1478, when the Inquisition was created. Besides, the use of Jewish origin for defining the *converso* identity could not be attributed only to Old Christians. Medieval Jewish sources, contradicting Inquisitorial ones, show that Spanish rabbis tended to consider New Christians “as gentilized apostates, or more simply, as gentiles”. Maimonides (1135-1204) excluded convert Jews from the community of Israel, while Isaac bar Sheshet Perfet, also known as Ribash (1326-1408), distinguished between the forced convert, who practised Judaism in secret and should therefore be considered a Jew, and the real convert, who was an idolater and gentile. Isaac Arama...
(1420-1494) claimed that most converts had been assimilated and should be separated from the Jewish people, while the Portuguese Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508) thought that converts wanted to be gentiles and refused to be Jews. If there were converts who did not integrate into Jewish communities, or if they did not leave the Iberian Peninsula after the expulsion orders so as to keep their faith, they were considered Christians by most Spanish rabbis. So, according to medieval Spanish rabbis, religion was the most important factor in defining identity. They distinguished only between Jews (a term which could sometimes include forced converts) and Christians, while the New Christians' link with Jewish lineage was not important for them. Only Simon ben Zemah Duran (1361-1444) claimed that forced converts and real converts were all Jews, because a Jewish sinner is still an Israelite.

For the Old Christians, Jewish origin was the relevant characteristic of converso identity, even before the Inquisition got under way. Pero Sarmiento’s Sentence-Statute, enacted on 5 June 1449 with the purpose of excluding New Christians from the local council of Toledo, states that “all mentioned converts [are] descendants of the wicked lineage of the Jews”. The “converts from the lineage of Jews” are mentioned in a petition written by Marcos García de Mora between October and November 1449, usually referring to them as “baptized Jews”. The word “lineage” makes reference to a person’s ancestors and descendants. So, when Old Christians used this word in reference to converts, they were declaring that religious conversion had no value for them. Detractors considered that the New Christians had inherited their beliefs, habits and customs from the Jews, as well as the guilt legacy and defects traditionally blamed on the Jews, believing them to have been transmitted by blood. This would later appear in the “purity of blood” statues, which “stipulated that anyone with at least one Jewish ancestor was himself still a converso and therefore was not a real Christian”. Biology was more important than religion for Old Christians, when they referred to converts.

But lineage was also used as a criterion for defining converso identity by the New Christians themselves. The word was used to refer to the descendants of houses or families, and of course family was the core of social organisation in converso groups. They preferred to not to marry Old Christians (contrary to popular belief), but would prefer other converts, and practised endogamy. Many converts entrusted their newborn children to Jewish wet-nurses, because they believed that Jewish milk secured the link between the baby and the Jewish lineage. In mid-October 1449, the converso Fernán Díaz de Toledo, who had achieved a prominent post in the royal court, described New Christians as having been descended from the Israelite lineage, in an instruction sent to Lope Barrientos, bishop of Cuenca. Another New Christian, Cardinal Juan de Torquemada (1388-1468), referred to them as “the descendants of the Jewish people, those who have converted to Christ’s faith”, “faithful Christians coming from the Israelite people”, “converts from Israelite people” and “descendants of Jewish race by name Christians” in his Tractatus contra madianitas et ismaelitas (1450). Thus, as Hernán-
dez Franco says, “there was constant preoccupation with protecting the memory of the ancestors and with lineage, which was the main concern in their way of life”33.

TERESA DE CARTAGENA AND HER LINEAGE

In *Grove of the Infirm*, Teresa de Cartagena claims that she heard the following words in her mind (they in fact come from Psalm 44:11, in the Vulgate version): “Listen, daughter, and obey, and strain your ear, forget your people and your father’s house”. But she refused to accept the literal meaning of these words, reflecting instead about her origins and lineage.

Cantera Montenegro considers that “the individualization of a Jewish person is established by filiation, and this always comes from the paternal name”34. According to Hutton, the role of the father in the family is outstanding in the Jewish tradition, persisting in many *converso* families. He also claims that “...when Teresa evokes her father’s image, as she does on different occasions, she is revealing her Jewish ancestry”35. Teresa does not want to accept the literal meaning of the Psalm, and she thinks quite the contrary. She refuses to forget her people and her father’s house, in other words, her lineage and her Jewish origin. This attitude shows bravery, mainly because she lived in a period when New Christians were under increasing threat. But she was not a reckless woman, and defended her origin without explicitly stating that she was a New Christian of Jewish origin.

Teresa says that she heard these words in her mind. But who is speaking to her? God? (though Teresa does not seem to be referring to Him, because she explains that what she heard was contrary to God’s law). It could be the voice of her conscience, although her declaration and explanation is quite contrary to this. Given the situation in contemporary Castile, it is probable that Teresa would have heard the words in her surroundings and that they would have lingered in her mind. There may also have been a real interlocutor to whom she wished to respond. But who could that have been? These words would not have come from her paternal family, because they would have been damaged if she had decided to pay attention to the literal meaning of the Psalm. Perhaps the comment came from the relatives of her mother, Maria de Saravia. But Teresa apparently did not have much of a relationship with her maternal family. More probably her confessor would have spoken to her in such a way, or the nuns of the religious order whose name was deleted from the manuscript. In any case, Teresa refused to accept the literal meaning of the phrase, and she was reluctant to renounce her people and her father’s house, which she identified with her family, although contemporary Old Christians considered them to be of Jewish lineage. This implies that Teresa refused to renounce her Jewish origin.

Another important question is whether Teresa de Cartagena’s claim was common amongst converts, if it was only shared with other members of her family, or if it had
sprung from herself alone. Fernán Díaz de Toledo, mentioned above, did not seem to feel either pride or shame at his Jewish origin, for as he pointed out, there were many notable men of similar origins, and the Church included two peoples, the Israelite and the Gentile. Juan de Torquemada, who did not deny the link between New Christians and Jews, and also came to Jews’ defence, preferred to insist on the similarities between New and Old Christians. He admitted that there was a tie, but it was not as important as the unity with other Christians. Thus, the priority of the converts would have been to avoid differences between New Christians and Old Christians, both considered part of the Church.

With regard to the Santa María family, some scholars such as de los Ríos, Baer and Castro have claimed that the patriarch, Pablo de Santa María, was involved in the persecution of Jews; indeed, Netanyahu insists on Pablo’s hatred of Jews in his writings and his involvement in the discriminatory laws enacted against them under the reigns of Henry III and John II. On the other hand, at the beginning of the 16th century, Juan de Lucena, who was probably also a converso, attributed to Alonso de Cartagena the following words: “Don’t imagine that you injure me when you call my fathers Hebrews. Of course they were, and thus I want them to be.”

Alonso de Cartagena wrote _Defensorium Unitatis Christianae_ or _Defensorium Fidei_ (1449-1450) in order to refute Marcos García de Mora’s Petition. In this work, Alonso de Cartagena attacked those who discriminated against the converts, calling them heretical and schismatic, and presents Christianity as the culmination of Judaism. According to Hussar, “Teresa’s careful selection and citation of texts, as well as her frequent deference to Jewish exegesis, suggest that she, like her uncle, wished to stress the continuity of Judaism and Christianity.” However, the _Defensorium_ does not suggest that Alonso de Cartagena was proud of his Jewish origin. He was basically arguing that converts should not be judged according to the standards applied to Jews, and he was in favour of eliminating the distinction between Old Christians and New Christians. In his words, “… all men had been reduced to one lineage…” , which brought together Old and New Christians. He thought that it did not make sense to investigate if a person had Jewish ancestry, an opinion that contrasts with Teresa de Cartagena’s, who believed that origin should not be forgotten.

In short, while the priority of contemporary converso intellectuals seems to have been to minimize the differences between New and Old Christians, Teresa de Cartagena was more interested in defending her Jewish origins, although she does not insist on the issue in her works. For the moment, this seems to be an isolated testimony of a sincere New Christian woman living in 15th century. But it proves that there were differences between the New Christians, and further analysis of testimonies by other New Christians is required in order to understand this issue more fully.
CONCLUSIONS

Bodian considers “converso identity as a changing cultural construction, evolving over many generations and answering a variety of needs”\(^4\). After analysing the words of Teresa de Cartagena and other New Christians, it seems that such complexity could be detected even in contemporary generations. This means that the usual distinction between crypto-Jews and true Christians is too simplistic a way of defining conversos.

Indeed, in the discussions about converts that took place in the Middle Ages, different criteria were applied by those who were not themselves New Christians. For Spanish rabbis, religion was the main issue, and they distinguished only between Jews, who practised Judaism, and Christians, who did not. On the other hand, lineage was the most important factor for Old Christians, who insisted on the Jewish origin and undervalued the religious conversion of the New Christians and their descendants.

Even amongst the converts themselves there was no unanimity. While the converso intellectuals highlighted the value of the Christianization, tried to erase the differences between Old and New Christians and turned against the Jews, some New Christians claimed their Jewish origin. It was to this last group that Teresa de Cartagena belonged, although she did not take part in the general debate and confined herself to reacting to comments concerning her family. She refused to renounce her origins, as it is evident in the Grove of the Infirm, unlike other converso intellectuals such as her uncle Alonso de Cartagena. Therefore, it appears that individuals constructed their personal identities irrespective of the group to which they belonged or the definitions established by others. Indeed, the case of the conversos was not unique in this respect, as some CLIOHRES studies have suggested in relation to other contexts and historical periods\(^4\).

Ironically, the Santa María family received a “purity of blood” statute in 1604\(^4\), which meant that, from that moment on, they were considered Old Christians. Thus the Jewish origins that Teresa de Cartagena had defended were erased, while her uncle’s opinion (concerning a single lineage between Old Christians and New Christians) prevailed. But this was possible only for the Santa Maria family and a few other privileged New Christians, as most conversos were compelled to hide their origins for fear of stigmatization.
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And with the already mentioned silence, straining the ear of my understanding, because that of my body helps me badly, I think that I heard resounding spiritually these words: “Listen, daughter, and obey, and strain your ear, forget your people and your father’s house”. And given that the first words warn me so long to hear and to give some great thought and to strain my ear, they let me know that the following words about forgetting my people and my father’s house have a different meaning than what they represented. Because in order to understand them literally, it was enough one of these warnings; but all three together, to hear, to give some great thought, and to strain the ear, clearly show me that I must diligently see not only what these words say but also the meaning that they convey. But first let see what is said in order to know better what it means, because it is said: “Forget your people and your father’s house”. And it does not order us to forget the father, but his house. And it is clear that this does not refer to his material house, because it does not make sense to forget or remember it, but to his family. And this is shown by our common speech when we say: “So-and-so has a very great house”, what does not refer to the buildings or the size of the house where he lives, small or big, but to his family and the multitude of his people. So if we are ordered to forget this house, it follows that we are ordered to forget and even loathe the father, because who truly
loves his father not only could not forget his house, what is the family of servants and relatives, but even I think that he would love them due to respect for his father. So in order to forget this mentioned house, it is first advisable to forget and even loathe the father. According to this, the already mentioned words would rather seem to have another more reasonable and healthful meaning, because if a man forgets his people and his father’s house in this way, he would seem to contradict that God’s commandment which orders to honour; because that who does not love man neither can honour him. And it is a sign that he does not love to whom he dishonours, although some honour and reverence are paid in this world... Given that we are ordered to honour, it is evident that we are ordered to love, because otherwise the honour or service we do to the father would be faked and cautious. So how would we be ordered to forget someone whom we are ordered to honour and love? Because that who loves well, he never forgets. It seems quite evident, because of the warning of the first words which so diligently admonish me to listen, obey and strain my ear, as well as these above-mentioned reasons, that this warning and advice of forgetting my father’s people and house has another meaning.