In his *Farce of the Tailor*, written sometime between 1497 and 1506, Anrique da Mota uses a number of anti-Semitic stereotypes so that the farce, at first glance, appears to be an overt satire deriding New Christians.¹ However, as this paper will show, there is in fact an underlying dialogue to the text: Mota takes these very same anti-Semitic stereotypes and subtly turns them on their heads to create a hidden, parallel reading. In so doing, his farce is actually a very serious polemic on the topic of conversion and, more specifically, apostasy. Mota makes it clear that converts have no rights or place in early sixteenth-century Portuguese society, but there is a sympathetic strain to his argument: in what is actually a sensitive depiction of the *converso*’s state of alienation and plight for social justice, Mota is making a statement against the practice of coerced conversion rather than attacking *conversos* themselves.

Previous scholars who have noted a sympathetic quality to Mota’s message include José Leite de Vasconcellos, Andrée Crabbé Rocha, and Neil T. Miller, yet these discussions have, due to restrictions of space and scope, only been cursory; a detailed study of Mota’s literary artistry in conveying this message has not yet been accomplished.² The present article therefore builds on their discussions by means of close textual analysis that will highlight the above-mentioned use of stereotypes and shed light on how they are manipulated. Most importantly, it will reveal the magnitude of Mota’s social commentary which, as I shall argue, may be informed by popular notions of Jewish rabbinical tradition and which, as will be seen, has been misrepresented in its most recent study by Reuven Faingold in 1991.³ The discussion will also further our knowledge


³ Reuven Faingold, ‘Judios y conversos en el teatro portugués pre-vicentino: la Farsa do alfaiate en el
of Mota’s biography by quietly correcting certain historical inaccuracies in previous discussions of archival documents concerning Mota and his family.⁴

Henrique da Mota: Life and Times

Little is known about our author’s birth and death. Though it is suspected that Mota was born in the late third or early final quarter of the fifteenth century, our only evidence for Mota’s dates is the chronological range of the documents either ascribed to him or in which he is mentioned. As Miller has shown, these date from 1499 to 1545.⁵

Mota was himself an Old Christian and a lay magistrate: he was a juiz dos órfãos [judge of orphans] in and around Óbidos, north of Lisbon. In his capacity as judge of orphans, he would have presided over all civil cases involving orphans under the age of twenty-five, as well as the destitute (prodiguos) and persons of unsound mind.⁶ Yet it is significant that, prior to the forced conversions of 1497, the judge of orphans would sometimes also have heard civil and criminal cases between Christians and Jews or Muslims, where the Jew or the Muslim was the plaintiff.⁷ Unfortunately, we do not know whether Mota ever served in this capacity of magistrate for Muslims and Jews, nor do we know whether he took up the position of judge of orphans prior to 1497; no judicial records from his term have yet come to light. Anselmo Braamcamp Freire suspects that Mota was appointed to the position by Queen Leonor, who acquired jurisdiction of the region in 1482, since the ‘relatively complete’ Chancelaria de D. Manuel does not include his notice of hire.⁸ In fact, Manuel’s registry is hardly complete and many documents from his chancery are now barely legible.⁹ Knowing, as we do, that D. Leonor was our poet Mota’s patron, she may well have secured a position for her protégé, although the date when he was appointed or elected to the office

⁵ Miller, Obras, pp. 123–52.
⁸ Anselmo Braamcamp Freire, Vida e Obras de Gil Vicente: Trovador, Mestre da Balança (Lisbon: Edição da Revista Ocidente, 1944), p. 64.
cannot be confirmed. The earliest surviving reference to Mota employed as a judge of orphans is in a literary text that dates to c. 1509: he appears as a character in his own lyrical piece known as O Processo de Vasco Abul [The Lawsuit of Vasco Abul], where he is a judge of orphans who is presented with an outlandish legal quandary involving an old lecher and a young, orphaned belly dancer. Later evidence corroborating Mota’s employment as a judge of orphans in the Óbidos region is, according to Freire, to be found in a certificate that is attached to a royal mandate dated 15 May 1521, but which subsequent scholars have not been able to locate and verify.

Also significant for our purposes, Mota was a member of D. Manuel’s court in the years following the edict of expulsion of 1496: a letter dated 1499 stipulates that he was commissioned with the delivery of a royal message to the fidalgo Anrique da Silveira, and it reveals that Mota was an escudeiro del rei (the lowest grade within the Portuguese ranks of nobility) who lived in Bombarral (a village close to Óbidos). After the edict was promulgated, D. Manuel is known to have resorted to a number of coercive measures in order to encourage the Jews to convert and remain in Portugal. These tactics included a decree, published 15 December 1496, stating that Jews who converted to Christianity could stay in Portugal and buy back their property for the same price at which it was sold. Writs were sent to the town council of Porto (31 December 1496) and the port of Buarcos (2 January 1497) stating that Jews were not to leave the country without a special royal licence — any fugitive Jews or ship’s captains who assisted them in leaving would lose their property. Children under the age of fourteen were removed from their Jewish parents, baptized, and adopted into Catholic families, to be given back to their parents only if they themselves converted. Parents obstinate in their faith were furthermore faced with financial duress, since the baptized children were to be paid two-thirds of their


11 The date of this text is discussed by Alina Villalva, Vasco Abul (Lisbon: Quimera, 1989; e-book, 2005); Miller, Obras, pp. 145–46; Freire, Vida e Obras, pp. 62–64.

12 Freire, Vida e Obras, p. 63. Freire references Gaspar Alvares de Lousada Machado’s Sumarios de Todas as Doações e Chancelarias da Torre do Tombo, vol. III, fol. 274v, which I have not been able to locate and consult despite the kind efforts of the staff at ANTT and the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal.


inheritance immediately upon their conversion. The final outcome was that in 1497 those Jews who had resisted these coercive measures, having chosen to retain their religious integrity and who wished to leave the country now were for the most part either martyred or forcibly converted to Christianity. These actions, the king maintained, were carried out in accordance with what the Franciscan theologian John Duns Scotus had described as the Christian ruler’s right and duty to forcibly convert Jews.

This was a time of great social upheaval, and many tried to flee even after the ordeals of 1497. In 1499, the same year in which the aforementioned document describing Mota as an escudeiro of the king was written, D. Manuel issued a decree that prohibited New Christians (that is, all those converted in 1497) from exiting the country. One can surmise from all this that, as an escudeiro da casa del Rei, our author would have had something of an insider’s perspective on court affairs in the turbulent years that followed the forced conversions.

In fact, Mota came from a line of Portuguese courtiers. His father, Gonçalo da Mota, was an escudeiro criado of Afonso V and João II. As such, he would have been schooled and raised in the Portuguese court alongside the infantes. His grandfather, João da Mota, was also an escudeiro, and he was granted land comprising vineyards and orchards in Bombaral, in which property the kings themselves would stay when travelling through the area. In 1509, Anrique da Mota was elevated from the status of escudeiro to cavaleiro fidalgo and he received his own coat of arms. On 12 August 1527, after the death of his patron, the dowager Queen Leonor, in 1525, an Anrique da Mota — who is believed to be the same individual as our author — was appointed to the position of escrivão.
da câmara real [royal clerk] to João III.\textsuperscript{22} No doubt, Mota was upwardly social, yet his longstanding role of guardian of the poor as judge of orphans may help to explain the sensitivity expressed in his lyrical social commentaries.\textsuperscript{23}

**The Farce of the Tailor: Summary and Date**

Anrique da Mota’s lyrical works are preserved in folios 201\textsuperscript{v}–11\textsuperscript{r} of the *Cancioneiro Geral*, an anthology of court literature — mainly poetry and dramatic works composed during the years 1450 to 1516 — that was compiled by the chronicler and poet Garcia de Resende, dedicated to D. Manuel’s fourteen-year-old son, Prince João (later João III), and printed in 1516.\textsuperscript{24}

Mota’s works include five pieces of early performance art that Miller refers to as dramatic dialogues.\textsuperscript{25} In most of these dialogues, Mota uses the common dramatic form of the mock trial; the present study is focused on one such mock trial, the one popularly known as *A Farsa do Alfaiate* [The Farce of the Tailor].\textsuperscript{26}

This comedic piece, which is only 260 lines long, opens with the protagonist, a *converso* tailor named Manuel, lamenting the loss of a gold coin he had been saving. He cannot determine whether it was mislaid or stolen, but he blames the unfortunate loss on the fact that he was baptized, as no good has come to him since. He is in a state of utter despair and, just as he resolves to take the matter to his lord, D. Diogo, D. João enters the scene. This Lord D. Diogo is believed to be the historical D. Diogo de Noronha, son of D. Pedro de Meneses, the Marquis of Vila-Real, and D. João is believed to be D. Diogo’s brother, D. João de Noronha, grand prior of Santa Cruz Monastery in Coimbra.\textsuperscript{27} The

\textsuperscript{22} His letter of appointment is preserved in ANTT, *Chancelaria de D. João III*, book 30, fol. 131\textsuperscript{v}; transcribed in Miller, *Obras*, p. 505.

\textsuperscript{23} For full details on Mota’s life and works, see Miller, *Obras*; and Mateus, *Obras*.

\textsuperscript{24} Garcia de Resende (ed.), *Cancioneiro Geral* (Lisbon: Herman de Campos, 1516).

\textsuperscript{25} For discussion of the theatrical merit of these pieces, including arguments that they transcend the common *entremês* (which would have been recited by one, single reader responsible for the voices of all *dramatis personae*) and instead bear the traits of stage theatre, predating the plays of Gil Vicente, see Vasconcellos, *Farsa*; Gustavo de Matos Sequeira, ‘*A Farsa do Alfaiate*’, *Teatro de Outros Tempos* (Lisbon: [n. pub.], 1933), pp. 9–16 (p. 15); Rocha, *Esboços Dramáticos*, p. 10; Ribeiro, ‘Rainha Dona Leonor’, p. 73; Luciana Stegagno Picchio, ‘Osservazioni sull’uso di alcuni termini nell’antico teatro portoghese’, *Boletim de Filologia*, 19 (1960), 131–43.

\textsuperscript{26} The rubric in the *Cancioneiro Geral* introduces this piece as ‘*D’Anrique da Mota a um Alfaiate de dom Diogo sobre um cruzado que lhe furtaram no Bombarral*’ (Mateus, *Obras*, p. 51); ‘[Lyrics] by Anrique da Mota to a tailor of D. Diogo’s regarding a coin that was stolen from him in Bombarral’.

\textsuperscript{27} Vasconcellos, *Farsa*, pp. 35 and 38–39; Miller, *Obras*, pp. 142–43. Dom Diogo features in another of Mota’s dialogues, the one popularly known as *A Lamentação da Mula* [The Mule’s Lament]. Dom João de Noronha is ridiculed in a satirical poem by Mota that was censored for its critique of corruption within the Church and that bears the heading ‘*D’Anrique da Mota a dom João de Noronha e a dom Sancho seu irmão porque se foram confessar a sam Bernaldim na metade de verão, levando consig o vigairo D’Óvidos que é muito gordo, e vieram jantar a um lugar que chamam Os Giraldos e nom acharam vinho para beber’ [‘[Lyrics] by Anrique da Mota to D. João de Noronha and his brother, D. Sancho, because they went to confess in São Bernardo in the middle of summer, bringing with them the vicar of Óbidos, who is very fat, and they went to dine at a place called Os Giraldos and they could not find wine to drink’] (Mateus, *Obras*, pp. 42–44 and 63–79). Dom Diogo was *comendador mór* of
grand prior directs the converso to the chapel of the Holy Spirit instead, saying that he should present himself as a penitent supplicant so that he may learn through divine intervention who has taken his coin. Manuel goes to the chapel and offers an awkward prayer for assistance. He grows frustrated at the lack of an immediate response from the Holy Spirit and leaves the sanctuary in a huff. He then encounters a rustic, João de Belas, along the road. The rustic tells him, in a vague and roundabout way, of some news he has learnt about an item that was found. Despite the rustic’s comically vague story, Manuel leaps to the conclusion that the item found is his cruzado. He thanks the rustic for having identified the man who found his coin, and he runs to the judge with the news. The judge agrees to assist Manuel in recuperating his cruzado, needing only the name of the culprit to recover the coin. However, the converso cannot name the culprit; instead, he gives an ambiguous description of him based on the story he heard earlier from the rustic buffoon, João de Belas. The farce then ends with the judge, having grown impatient with the tailor’s ramblings and lack of clear evidence, ruling that the lost coin had been stolen by Manuel in the first place, since he acquired it without proper fear of God.

While the precise date at which this text was composed has not been confirmed, internal evidence points to the period between 1497 and 1506. Our protagonist describes himself as a voluntary convert:

Çerto eu naçy maa ora,  
em pior fuy bautizado,  
pois desemtam atêgora  
sempre em mym mofina mora,  
[...] 
tudo he bem empreguado  
em mim, pois tomei de grado  
esta ley noua de graça. (ll. 41–50)  
[For certain I was born at a bad hour,  
at an even worse hour I was baptized,  
since from that time until now  
misery always resides in me,  
[...]  
all is well deserved  
in me, since I willingly accepted  
this new law of Christ.]  

Many believe that the mention of the ‘new law of Christ’ in the last line of this passage is a reference to the nationwide forced conversion of the Jews in 1497,

the Ordem de Cristo, alcaide mór of Óbidos, and senhor dos direitos of Salir do Porto. His second wife was D. Filipa de Ataíde, granddaughter of Nuno Vaz de Castelo-Branco, Lord of Bombarral, according to one of the two traditions preserved in António Caetano de Sousa’s Provas da História Genealógica da Casa Real Portuguesa, vol. ix (Lisbon: Lisboa Occidental: Na officina Sylviana da Academia Real, 1742), p. 64. She was Nuno’s great-granddaughter in the alternative tradition in vol. v (Lisbon: Lisboa Occidental: Na officina Sylviana da Academia Real 1738), p. 196.
and they therefore hold that the text could not have been written before this date. Whether or not they are correct in their reading of this line, there is no doubt that Manuel expresses regret that his conversion had been voluntary and that he had not put up any resistance. This is exemplified, for example, in his exclamation, ‘Oxalá fôra batalha!’ [If only there had been a fight!] (l. 88). I will be arguing that, by having the converso lament his voluntary conversion, our author is presenting his protagonist as a repentant meshumad, a common term in twelfth- to fifteenth-century Jewish responsa literature, in which a distinction was often made between forced converts (anusim) and voluntary converts (meshumadim). We will be returning to this point below, but it is important to signal now that the distinction between forced and voluntary converts would have had special relevance in Portugal after the forced conversions. The Jewish community would no doubt have distinguished between those who were forcibly baptized and those who had converted willingly when under social and economic pressure, in 1496, and this may support the argument that 1497 is the earliest possible date when the farce could have been composed. The terminus ad quem is 1506 since this is the year that one of the characters, Grand Prior D. João de Noronha, died, and the representation of a character in a dialogue post mortem would have been unlikely.

Condemnation of the Convert

The Farce of the Tailor is rather telling about what a man of law has to say about the rights of converts: in short, they have no rights. This is made clear in Manuel’s despair upon the loss of his coin, since he does not know where to turn to obtain justice. He fears that the Old Christian judge will not defend his rights:

Eu nam ssey que mal eu fiz,  
que tal perda me conuenha!  
O coraçam quá me diz  
que vá buscar o juiz,  
& creo que bem me venha.  
E direy que me mantenha  
em justiça com ssa vara.  
Oo quem me dera ter grenha!  
pois nam tenho quem me tenha,  
eu por m’y m’arrepelara! (ll. 61–70)

28 Vasconcellos, Farsa, p. 34; Luciana Stegagno Picchio, Storia del teatro portoghese (Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1964), p. 91; Miller, Obras, pp. 142–44. These scholars give 1496 as the year of the conversão geral, however, it is well known that the forced conversions occurred in 1497 (Soyer, Persecution, pp. 218–31). Reuven Faingold also regards this piece as having been written after the forced conversions of 1497, but his analysis of the farce, based on his interpretation of Manuel as a forced convert, is not supported in the text: ‘Judíos y conversos’, pp. 41–43.

29 The statement above is an oversimplification: rabbinical ideas differed regarding what constitutes duress and ‘forced’ conversion, and the anusim/meshumadim dichotomy becomes somewhat skewed, if not abandoned in some of the discussions. This will be discussed below.

I don’t know what wrong I did  
to deserve such a loss!  
The heart that beats within me says  
that I should go and fetch the judge,  
and I believe that good will come of it.  
I will ask him to maintain me  
in justice with his staff.  
Oh, would that I had wild, unruly hair!  
Since I have no one to defend me,  
I would pull it out myself!]

He resolves to go to his lord, D. Diogo, who has always shown him favour:

Mas porem sse o Ssenhor  
Dom Dyogue ysto ssabe,  
segundo me tem amor,  
porque ssam sseu seruidor (ll. 76–79)

[But, however, if Lord  
Dom Diogo were to know of this,  
he has much affection for me  
because I am his client]

This may or may not be a comment on the tight-knit relationship between some Jews and the Portuguese nobility.  
There is certain irony in the fact that the first figure Manuel meets on his path for justice is a Christian religious figure, Grand Prior D. João; a religious figure from his ancestral faith, the rabbi menor (lower rabbi), would have been Manuel’s first point of contact regarding any issues of faith or justice. Though Manuel first rejects the grand prior’s assistance, the cleric succeeds in pushing him towards a Christian route for legal recourse (he sends him to pray in the chapel of the Holy Spirit). But this route is not satisfactory as he does not get an immediate response from the Holy Spirit, and Manuel’s initial fears concerning his lack of support within the Old Christian judicial system are reaffirmed by the Old Christian judge’s verdict which ends the farce:

Mas porem, porqu’aleguays  
ssynays com que m’embaçastes,  
por esses mesmos ssinays  
eu julgo, que vós percais  
o cruzado que furtastes,  
por c’assy como o ganhastes  
sem temor de Deos nem medo,  
a bofee bem no lograstes:  
& nam ssey como o goardastes,  
que sse nam perdeo mais çedo (ll. 251–60)

On such ties, see Maria José Ferro Tavares, Os Judeus em Portugal no Século XIV, 2nd edn (Lisbon: Guimarães, 2000), p. 66.
[But still, because you allege
the description with which you confuse me,
by the same description
I deem that you lost
the cruzado that you stole,
for, since you won it
without dread nor fear of God,
by good faith, you rightfully deserve to lose it:
and I do not know how you kept it,
without having lost it much sooner]

No doubt, the text ends with a clear note of condemnation from the Old Christian judge.

Pere Ferré has recently suggested that, in the lines ‘Mas yr-m’ey por essa terra, | como homem ssem ventura’ (ll. 11–12), Mota makes an allusion to Gonzalo de Montalbán’s poem ‘Morir vos queredes, padre’, which reads, ‘Yrme he por esas tierras | como una muger errada’. The latter poem describes an exchange between Princess Urraca and her dying father, Fernando I, King of León and Castile: in her successful petition to secure an inheritance of land, she warns that she would otherwise be forced to wander as a wanton woman, offering herself to Muslims and Christians alike. Ferré argues that Mota intends a comic counterpoint between the aristocrat’s complaints to her father over a lack of royal inheritance and the complaints of an indigno judío [contemptible Jew] over the loss of a ‘miserable cruzado’. Yet an attempt to draw similarities between these two plotlines seems strained, and Ferré’s reading may be further complicated by potential issues regarding the chronological order of the two works (Montalbán’s floruit is unknown and the earliest printed edition of his text has not been dated more precisely than to the first half of the sixteenth century). It would seem that any similarity in the above-cited couplets may be more easily attributed to common influence or perhaps even more simply to a commonplace trope. Nevertheless, Ferré has approached Mota’s work on the literal level alone and thus describes it as an anti-Semitic piece that contains ‘Mota’s biting critique of the Jews’. He is not alone; Faingold has also recently interpreted an anti-Semitic message in Mota’s text. But, even if a parody of D. Urraca’s distress has indeed been woven into the farce, let us reconsider where the author’s sympathies (if we can use the term) lie.

32 Pere Ferré, ‘Breves notas sobre el teatro de Anrique da Mota y Gil Vicente’, in Em Louvor da Linguagem: Homenagem a Maria Leonor Carvalhão Buescu, ed. by Maria Leonor Machado de Sousa et al. (Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 2003), pp. 97–110 (pp. 103–04).
34 ‘La enorme trascendencia puesta en esta pérdida del “cruzado” y, a su vez, el camino que tendrá que hacer como “homem sem ventura” [...] son suficiente claros para que el auditorio entienda la irónica crítica de Mota a los judíos’ (Ferré, ‘Breves notas’, p. 104).
Literal Reading (Converso Ridiculed)

There seem to be two possible readings of this text: a literal Christian reading in which the converso is ridiculed, and an allegorical reading that is sympathetic to the moral-theological dilemma faced by Jews who were forced to either convert to Catholicism or attempt to leave the country. To begin with the literal reading that mocks the converso, we see from his opening monologue that Manuel’s speech is characterized by Jewish expressions like goayas and guyzeraa, and one could argue that his pranto [lament] is a farcical exaggeration of the very serious melancholic style that converso authors commonly used to express sentiments of grief over their social circumstances and the sempiternal exile of the Hebrew nation.36

Goayas, que sam destroçado!
ay, Adonay, que farey!
poys que quys o meu pecado
que perdy o meu cruzado
que por maas noytes guanhey!
Goay de mym, onde m’irey,
que rreçeba algum conforto?
se o calo, abafarey...
jur’em Deu, nam calarey,
porque nessora ssam morto!
[...]
Guyzeraa, que gram tristura! (ll. 1–16)

[Woe, that I am destroyed!
Oh, Adonai, what will I do!
Because I willed my sin
I have lost my cruzado
which I earned after many hard nights!
Woe is me, where will I go
to find any consolation?
If I remain silent, I will suffocate.
By God, I will not remain silent,
for at this hour I am dead!
[...]
Guezera, what great affliction!]

In his lampoon of the melancholic style, Mota employs stereotypes about Jews that a Christian audience would easily recognize as derogatory. The most

obvious stereotypes are those of pride and avarice. The stereotype of the Jew’s excessive love of money is clearly at play in Manuel’s account of his loss:

Hum cruzado que poypey,
em que tanto me rreuia,
tantas vezes o olhey,
até que nam no achey (ll. 121–24)

[A cruzado that I saved, in which I so often saw myself, many times I watched it, until I was not able to find it]

He also cries:

Oo cruzado! minha vida!
pera que te conheçy,
poys tua triste partida
me causa dor tam creçida,
qual eu nunca padeçy? (ll. 56–60)

[O cruzado, my life, why did I know you, since your sad departing causes me such great pain, the likes of which I have never suffered?]

I would argue that, in these two passages, the author intends an illusion to Narcissus, the conceited mythological figure who died pining after his own image, which he saw reflected in a pool of water. Manuel does say that he saw his reflection in this gold coin (l. 122), and, at one point, he clearly wants to die, pining for his lost cruzado:

Ay, que quero abafar!
ay, que me quero perder!
quero-m’yr lançar no mar!
milhor he de me matar
que sempre proue viuer!
Ô quem me desse ssaber
onde hum toyro estiuesses!
hy-lo-hya cometer:
jur’em Deu, em me comer
grande graça me fizesse (ll. 21–30)

[Oh, I want to choke!
Oh, I want to disappear!
I want to go throw myself into the sea!
Life always proves that I’m better off dead!]

37 Previous scholars who have noted (albeit in passing) Mota’s use of the stereotype of Jewish avarice include Rocha, Esboços Dramáticos, p. 37; and Miller, Obras, p. 252.
The Subversion of Hate in Mota’s Farce of the Tailor

Oh, who would tell me where I could find a bull? I would go offer myself to it: by God, it would be doing me a great favour in devouring me.]

Mota likely intends for us to make this connection with Narcissus since he mentions him by name earlier in the dialogue:

D’outra parte namhe ssyso buscar minha perdiçam, que, quando culpam Narçyso, que morreo por mao auiso, pois de mym ja, que diram? (ll. 31–35)

[On the other hand, it is not wise to seek out my own perdition, for, seeing how they fault Narcissus, who died by his own bad judgment, what will they say about me?]

The next major stereotype developed by Mota is that of the wandering Jew. As is well known, exile has been inextricably linked to Jewish history as far back as the Old Testament wanderings of the tribes of Israel in search of the Promised Land. Christian writers, moreover, commonly described the Jews as damned wanderers punished with exile for the sin of deicide. Pope Innocent III, for instance, likens Jews to Cain, another eternal wanderer, in his bull Ut esset Cain. Mota was definitely familiar with the stereotype of the wandering Jew, since he makes direct mention of it in another of his works. And in our text, Manuel makes many references to his state of exile. For example, he cries:

Mas yr-m’ey por essa terra, como homem ssem ventura, porqu’a dor que me desterra me fará tam crua guerra, que moyra ssem sepultura (ll. 11–15)

[But I shall wander through this land, as a man without fortune,

38 Mota’s use of this stereotype is briefly acknowledged in Faingold, ‘Judíos y conversos’, p. 42.
for the pain which kindles my exile
will provoke in me such cruel war,
that I shall die without a sepulchre.]

This exile could be interpreted by a Christian audience as the typical state of the damned, wandering Jew.

However, one important hint suggests that our author does not himself agree with the judge’s condemnation of the convert in the play: Mota named the judge after his own father, Gonçalo da Mota, and, according to two documents discovered by Miller in the chancery of João II, his father acted as a municipal judge in 1486 and was fined 500 reais because he gave an erroneous judgment during his term. By naming his judge after a person who, as some audience members would know, had given a false verdict, our author is calling into question the Old Christian judge’s ruling in the play.

**Allegorical Reading (Sympathy for the Converso?)**

This brings us to the alternative, allegorical and more sympathetic reading of the Jew’s exile and wandering in this text, a reading that may be partly informed by tenets of the Maimonidean school of rabbinical tradition regarding the Talmudic penalty for apostasy. This penalty is exclusion from the Jewish community and destruction in the world to come. At the end of days, upon the gathering of the exiled diaspora, apostates will be excluded from redemption and instead subjected to perpetual torment: ‘hell shall pass away, but they shall not pass away’. This traditional belief — that perpetual exile from the people of Israel (i.e., excommunication) was the punishment for abjuring God — continues to be seen in writings more contemporary to Mota’s period. The fifteenth-century Rabbi Joel ibn Shuaib (of Aragonese origin, living in Navarre) wrote in his *Nora Tehilot* [*Awesome in Splendour*] that the only future of converts is to rot forever in the ‘prison of exile’. When the day of redemption comes, ‘God will reject them with both hands’.

Alongside this traditional Talmudic punishment, the fifteenth century witnessed the production of a number of works by Jewish mystics concerning the kabbalistic doctrine of *metempsychosis* (transmigration of the soul). This doctrine had already been expounded in earlier kabbalistic texts such as the thirteenth-century *Sefer ha-Zohar* [*The Book of Splendour*], which outlines the various stages of the soul’s exile. It received renewed importance in the

---

42 (b=Baylonian Talmud) *bRosh Hashana* 17a; Maimonides, *Hilkhot ‘Avodat Kokhavim*, 2. 5; *Hilkhot Mamrim*, 3. 2; *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, 3. 6. 9; see discussion in Benzion Netanyahu, *The Marranos of Spain from the Late XIVth to the Early XVth Century according to Contemporary Hebrew Sources*, rev. 3rd edn (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 17 note 47.
43 *bRosh Hashana* 17a; see also (*-Tosefta) *tSanh*. 13. 5; Maimonides, *Hilkhot Teshuvah*, 3. 6.
early fifteenth century, however: in response to the Sophist bent arising among many Spanish Jews, who abandoned the idea of Providence and voluntarily converted amid social pressure in 1412–15, Shem-Tov ben Shem-Tov wrote Sefer ha-Emunot [The Book of Beliefs], in which he further developed the theory of metempsychosis in his aim to renew faith in the ideas of Provenance and Punishment and Reward. 

Significantly, the Zohar is believed to be drawn upon in the writings of one of Mota’s contemporaries: Bernardim Ribeiro (c. 1482–1552?). Many details regarding Ribeiro’s life are shrouded in mystery. Nevertheless, it has been argued — based on the scant biographical information that can be gathered from his poetry and from mentions of him in two works by Francisco Sá de Miranda (1481–1558) — that the poet and courtier Ribeiro had converted to Christianity voluntarily, likely for material gain, and that, on account of being a crypto-Jew, he fell out of favour at the Portuguese court by 1521 and sought refuge in Italy. 

Building on comments first made by José Teixeira Rego, scholars such as Helder Macedo and Luís Nepomuceno thus view Ribeiro’s eclogues as prantos written from the perspective of a crypto-Jew influenced by the ideas of Hispanic kabbalah. They interpret the convert’s grief and state of wandering in these enigmatically autobiographical poems as a reference to the kabbalistic notions of exile and union with God as expressed in the Zohar and other mystical writings, and it is interesting for our purposes that, as Leite de Vasconcellos first noted, there are striking similarities between the wording of Manuel’s pranto and the eclogues. 

These similarities may well be coincidental, particularly since, though the exact chronological relationship between Mota’s farce and Ribeiro’s eclogues or his Menina e Moça remains unknown, the latter works are suspected to

---


48 Vasconcellos, Farsa, p. 38 note to ll. 46–47. The similarities between Ribeiro’s eclogues and Manuel’s pranto will be further discussed in Matheson, The Polemics of Conversion.
have been written afterward, once Ribeiro was already in exile in Italy.\(^{49}\) The theme of exile and wandering is, moreover, common in Portuguese poetry of the Renaissance period. However, as Nepomuceno has shown, this theme was adopted in an amplified form by Jewish and New Christian authors, and it is no doubt an overpowering aspect of Manuel’s lament as well.\(^{50}\) Exile does not appear to be a prevalent theme in the poems by Ribeiro printed in the *Cancionceiro Geral* — these follow immediately after Mota’s at fols 211r–12r. One might nevertheless note a similar theme of loss in Ribeiro’s *vilancete* with the *incipit* ‘Com quantas cousas perdi’. More significantly, as Stephen Reckert has stated, Ribeiro ‘characteristically modulates through regret and disillusionment to a resigned expectation of the worst’ in his *vilancete* beginning ‘Antre mim mesmo e mim’. And the poems beginning ‘Desperança em esperança’ and ‘esperança minha, is-vos’ contain ‘nostalgic signifiers — parting and pain, disillusion and loss of hope, loss even of self’; these signifiers suggest to Reckert that, in Ribeiro’s early poems, which were not necessarily informed by kabbalah as his eclogues were, one also sees a ‘covert allegory of the plight of Iberian Jewry’.\(^{51}\)

The extent of Mota’s contact with Ribeiro is uncertain. One might speculate that, as contemporary poets and courtiers, they might have crossed paths and even exchanged works. Yet Ribeiro, a native of Alentejo, is believed to have been situated at the court in Lisbon whereas Mota’s office was in the nearby area of Óbidos, and the latter’s writings and biographical details indicate that he was more closely associated with D. Leonor’s artistic circle. They may have been connected through common acquaintances: if Mota knew the renowned humanist and translator of Graeco-Latin texts, João Roiz (Rodrigues) de Sá de Meneses (c. 1487–1579) — to whom he addresses one of his poems — personally, this may have put him in touch with one of Meneses’s close friends, the poet and ardent Erasmian Francisco Sá de Miranda (1487–1558), himself a close friend of Ribeiro’s.\(^{52}\) He thus may have at the very least been connected indirectly with Ribeiro, but one can only speculate about this.

Also, though it is believed that the Zohar circulated widely among Sephardic Jews and that it remained popular among converts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain and Portugal,\(^{53}\) it would seem far-fetched and unnecessary to argue that our Old Christian Mota engaged directly with this or other Hebrew texts. Though Mota’s depiction of the psychological anguish of a convert is

\(^{49}\) Nepomuceno, ‘Platonism and Judaism’, p. 128.


\(^{52}\) ‘D’Anrique da Mota a João Roiz de Sá para que falasse por ele ao Conde seu sogro e a Jorge de Vasconcelos seu cunhado sobre dinheiro que lhe não pagavam de vinhos que lhe vendeu para uma armada’ (Mateus, *Obras*, p. 31); Macedo, ‘Sixteenth-Century Portuguese Novel’, p. 54; ‘Strangers Within’, p. 128.

unmistakably akin to Ribeiro’s poetic works, it seems more likely that Mota would have been drawing upon the Maimonidean punishment for apostasy since, as shall be noted below, its most basic tenets circulated widely among converts and Christians through word of mouth. Nevertheless, it is interesting that one can employ a line of inquiry somewhat similar to that first used by Macedo and read Mota’s farce from the perspective of Jewish eschatological tradition.

We might thus return to the above-cited example of one of Manuel’s many references to his state of wandering (ll. 11–15), and interpret it in a Talmudic light as an allusion to spiritual exile — to his excommunication from the Jewish community — especially in his statement that he will die without a sepulchre.

Manuel makes direct reference to his being in God’s disfavour when he says ‘Jur’em Deu, que nam me guabe’ [By God, who does not applaud me]. The God he refers to here is that of his ancestors: here and elsewhere, he pronounces Deus [God] without the final –s as many Iberian Jews did in order to eliminate any insinuations of a plural meaning and thereby differentiate their God from the Trinity of the Christians. Only in his prayer to the Holy Spirit does he refer to God with a final –s: ‘de ty, Ssenhor, me he dito | que es hum Deos infinito’ [I have been told | that you are an infinite God].

The pathos of the text is centred, I would argue, on the remorse and alienation that a meshumad feels for having converted voluntarily, distinguishing him from those who resisted and were forcibly converted. According to the rabbinical responsa literature of Maimonides and his followers, conversions resulting from coercive measures such as those employed by D. Manuel did not qualify as forced since, in theory, the converts had the option to leave the country of persecution and retain their religion (though of course we know that, in fact, many were prohibited from leaving); forced conversions were those made upon imminent threat of death. Although some rabbinical authors did express more lenient views in which any duress, including financial or social, was sufficient to justify a forced conversion, the authors contemporary to the 1497 conversion were by no means so flexible.

In fact, in their commentaries concerning the 1497 mass conversions, authors such as Isaac Caro and Abraham Saba considered martyrdom the only course to be followed when the alternative was forced conversion, stating that ‘compulsion is also will’. According to Caro and Saba, there was no such thing as an anus of the 1497 nation-wide conversion. However, the traditional dichotomy does prevail in some writings concerning the converts of 1497, and

54 Vasconcellos, Farsa, l. 88.
55 Vasconcellos, Farsa, ll. 9 and 29; Teyssier, Langue, pp. 218–19; Salomon, ‘O que Tem de Judaico’, p. 208.
56 Vasconcellos, Farsa, ll. 143–44.
57 Netanyahu, Marranos, pp. 13–17.
58 Netanyahu, Marranos, pp. 157–74. I am grateful to Dr Nadezda Koryakina for directing me to this important body of literature.
those who converted under similar conditions of social and financial duress in Spain in 1412–15 were generally regarded as apostates.\textsuperscript{60} Manuel’s conversion is clearly presented as apostasy since it is done \textit{de grado} [willingly] (l. 49).\textsuperscript{61}

Our author may well have been familiar with the aforementioned rabbinical distinction between voluntary \textit{meshumadim} and forced \textit{anusim} since knowledge of it reached Christian circles throughout the Iberian Peninsula as well. For instance, an explanation of the traditional rabbinical dichotomy is found in a Christian polemic text: the anonymous, late fifteenth-century pamphlet \textit{El libro del alboraique}, which is directed against Judaizing converts. This pamphlet clearly states that \textit{meshumadim} (those who, like Manuel, turned Christian ‘de grado’) were shunned and thus ostracized by other Jews:

Desto tomaron entre sí un sobre nombre, en hebrayco hanuzym, que quiere dezir forzados, y si alguno se tornó christiano de grado, y guardava la ley christiana, llamábanle mesumad en hebrayco, que quiere dezir rebolvedor que los revuelve con los xrianos. Y si alguno deste linage llega algún lugar a donde hay questa generación, pregúntanle: ¿eres anus, e dest christiano, o mesumad, christiano por la voluntad? Y si responde, christiano soy, anus soy, danle dávidas y hónrranle, y si dice mesumad, no le hablan más.

[Those baptized by force] took on a nickname, \textit{anusim} in Hebrew, meaning ‘forced ones’, and if one became Christian voluntarily and observed Christian law, they called him \textit{meshummad} in Hebrew, which means ‘turncoat’ because he turns against them with the Christians. And if someone of [Jewish] descent arrives at a place where there are people of this generation, they ask him: ‘are you \textit{anus}, and in this way a Christian, or \textit{meshumad}, a Christian by choice?’ And if he responds, ‘I am Christian, I am \textit{anus},’ they give him offerings and honour him, and if he says \textit{meshumad}, they speak to him no further.\textsuperscript{62}

The text, which enjoyed wide, popular circulation, particularly in the sixteenth century, is believed by Pilar Bravo Lledó and Miguel Fernando Gómez Vozmediano to have been written in Llerena c. 1454–74 (before the Inquisition and approximately seventy years after the violence of 1391). The author, they argue, may have been a sincere convert from Judaism who sought to decry and distance himself from Judaizing converts.\textsuperscript{63} An earlier argument put forward

\textsuperscript{60} Netanyahu, \textit{Marranos}, pp. 95–134.
\textsuperscript{61} The reading of the farce that I present above is largely dependent on the interpretation of Manuel’s statement ‘Oxalá que fora batalha!’ (l. 89) as referring to his wish to have more honourably converted as a forced one (\textit{anus}) rather than voluntarily, reflecting the same \textit{anusim/meshumadim} dichotomy described in the \textit{Libro del alboraique}. An alternative reading, equally valid, is that Manuel’s conversion, done \textit{de grado}, is reflective of the argument presented by Caro and others that compulsion is will, without reference to an \textit{anusim/meshumadim} dichotomy. This would also place the composition of the farce after 1497, but it would seem more difficult to explain how our Old Christian author could have been familiar with the content of these more recent writings.

\textsuperscript{63} Pilar Bravo Lledó and Miguel Fernando Gómez Vozmediano, ‘El alborayque: un impreso
by Isidore Loeb offers, based on internal evidence, the more precise date of 1488, during the Inquisition. Loeb suggests that the author intended to deflect inquisitorial attention away from northern kingdoms and towards the sinful southerners. 64 Notably, the term *alboraique* (or *alboraico*) circulated elsewhere in fifteenth-century Spanish writings and in the popular tongue as a derogatory word for *conversos*. 65

Whether or not Mota had come into direct contact with these Spanish writings or the insult *alboraique*, the social and spiritual repercussions of apostasy would certainly have been a topical subject for discussion between Old and New Christian neighbours in Portugal. Inquisitorial records indicate that some forced converts had been quite vocal in expressing displeasure over their spiritual predicament. 66 Familiarity with the classical dichotomy of *anusim* and *meshumadim*, as expounded by Maimonides, could thus well have been transmitted by word of mouth. We know, moreover, from João de Alcobaça’s *Speculum hebraeorum* (1333) that, historically, Jewish teachings were spread orally, for instance in public squares, which were a popular arena for disputes between defenders of Christian and Jewish doctrine. 67 Later, measures aimed at enforcing the social integration of Old and New Christians were introduced by D. Manuel after 1497, and many public offices from which Jews had formerly been barred were now accessible to them. 68 While this may theoretically have increased the chances for Mota’s own interaction with New Christian peers, evidence of Jewish and New Christian medical doctors in D. Leonor’s court may offer a slightly more concrete channel of influence.

The queen is known to have kept certain Jewish and New Christian physicians in her employ, including Mestre João de Mazagão (also known as Mestre João da Paz). 69 Mota is moreover known to have socialized with at least one of D. Leonor’s doctors. His aforementioned work known as *The Lawsuit of panfletario contra los conversos fingidos de la Castilla tardomedieval*, *Historia, instituciones, documentos*, 26 (1999), 57–83.


66 For some examples of alleged complaints voiced by New Christian Maria Rodrigues, as reported by her neighbours and contained in ANTT, *Inquisição de Lisboa, Livro 1 de denúncias*, see Soyer, *Persecution*, pp. 288–89.


Vasco Abul contains a section allegedly composed by ajudadores [helpers], and nine out of these ten helpers have been identified by Ivo Carneiro de Sousa: all are officials and/or noblemen (and one lady-in-waiting) in D. Leonor’s court, including her physician, Mestre Gil. Though there is considerable disagreement as to whether these helpers composed their own pieces, simply read them out loud, or were part of the intended audience, Mota’s inclusion of Mestre Gil in this work suggests that he engaged with this physician and quite possibly others as well, some of whom would have been Jews or conversos.

By the date Mota’s farce was written, the Inquisition in Spain had already been investigating the faith of Jewish converts (including descendants of the 1391 forced conversions) for approximately two decades. Forced conversions had, moreover, recently been undertaken in Portugal by D. Leonor’s husband, João II, in his handling of the Castilian exiles of 1492: those who entered the kingdom seeking only temporary shelter were obliged to leave within a set time limit (eight months, according to Rui de Pina), but many migrants had been unable to leave, either because they were unable to board the ships within the prescribed time or because they were unable to afford the exorbitant prices that the captains demanded for passage. They were reduced to servitude and, in 1493, their children were taken from them, baptized, and sent to populate the new-found island of São Tomé. The ‘Jewish problem’ was once again a matter of current interest in D. Manuel’s reign, and had Mota engaged in conversation with his peers regarding the eschatological ramifications of apostasy he could be drawing on the Jewish perspective gained from these dialogues in his depiction of Manuel.

Meshumad, participle of the verb shamad, literally means ‘someone destroyed’ or ‘someone dead’, and it would thus appear that Mota presents his convert as a repentant meshumad from the very first line of the dialogue with ‘Woe, that I am destroyed!’

Oh, Adonai [the Hebrew word for God], what will I do!
Because I willed my sin [likely a reference to his conversion]
I have lost my cruzado
[...]
for at this hour I am dead! [again, a translation of meshumad]

---

71 For a summary of these arguments, see Villalva, Vasco Abul.
75 Vasconcellos, Farsa, ll. 1–10, cited above.
This farce is not really about a stingy Jew who overreacts to the loss of a single coin; it is an allegory of the loss of one’s religious identity: Manuel lost the gold coin that he saw himself reflected in. His image is, according to the Old Testament, the image of God, so, on an allegorical level, we might say that he is lamenting his Godless state as an outcast soul and trying to obtain justice for the fact that he was made to suffer this loss in the first place.

Of course, in addition to the above-described reading informed by Jewish doctrine, one must also consider the possibility of a reading informed by Christian tradition concerning apostasy. Such a reading might also view the convert’s statements that he is dead (ll. 1, 10) as reflective of the punishment for abjuring God described in Deuteronomy 13: the apostate is to be killed. As the famous fourteenth-century exegete Nicholas of Lyra explains in his moral reading of Deuteronomy, this death is at first symbolic, signifying the apostate’s banishment or exclusion from the Christian community, taking the form of excommunication, his eschatological death. (If he continues in perfidy, however, he will be subject to physical death.) This explanation is in accordance with Church law, which traditionally punished apostates with excommunication, and in this Christian vein we can also read Manuel’s multiple references to his state of exile. The statement that Manuel will die without a sepulchre (l. 15) may thus moreover also be interpreted in a Christian sense as a reference to the fact that apostates and other excommunicates were traditionally denied a Christian burial — a tradition attested as far back as Pope Leo the Great’s letter to Rusticus, Bishop of Gallia Narbonensis [we cannot be in communion with those, when dead, with whom when alive we were not in communion], and which is still seen in the old Roman Ritual VI. 2, De iis quibus neganda est ecclesiastica sepultura [On those to whom a Christian burial is denied]. The tradition is also mentioned in canon law texts such as Boniface VIII’s Liber sextus (Bonif. 5, 2, 2) on the desecration of the graves of those discovered to be heretics post-burial: ‘And that place shall always lack a sepulchre’. In all these early discussions, apostates fall under the category of heretics, and in this Liber

76 Sebastian Brant (ed.), Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria ... et cum postillis ac moralitatibus Nicolai de Lyra (Basel: Johann Froben and Johann Petri de Langendorff, 1498), fol. 346*: ‘Per istum prophetam falsum qui precipitur interfici significantur omnes diuinatores et doctores superstitiosi qui primo sunt occidendis spirituali gladio per excommunicationem. Et si permanserint obstinati dimittendi sunt iusticie seculari occidenti per mortem corporalem’.

77 Liber extra (Greg. 5, 7, 7–10; Greg. 5, 9); Concilium Lateranense IV (c. 3); see also Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologica (Sum. II-II, Q. 12, Art. 2).


sextus it is moreover specified that both must receive the same punishment. 80

In Roman law, the penalty was the loss of one’s civil rights (i.e., civil death). The text in Justinian’s Codex (C. 1, 7 (de apostatis), 3, 2) adds:

And they shall never return to their former condition, the flagitiousness of their morals shall never be obliterated by penitence, or covered up by any pretended and invented excuse or exculpation, since lies and pretenses cannot protect those who have polluted the faith which they had vowed to God, and who, having betrayed the divine mystery, have joined the profane. Help is extended to the fallen and to the erring, but the lost ones, those who have profaned the holy baptism, cannot be aided by any remedy of penitence, which helps other crimes. 81

This tradition, too, may be reflected in Manuel’s despair; the eschatological implications of abjuring one’s God would not escape a sensitive audience knowledgeable of Christian conventions concerning apostasy.

Mota was not necessarily schooled in the Romano-canonical legal tradition. Such training was not a prerequisite for the position of judge of orphans, and his works betray no indication of formal legal instruction — apart, of course, from the reference to the Italian jurist Bartolus of Sassoferrato (d. 1357) in a section of The Lawsuit of Vasco Abul that may, as some scholars have pointed out, have been written by Gil Vicente (c. 1465–1536/37) in this arguably composite poem. 82 Leonor’s was indeed one of the largest libraries in the kingdom, and, if Mota had access to it, he may have consulted Nicolas of Lyra’s reading of Deuteronomy since Sousa, in his attempt at constructing a list of her books, has located a 1496 edition of the Glossa Ordinaria (with Nicolas’s moral and literal readings) from her collection. 83 Though the volume located only covers the Old Testament books of Isaias to Maccabees, it is unlikely that the queen would have acquired an incomplete set. There may be no way of knowing whether her library also included books of canon and Roman law, but certainly the basic tenets of the canonical punishment for apostasy would have been common knowledge among Christians at this period.

80 Bonif. 5, 2, 13.
81 Annotated Justinian Code, trans. by Fred H. Blume, 2nd edn, rev. by Timothy Kearley (2008) <http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/books/> [accessed 3 February 2015]. Corpus juris civilis, vol. 2, Codex Justinianus, ed. by Paul Krüger, 11th edn (Berlin: Weidmann, 1954; repr. 1997), p. 60: ‘Sed nec umquam in statum pristinum revertentur, non flagitium morum obliterabitur paenitentia neque umbra aliqua exquisitae defensionis aut munimiris obducetur, quoniam quidem eos, qui fidem quam deo dicaverant polluturum et prodesse divinum mysterium in profana migraverunt, tueri ea quae sunt commenticia et concinnata non possunt. Lapsis etenim et errantibus subvenitur, perditis vero, hoc est sanctum baptismas profanantibus, nullo remedio paenitentiae, quae solet alius criminibus adesse, succurratur.’ The same occurs in the earlier Codex Theodosianus (16, 7 (de apostatis)). On the punishment for apostasy in Manueline Code, see OM V. 2, which states that those guilty of apostasy were tried in ecclesiastical courts but incorrigible perpetrators were handed over to the king’s jurisdiction so that the latter could carry out sentences that involved corporal punishment.
82 Mateus, Obras, p. 91 ll. 369–70; Villalva, Vasco Abul; M. Vieira Mendes, ‘Gil Vicente (no Cancioneiro Geral),’ in Dicionário de Literatura Medieval Galega e Portuguesa, ed. by Giulia Lanciani and Giuseppe Tavani (Lisbon: Caminho, 1993), pp. 296–97.
83 Sousa, Rainha D. Leonor, pp. 775, 889 and 897.
Thus, even from a Christian perspective, one can detect a commiserative angle to the depiction of the converso’s exile and wandering: the text still portrays an acute understanding of the spiritual implications suffered by a person induced into apostasy for reasons other than religious conviction. Whether Mota was drawing on popular rabbinical tradition or Catholic tradition or both, the sympathetic reading of Manuel’s spiritual predicament presented above remains a valid possibility. And despite the viability of the Christian eschatological reading, it is still very possible that Mota’s depiction of Manuel’s grief is also informed by popular knowledge of the Maimonidean dichotomy between forced and voluntary converts. As seen above, one would suspect this not only because he laments that his conversion was voluntary and not forced (ll. 3, 49, 88), but also because Jewish eschatological tradition would quite logically be invoked since it is the religion from which he has apostatized and since the Jewish God is the one in whose disfavour he claims to be (l. 80).

Apart from the aforementioned fleeting reference to the Wandering Jew, João Espera em Deus, Jewish- or converso-related themes do not reoccur in the few other works by Mota that have survived, so one cannot use his other writings to substantiate the above-argued reading informed by Jewish tradition. Similarly, extant sources concerning Mota’s biography do not provide any further indication that he opposed forced conversion or empathized with conversos.

One can, however, use his other dramatic dialogues to substantiate a sympathetic depiction of the converso’s psychological anguish. As Miller and others have shown, two of the other four pieces are known to contain social satire. His piece commonly known as O Pranto do Clérigo [The Priest’s Lament] has been described as an Erasmian critique of a corrupt clergyman that is done ‘in an extremely burlesque manner, using a tone which would not be offensive’. And the more serious piece known as The Mule’s Lament is considered by Crabbé Rocha, Miller, and Mateus to contain a critique of the actions of royal officials and clergymen during a famine plaguing Portugal — at a time when the Portuguese nation (represented by an emaciated mule) was starving, there was in fact no shortage of food and, according to their reading of the text, the clergy themselves continued to live in plenty. Mota was thus quite adept at using the comedic mode to communicate a serious political statement, and he is also known to have voiced in his works his disapproval of the actions of lay and ecclesiastical figures. It is therefore quite possible that the social satire contained in The Farce of the Tailor is actually directed against Manueline policy towards the Jews and not the Jews/conversos themselves. Manuel is the embodiment of this Manueline policy (hence, perhaps, Mota’s decision to give him the same name as the king), and, through him, Mota shows that even a

84 Miller, ‘Henrique’, p. 313; Obras, pp. 227–51. See also Mota’s poem in goliardic style discussed above at note 27.
85 Mateus, Obras, pp. 72 ll. 316–24, 75–76 ll. 434–42, and 15–17; Crabbé Rocha, Esboços Dramáticos, pp. 25–26; Miller, Obras, pp. 222–23.
Jew who willingly converts as a result of the king’s coercive tactics (i.e., even one who represents the best-case scenario, before the violence of the forced baptisms) will not necessarily be a wholehearted Christian.

It would appear that this closer, more compassionate reading did not escape Gil Vicente, the more famous dramatist under D. Leonor’s patronage. Vicente was a known defender of New Christians: by means of a letter addressed to João III decrying the monks of Saint Francis in Santarém, he interceded on the New Christians’ behalf to prevent a pogrom after the violent earthquake of 1531. (The monks had been propagating the idea that the calamity was a punishment from God, angered by the insincerity of new converts.) And as Luis Girón Negrón has noted, though Jews are typically demonized in Vicente’s religious plays, ‘the representation of Jews and conversos in Vicente’s nonreligious works is, nonetheless, singularly warm and sympathetic.’ It is suspected that a reference is made to Mota’s Farce of the Tailor in the incorrect sentence uttered by Vicente’s own judge in his farce O Juiz da Beira [The Judge of Beira], first performed in 1525. When confronted with a case involving a procurress and an escudeiro who seeks to recover his money from her, Vicente’s comically ignorant and illiterate judge decrees ‘Desde aqui sentenceio eu | a moeda por perdida | como alma de judeu’ [I hereby declare | that the coin is lost | like the soul of a Jew]. This judge’s final sentence is presented as faulty (it suggests that the procurress was legally entitled to her income, thereby denying the fact that procuring was a crime), as are the judge’s other sentences in this play. Vicente and Mota, both members of D. Leonor’s court, were in the same artistic circle, and we have already seen that Vicente’s involvement in The Lawsuit of Vasco Abul (whether as co-author, reciter, or audience member) suggests that they were in close contact. It is quite possible that they exchanged written work, and it is even more likely that this familiarity gave Vicente special insight into the intended message in Mota’s farce — which message he may have tried to spell out more clearly in his own Judge of Beira.

Conclusion

As Mota has shown, coerced conversion is a no-win situation. We see this in the tailor’s grief over his spiritual exile, we also see it in the Old Christian judge’s verdict: the loss Manuel has suffered through the abjuration of his faith is far greater than the tenuous position he has gained within the Christian community. Moreover, the pressure tactics used by D. Manuel to coerce Jews

90 Gil Vicente, Obras Completas, V, 300 ll. 16–18.
91 Braga, Obras, v, 273.
to convert may have removed Judaism on an official, superficial level, but they have not furthered Christianity since they have not produced wholehearted Christians. This is clear in the converso’s prayer to the Holy Spirit, which is an illustration of the caveat outlined in Gratian, D.45 c.5 and Gratian, C.23 q.4 c.17, which state that Jews are not to be led to the faith by force or attrition but by kind example so that their motive for baptism will be nothing other than divine inspiration. Manuel, as demonstrated in his prayer, is clearly not a true Christian follower:

Ó tu, Ssenhor Ssant’Esprito,  
posto que t’eu nam conheça,  
de ty, Ssenhor, me he dito  
que es hum Deos infinito,  
& m’o metem em cabeça;  
e dizem que m’ofereça  
a ty em mynha paixam (ll. 141–47)

[O you, Holy Spirit,  
although I don’t know you,  
I have been told  
that you are an infinite God,  
so they put it in my head;  
and they tell me to offer myself  
to you in my passion]

Most interestingly, the prayer includes the daring statement:

& posto que me nam creça  
deuacam quanta mereça,  
nam me ponhas culpa, nam’ (ll. 148–50)

[and although devotion does not grow within me,  
not as much as you deserve,  
don’t lay the blame on me, don’t.]

Whose fault is it then? Clearly, though in the guise of a comedic text deriding a convert, Mota’s Farce of the Tailor is a biting critique of D. Manuel’s actions towards the Jews of his realm in 1496 and following. It is a polemic against coerced conversion, and, upon close examination, it portrays a sympathetic description of the social and spiritual alienation suffered by a convert in Portuguese society at the turn of the sixteenth century. For this reason, and on account of its subtle and deft argumentation, it deserves a place in the larger corpus of polemic literature from the Iberian Peninsula in the early modern period.
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92 For discussion of how D. Manuel himself had ‘few illusions about the sincerity of the new converts’ and of how Old Portuguese society in general doubted the religious sincerity of the New Christians, see Soyer, Persecution, pp. 285–87.
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