

La pseudo-lusitanidad que le atribuyeron a nuestro poeta don Francisco Manuel de Melo y los escribanos inquisitoriales, refleja el carácter que le habían dado los gremios mercantiles madrileños, los mercaderes cristianos nuevos y los diplomáticos del Portugal restaurado. El caso de Enríquez Gómez nos recuerda perfectamente la virtud capital del historiador: la desconfianza. Su lusitanidad es un hecho establecido por múltiples testimonios auténticos e independientes, derivados de géneros y de lugares distintos, y finalmente, de su propio testimonio repetido. A pesar de todo, Enríquez Gómez no fue lusitano. Castellano navegando bajo el pabellón de las quinias, el poeta conquense queda como un Magellán al revés.

No hubiera tenido ningún éxito la mentira sin que el pseudo-portugués colaborase él mismo en ella. En medio de la guerra peninsular que opuso a España y Portugal entre 1640 y 1669, escribiendo para un público español, mas hallándose de emigrante en un país que apoyaba la Restauración, Antonio Enríquez Gómez tuvo buenas razones para hacerse pasar por español en España y por portugués en Portugal y Francia. Queriendo sugerir a españoles, portugueses y franceses ideas encontradas sobre su identidad, se expresó ya en documentos manuscritos, ya bajo anonimato, ya produciendo varias versiones del mismo texto o, en un caso, de la misma imagen.

Sin embargo, el interés político y económico no explica suficientemente su esfuerzo teatral por crear una doble identidad. Influyeron también en esta estrategia identitaria, como calidades inseparables, el ser converso, nieto de hereje quemado, mercader, reo, refugiado, judaizante, poeta y autor de comedias. No es extraño que Antonio Enríquez Gómez, volviendo a España en noviembre de 1649, haya abandonado simultáneamente el comercio, el criptojudaísmo y la pseudo-lusitanidad. La comedia, ésta sí, la siguió cultivando.

An example of collaboration between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions: The Trials of the *Converso* Diogo Ramos and his Family (1680-1683)

François Sayer

Universidade de Évora (Leverhulme Trust)

The nearly three centuries that extend from 1536 to 1820 witnessed the existence of two separate Inquisitions operating in the neighbouring kingdoms of Spain and Portugal. These two institutions, and the various tribunals that composed them, shared the same goal of expurgating Christian society of any activity deemed to be heretical. The study of the various tribunals of the Holy Office in these two realms has been increasingly gathering impetus during the last two decades, but one aspect of this history remains little examined: namely, the level of interaction and active cooperation between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. This article will present a case study as a means of exploring the manner in which these institutions collaborated in the repression of heresy. The case under consideration concerns the trials of Diogo Ramos – or Diego Ramos, as he is named in those parts of the trial dossier that are in Spanish – his wife Joana da Paz, as well as their two daughters, Beatriz da Paz and Maria da Paz. These four individuals were all prosecuted by the tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition of Lisbon for crypto-Judaism in 1682-3 and the complete trial dossiers (*processos*) recording the cases brought against each of them have been preserved in the National Portuguese Archives of the *Torre do Tombo* with the respective numbers 1237, 6304, 7674 and 11264.

The period in which Diogo Ramos and his family were brought to trail by the Portuguese Inquisition was one of great activity for

both the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal. In Portugal, the Holy Office had become the focus of considerable criticism, most notably from the pen of the redoubtable Jesuit António Vieira, and its very existence has been brought into question. The tribunal had been suspended by order of Pope Clement X in October 1674, only to be reinstated by his successor Innocent XI in August 1681. The institution that prosecuted Diogo Ramos and the women of his family was thus anxious to justify its existence. The official in charge of the register of correspondence sent by the tribunal of Lisbon made a note in the register in order to indicate those letters sent “after the Inquisition was reopened, having weathered the storm it has endured”.¹ This anxiety of the Portuguese Inquisitors translated into a sudden spike in its activity during 1683, 1683 and 1684, although its activity declined steeply thereafter until it rose again at the start of the eighteenth century.² Meanwhile, this period was one of great activity for the Spanish Inquisition which was in the midst of a campaign of sustained repression against *conversos* or “New Christians” of Portuguese origin – the descendants of those Jews forced to convert to Christianity by King Manuel I of Portugal in 1497 – who were widely suspected by the “Old Christian” population of practising Jewish rituals in private whilst pretending to be Christians in public. In this work, I shall not attempt to determine the veracity of the allegations of crypto-Judaism brought against Diogo Ramos and his family, or explore the other possibility, i.e. that they were genuine Christians who fell victim to racial prejudice. Such a discussion would not only be irrelevant to the aims of this work but would in all likelihood be largely a fruitless one, given the

¹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa*, livro n° 19, fol. 33v: “*Depois da Inquisição aberta, passada a tempistade que padeceo*”. Interestingly, the official made this comment whilst recording the correspondence sent by the tribunal of Lisbon in October 1679 and not in 1681.

² JOSÉ VEIGA TORRES, “Uma longa guerra social: os ritmos da repressão inquisitorial em Portugal”, *Revista de História Económica e Social*, 1 (Janeiro-Junho 1978), pp. 55-68. According to Torres, 122 persons were sentenced by the tribunal of Lisbon in 1682, 70 in 1683 and 58 in 1684.

nature of the sources. The purpose of this article is simply to reconstruct the manner in which the various tribunals of the Portuguese and Spanish Inquisitions combined forces to destroy a humble *converso* and persecute his family. The evidence for this reconstruction can be found both in the various trial dossiers mentioned above – and especially those of Diogo Ramos and Maria da Paz – and in the surviving register of correspondence sent by the Inquisition of Lisbon to its Spanish counterparts during this period.³ Although the trial dossiers examined here are all from the Lisbon Inquisition, they contain original copies of many documents that were sent by various Spanish Inquisitions at the request of the Portuguese.

The Sevillian Connection: the Trials of Francisco and António Gomes

The events that were to lead to the arrest and prosecution of Diogo Ramos and his family did not take place in Lisbon, or even in Portugal, but hundreds of kilometres away in the Andalusian metropolis of Seville. It was there that two men, Francisco Gomes, alias Francisco Rodriguez, and his brother António Gomes, were arrested by the tribunal of the Inquisition of Seville on charges of crypto Judaism in late 1681. According to their own declarations, Francisco Gomes had been arrested a fortnight previously and António Gomes had already been imprisoned for over three months. Both men declared themselves to be “*de nacion portuguesa*” and natives of the town of Almeida. Francisco Gomes stated that he was aged 20 and described his profession as that of “tobacco grinder” (*moledor de tabaco*), residing in the *barrio de la moreria* in Seville. For his part, António Gomes declared that he was aged 24 and that he did not “have any other trade but selling and buying things in the street” (*no tiene offiçio alguno mas que comprar y bender por la calle*). The

³ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa*, livro n° 19.

family was no stranger to inquisitorial prosecution as both their parents and another brother had already been arrested and reconciled by the Portuguese Inquisitions of Coimbra and Lisbon in 1669.⁴ António Gomes and his brother Francisco stated that they were married to two sisters named Sebastiana da Paz and Breatriz da Paz respectively who were the daughters of a certain Diogo Lopez and his wife Joana da Paz. In the confessions that Francisco and António Gomes made during a series of interrogations – *audiencias* – held between December 1681 and February 1682, the two brothers declared that they had performed “Jewish ceremonies” and implicated a large number of relatives. It was these confessions made in Seville that provided the starting point for the case against Diogo Ramos and his family. Certified copies in Spanish of the original transcripts of these interrogations are included at the very beginning of the trial dossier of Diogo Ramos.

In the course of his first interrogation, Francisco Gomes confessed that he had been instructed “in the law of Moses” by his mother at the age of five or six. She had warned him not to consume pork lard (*toçino*) and to observe Jewish fasts. He claimed to have fasted in the manner taught to him by his mother but acknowledged that he had eaten *toçino* “whenever he had the opportunity to do so, even though he knew it was contrary to the Law of Moses”.⁵

⁴ “Dijo que es verdad que tiene por hermano a fernando Gomes el qual sera de hasta treinta años y salio en auto general con sanbenito en compañía de sus padres en Lisboa donde los embio la Inquisicion de Coimbra que los prendio y fueron a cumplir su penitencia los tres a el lugar de bascofeira (Baixa Beira?) donde fueron presos...” This information was revealed by António Gomes. A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 10v. It is confirmed by the extant trial dossiers of António Gomes, his wife Maria Henriques and Fernão Gomes, who was aged only 12 at the time of his reconciliation. See A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Coimbra, processo n° 3816* (Fernão Gomes) and *Inquisição de Lisboa, processos n° 398* (António Gomes) and 11343 (Maria Henriques). All three were reconciled by the tribunal of Coimbra in 1669.

⁵ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 1v: “Dijo que su madre se aconsejo que no Comiese toçino por ceremonia judaica y que arra de ayunar estandoçe veinte y quatro oras sin comer ni beber desde que le pone el sol hasta que la pone el dia siguiente empeçando y acabando dicho ayuno en dos çenas de pescado y nada de carne y este los a ejecutado en la misma forma en las ocasiones y lugares que a podido y enquanto a el comer toçino no a Hecho rreparo aunque sabia era contrrario a la de moisés y lo ha comido siempre que a tenido ocasión.”

His older brother gave broadly the same testimony. At first António Gomes denied being married but rapidly admitted to having lied in order not “to cause problems to, or provide testimony against, his wife Sebastiana da Paz”.⁶ During their respective interrogations, both brothers confessed to having fasted and performed other “Jewish ceremonies” with relatives and friends in the town of Almeida in Portugal as well as those of Salamanca, Ciudad Rodrigo and Madrid in Spain. It was whilst they were in Madrid that the group first came to the attention of the Inquisition. According to their own declarations, Francisco and António Gomes were both part of a group of judaizers that regularly gathered in the house of a certain Gregório Mendes and his wife. This house was located in the street of San Isidro in Madrid. This situation came to an abrupt end, however, when their brother-in-law Bernardo da Paz was arrested by the tribunal of Madrid in 1680, and the brothers and other members of the group were compelled hurriedly to abandon the Spanish capital.

At the end of their confessions, both men denounced a group of crypto-judaizers residing in Lisbon which consisted of their in-laws: Diogo Lopez, his wife Joana da Paz and five of their children: Beatriz da Paz, Catalina da Paz, Sebastiana da Paz, Josefa da Paz and Andrés da Paz. The brothers also informed the inquisitors that Diogo Lopez and his family were living in the *Pedras Negras* district of Lisbon, which was situated on the south-western slopes of the Castle of São Jorge. Francisco Gomes stated that he had received word that his wife’s eldest brother, João da Paz, had been arrested by the “Inquisition of Salamanca” (in fact there was no tribunal based at Salamanca).⁷ In relation to Diogo Lopez, Francisco declared

⁶ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 9v: “Preguntado que causa o motivo a tenido para aver dicho con juramento que no era casado y para decir ao que lo es perjurandose notoriamente (...) Dijo que por no haçer molestia ni culpar a la dicha su muger sebastiana da Paz nego el ser casado y agora quiere decir la verdad.”

⁷ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 3r: “Y con el dicho Juan de paz su cuñado se declaro por judio en la forma que a declarado en salamanca y asistio tambien a el ayuno que este a declarado hiço en Madrid y a oydo decir que lo prendio la inquisicion despues en Salamanca...”

that he was “travelling around the area of Lisbon, plying his trade as a cobbler repairing old shoes (*zapatero de viejo*), he is no more than sixty years old, with a healthy body, an aged face, short white hair and with moles on his face”.⁸ The testimony of the Gomes brothers was sufficient for the Sevillian inquisitors António Ponce de León and Diego de Carvajal y Escavias to issue a warrant for the arrest of Diogo Lopez and all the other suspects resident in Lisbon on 2 March 1682.⁹

The Arrest of Diogo Ramos and his Family in Lisbon

The information provided by Francisco and António Gomes was relayed to the tribunal of the Holy Office in Lisbon by their colleagues in Seville and the Lisboan inquisitors decided to move against Diogo Ramos and his family. Diogo Ramos (alias Lopez), Joana da Paz and their daughters Maria da Paz, and Beatriz da Paz, who was nineteen, were all arrested and incarcerated in the last week of April 1682.¹⁰ The arrest warrant for Diogo Ramos was issued by the Lisboan inquisitors on 22 April 1682 and he was detained and brought to the seat and prison of the Inquisition in the Portuguese capital – the Estaus palace – four days later. His wife had already been arrested and imprisoned on the 25 April whilst his daughters Beatriz and Maria were imprisoned on 26 and 28 April respectively. Unfortunately, no information is provided relating to the conditions in which the arrests were carried out, but it would

⁸ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fol. 4v: “...[Diogo Ramos] estava declarado por juízo con el suegro de este el qual se fue tambien buyendo desde madalo quando prendieron a bernardo de paz no sabe donde estara aora : que luego dijo que anda al rrededor de Lisboa trabajando en su officio de capatero de viejo y es de edad de hasta sesenta años buen cuerpo grueso mui añejo de cara pelo corto y cano y unos lunares en el Rosttro y de naçion portugues...”.

⁹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fol. 11v.

¹⁰ This much can be gathered from the fact that the Inquisition of Lisbon wrote a letter to that of Seville on 14 September 1682 “*em que se lhe lembrara as culpas contra Diogo Ramos e seus filbos presos nesta Inquisição por auço da aquella*”. A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, livro* n° 19, fol. 51v.

appear that the other members of the family listed by Francisco and António Gomes as residing in Lisbon – Catalina da Paz, Sebastiana da Paz and Josefa da Paz – either escaped or were not in the town at the time of the arrests. In any event, their names do not appear in the catalogues of *processos* conducted by the Portuguese Inquisition. The trial dossier of Beatriz da Paz reveals that she was pregnant at the time of her arrest and gave birth sometime between 22 April and the date of her first interrogation by the inquisitors, when she declared that “she had a son who was born in this prison”.¹¹ Furthermore, her sister Maria da Paz was the mother of two young girls: one named Anna who was five years old and Catarina who was only two and a half years old. The trial dossier offers little evidence concerning the fate of these infants.

Diogo Ramos was a relatively old man at the time of his arrest and imprisonment. In his first audience with the inquisitor Pedro de Attaide de Castro, he declared his age to be sixty-four and that he had been born in the Spanish town of Benavente, located near Zamora in Castile.¹² The structure of his family can be reconstructed from the declarations made by his daughter Maria da Paz during her own trial, which are particularly detailed. To these declarations may also be added the information contained in the testimony of Francisco Gomes (referred to above), that provided not only ages but also succinct physical descriptions. From these two complementary sources, it appears that Diogo Ramos and Joana da Paz had no fewer than eight children:

1. João da Paz, a bachelor and a merchant, aged around thirty-four. His physique was described as “*mediano y grueso, [de] color trigueño*”.
2. Bernardo da Paz, married to a “New Christian” woman named Francisca (whose surname nobody knew according to

¹¹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 11264, fols. 34r-36v “...*be casada com Francisco Gomes tratante de quem teve hum filbo que nestes carçeres lhe naço.*”

¹² A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fols 1-1v.

Maria da Paz) and the father of a son named Gabriel aged one. Bernardo was around 30 years old. His brother in law described him as being “*de buenas carnes, blanco y tiene unos lunares en el rostro*”.

3. Sebastiana da Paz, married to António Gomes. She was aged around thirty and described as being “*alta, blanca y gruesa*”.
4. Andrés da Paz, a bachelor and student of medicine at the University of Coimbra. Andrés was aged around twenty-two. He was described as “*cojo de [unreadable], buen cuerpo, delgado, blanco descolorido*”.
5. Anna da Paz, married to João Mendes, a cobbler, by whom she has five sons whose names Maria da Paz claimed not to know.
6. Maria da Paz, who had two daughters by her deceased husband Pedro Henriques, Anna aged five and Catarina aged two and a half.
7. Josefa da Paz. She was between nineteen and twenty years old. She was described as “*pequeña de cuerpo y gruesa, morena*”.¹³
8. Beatriz da Paz was married to Francisco Gomes and between eighteen and nineteen years old. She was described as “*pequeña de cuerpo, gruesa [y] morena de cara*.”

This detailed description of the family of Diogo Ramos appears to be the most accurate, notwithstanding the contradictory declarations made by other members of her family. Diogo Ramos himself declared that he had six children – two sons named Bernardo and João as well as four daughters named Sebastiana, Maria, Beatriz and Josefa – whilst her sister Beatriz only informed the inquisitors of her three male siblings: João da Paz, Bernardo Ramos and Andrés da Paz.¹⁴

Diogo Ramos described himself as a cobbler (*zapatero*) by trade,

¹³ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 6304. This trial dossier has no foliation.

¹⁴ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n°s 1237, fols. 3r-4r and 11264, fols. 34r-36v.

though this may not have been his only profession as his daughter Beatriz described him as a tanner (*curtidor*).¹⁵ When, in accordance with the strict procedure of the Holy Office, the inquisitors asked Diogo Ramos if he owned any “real estate, chattels, gold, silver, money or had any outstanding debts owed to him”, he simply answered that “he did not own any real estate or disposable property with the exception of some clothes that he wore”.¹⁶ His wife and daughters gave the same reply and Beatriz even stated that she was entirely dependent upon the earnings of her absent husband Francisco Gomes to sustain herself.¹⁷ Another clear indication of the humble social status of Diogo Ramos and his family is that none of them knew how to write or read. When Diogo Ramos was asked to confirm the declarations he had made in the first audience by means of his signature, he drew a simple cross, under which another hand – doubtless that of an inquisitor or the notary – added “*De Diogo Ramos*”. Although some prisoners attempted to hide their ability to read and write from the Inquisitors in order to pass themselves off as feeble-minded in the hope of more lenient treatment, there is no reason to believe that Diogo Ramos did so.¹⁸ According to their own declarations, neither his wife nor his daughters Maria and Beatriz knew how to read or write. When these facts are considered, it appears all the more surprising that one of his children, Andrés da Paz, was nevertheless a student of medicine at the University of Coimbra.¹⁹

¹⁵ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 11264, fols. 34r-36v.

¹⁶ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fols. 1r-1v: “*Disse que não tinha bens alguns de raiz, nem moneis, mais algum fato muy limitado de seu uzo e mas não dizê.*”

¹⁷ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 11264, fol. 25v: “*Disse que não tem mais que [aquellas?] que sam suas mais ganhaça do sen marido pera se sustentarem e mais não disse.*”

¹⁸ Such an attempt was made by a resident of Madrid named Lucrecia of León, whose prophetic dreams led to her arrest by the Inquisition of Toledo in 1590. The story of her dreams and arrest is brilliantly reconstructed by R. L. Kagan in *Lucrecia's Dreams: Politics and Prophecy in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Berkeley, 1990).

¹⁹ According to a nineteenth-century inventory of the trials of the Inquisition of Coimbra, edited by Luiz de Bivar Guerra, it appears that Andrés da Paz was indeed a stu-

When the inquisitor D. Pedro de Attaide de Castro inquired about his ancestry, Diogo Ramos freely admitted that he was of New Christian ancestry “on both sides” (*por ambas vias*). His parents, both of whom were deceased, were named António Ramos and Ana Hernandes, the former was a native of Vimioso in northern Portugal whilst the later was a native of Benavente in Spain.²⁰ Moreover, he did not attempt to hide his previous conviction for crypto-Judaism by the Inquisition in Spain. In the transcript of the trial, the secretary noted that when the inquisitor asked him if he had already been arrested by the Holy Office, Diego Ramos straightforwardly replied that he had previously been arrested and convicted of the crime of crypto-Judaism by the Inquisition of Valladolid in 1666 and had been a prisoner in its *carceles secretos* for “close to a year” (*perto de hum anno*). He had been reconciled in a public *auto-de-fé*, celebrated in the main square of Valladolid, in which he had been sentenced as a repentant believer of the “Law of Moses” and had abjured his heretical errors. The readiness with which Diego Ramos admitted to his prior conviction, which exposed him to the serious accusation of being a relapsed heretic, is startling. Perhaps it is evidence that he was aware of the close ties of collaboration that existed between the Spanish and Portuguese inquisitions. Inquisitions on both sides of the Luso-Castilian border regularly exchanged lists of prisoners; hence any attempt to hide his past was doomed to failure and might even prejudice his case.²¹ This document nevertheless also raises the question of whether or

dent at Coimbra and was himself prosecuted by that tribunal in 1683. I have not been able to find his trial dossier at the *Torre do Tombo* and it thus seems that it may no longer be extant. Andrés da Paz was described as the son of Diogo Alexandre, a native of Moraleja (near Zamora) in Castile. See L. de Bivar Guerra, *Inventário dos Processos da Inquisição de Coimbra*, 1541-1820 (Paris 1972), Vol. 1, p. 279.

²⁰ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa*, processo n° 1237, fols. 2v-3v.

²¹ For an example of the intense collaboration between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions see A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Évora*, livro 55, in which is preserved the correspondence received by the tribunal of Évora from various Spanish tribunal between 1697 and 1718.

not Diogo Ramos had hidden his past from his own family. His wife Joana declared in her own trial that she had never been prosecuted by the Inquisition and neither had any member of her family.²² It seems more likely, however, that Joana was lying in order to protect her husband. Her statement simply cannot be reconciled with the facts. When the ages of her children are examined it rapidly becomes apparent that she had been married to Diogo Ramos well before his first trial and reconciliation by the tribunal of Valladolid in 1666-7. It would therefore have been impossible for her not to have been aware of the first occasion on which her husband was arrested and put on trial by the Holy Office.

Enter the Inquisitions of Valladolid and Toledo

To verify the truthfulness of the declarations made by Diogo Ramos, the Lisboan Inquisitors were compelled to seek the help of their Spanish colleagues, in this case, of the tribunal of Valladolid. The Inquisition of Lisbon thus sent a letter to that of Valladolid on 19 October 1682 in which they requested them to send a copy of the original sentence handed down to Diogo Ramos by that tribunal as well as a certified copy of the official act in which he had abjured his heretical errors.²³ Don Melchior de Rojas Velazquez, the *secretario del secreto* of the Valladolid tribunal, sent a reply, dated 16 November 1682, in which he informed them that, after a search of the archives under his responsibility, he had located the trial dossier dating from June 1667 of a certain Diogo Ramos, aged forty-four, who had declared himself to be a native of the village of *Mosaseja*, which is described in this document as situated at a distance of one league from the town of Zamora. According to Don Melchior de Rojas Velazquez, this Diogo Ramos had confessed during his first audience with the inquisitors to having committed *delictos de Judaismo*

²² A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa*, processo n° 7674, no foliation.

²³ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa*, livro n° 19, fol. 54v.

and denounced his accomplices. The repentant heretic had been made to abjure his errors *de vehementi* and was reconciled in an *auto-de-fe* held on Sunday 30 October 1667.²⁴ This document confirmed Diogo Ramos's declarations in Lisbon but also raises some questions concerning Diogo Ramos's real age. The letter by Valladolid states that Diogo Ramos was aged forty-four in 1667 but the defendant declared himself to be sixty-four years old in 1682. This discrepancy of five years nevertheless does not appear to have interested the inquisitors, who simply side-stepped the issue.²⁵

The inquisitorial prosecutor's case against Diogo Ramos, already a strong one with the denunciations of Francisco and António Gomes, was further strengthened when no fewer than ten prison guards and familiars came forward to denounce him for having performed Jewish fasts whilst in his cell.²⁶ To verify these denunciations, the inquisitors held a special interrogation on 23 October 1682 during which Diogo Ramos was closely questioned about the food he had been given in his cell. The prisoner apparently did not suspect that he had been accused of fasting in his cell as his declarations only provided further damning evidence against him in the eyes of his accusers: he answered that he had no complaints about the food which he received, thus removing any grounds which he could reasonably give for failing to eat it. Asked whether the guards were treating him well, or if he had any particular grievances, he

²⁴ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fol. 16r. I have not been able to find any trace of a village near Zamora named Mosaseja. Diogo Ramos later identified himself as a native of Benavente, north of Zamora. Possibly Mosaseja was a corruption of Moraleja. The modern village of Moraleja del Vino lies just south-east of Zamora. Andrés da Paz apparently claimed the Diogo Ramos was from Moraleja. See footnote 19.

²⁵ The age given in the document from Valladolid would, however, seem to support Bernardo da Paz's statement to the Inquisition of Seville, that Diogo Ramos was aged “*hasta sesenta años*”. Possibly Diogo Ramos did not know his own exact age.

²⁶ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fols. 41r-75r. The prison guards and familiars who testified against Diogo Ramos were Manuel Fernandes, Manuel Moreira, Manuel da Costa, Agostinho da Costa, João da Costa, António Gonçalves, António Carvalho, João Maçiel, Domingos Maçiel and Domingos Ferreira Soreto.

replied that he had no complaints to make against them. To his interrogator's questions about the food he received in his cell, he confirmed that he had “received meat on the day when meat is served, fish on the day when fish is served (Friday), as well as bread and (...) they provide him with seasonal fruit, which at the moment are pears and apples, and anything else that he asks for...”. When his interrogators inquired about the quality of his food, he replied that “the ordinary portions of meat and fish are always well cooked”. At the end of the interrogation, Ramos further stated that he took “his lunch between ten and eleven and supper at eight” and claimed that he did not require any more food as the portions were acceptable.²⁷ In the inquisitors' eyes, this meant that his refusal to eat his food could only be interpreted as a deliberate fast.

Since Diogo Ramos steadfastly continued to deny having any heretical errors (*culpas*) to confess during the three statutory “admonitions” put to him in his first three interrogations by the Inquisition, he was thereby deemed to be an unrepentant heretic, or *negativo*. He had accepted the appointment by the tribunal of a defence attorney named Francisco Soares Nogueira to assist him in preparing his defence on 26 October 1682 and now his trial moved on to its next stage. The prosecutor – the *promoter fiscal* – officially accused the defendant of being guilty of a number of separate heretical acts and demanded the severest penalty that was due to unrepentant heretics and apostates: “relaxation to the secular arm”. On 21 January 1683, the charges brought against Diogo Ramos were read in his presence and a copy of these accusations was handed over to the defendant and his attorney, who saw them for the first time. Even so, the charges were couched in such a manner as to render them of little use to the defence. Any reference to a place and/or time that might identify the source of the information had been carefully pruned by the inquisitors. By way of illustration, one of the accusations put forward by the prosecutor concerning one of the

²⁷ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo* n° 1237, fols. 7r-8v.

Jewish fasts allegedly carried out between 1667 and 1682 was described in the following manner:

“[The prosecution maintains that] the accused found himself in a certain place after his reconciliation [by the Inquisition of Valladolid] and in the company of certain persons of his “nation” (*nação*). There the accused and the aforesaid persons declared themselves to be believers and followers of the Law of Moses [in order to] save their souls. In the observance of the aforesaid Law [of Moses] they observed a Jewish fast, remaining without eating or drinking during the day until the appearance of the stars at night.”²⁸

Presented with such vague charges, the Diogo Ramos and his attorney faced an almost impossible task of discrediting the sources of the evidence brought against him.

Three days later, on 23 January 1683, Diogo Ramos and his attorney presented the tribunal with a list of witnesses residing in Portugal and Spain, whom the defendant claimed could vouch for his character as an honest and genuine Christian.²⁹ When they were interrogated by the Inquisition about the Church attendance of the prisoner, these witnesses provided testimony that was of only limited value to the defence. Francisco Lopez Laguna, a merchant residing in Lisbon declared that he believed Diogo Ramos to be a good Christian although “he never saw him hear a mass or a sermon”. The other witnesses dwelling in Lisbon provided more positive, though still guarded, answers to the same questions. António Rodrigues Estrada, a merchant who was a native of Bragança in northern Portugal, stated that he had met Diogo Ramos “nine or ten years ago” and that to his knowledge the accused was a good Christian whom he had seen attend masses and hear sermons when they

²⁸ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fols. 17-r-19r: “*Que lbe Reo se achou em certo lugar depois de sua reconciliação, e abjuração a esta parte, e em companhia de pessoas de sua nação onde se declarou e derão [?] o Reo e as ditas pessoas, como crião(?) e uiuão na ley de Moyses para salução de suas almas e por observança de dita ley; fizeram hum jejum judaico estando o dia sem comer, nem beber seño a noite depois de saída a estrela.*”

²⁹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fols 16r and 39r-41v.

were both residents of Bragança. Furthermore, a lawyer named Francisco Cardoso Pereira and his wife Angela de Medina, who were residents in the district of Pedras Negras and claimed to have known Diogo Ramos for two years, both vouched that they had seen him attend mass and hear sermons in the Igreja da Misericórdia.

The Spanish witnesses that Diogo Ramos listed amongst his defence witnesses lived in a hamlet named Papatrigo, which the inquisitorial documents stated was situated near Cordovilla (itself a village situated circa 25 kilometres west of Salamanca), and was thus located within jurisdiction of the Inquisition of Valladolid.³⁰ The fact that many of the charges brought against Diogo Ramos concerned heretical acts committed in the neighbouring kingdom, in the years after his reconciliation in 1667, meant it was vital to receive the testimony of these witnesses. As such, the inquisitors were once more compelled to seek the assistance of their Spanish colleagues. Lisbon accordingly wrote to the Holy Office in Valladolid on the first of February 1683, sending them a copy of the names of the witnesses submitted by the defence and including a detailed list of three questions which were to be put to these witnesses.³¹

The tribunal at Valladolid handed the task of travelling to Cordobilla to question the witnesses cited by Diogo Ramos over to two of its agents: Manuel de Temulos, the *comissario* of the Holy Office in Tordesillas, and another familiar named Marcos Gomes Flores. The testimony recorded by these two men did little to aid Diogo Ramos’s defence and in fact even rebounded against him. Interviewed on 9 April 1683, the curate of Cordobilla declared that he did not remember anyone named Diogo Ramos. The following day, Manuel de Temulos questioned Alonso Saez, a labourer aged thirty-one, who also declared never having heard of a Diogo Ramos

³⁰ The village of Papatrigo is actually situated closer to Avila than to Cordovilla or Salamanca.

³¹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, livro n° 19*, Fols. 64r-64v; A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, Fol. 56r.

residing in that place but who conceded that four years ago, “more or less”, he had known a man and his sons in Cordobilla, all of them Portuguese, who were cobblers. This “Portuguese” family had lived in Cordobilla for four months but had suddenly disappeared one night and Alonso Saez affirmed that he did not know where they had gone. Worse still for Diogo Ramos, the commissary had not been able to find any trace of a third witness named Juan Suarez living, or having lived, in Cordobilla. The Inquisition of Valladolid sent the results of their investigations back to Lisbon on 12 June 1683.

Similar enquiries were made by the Inquisitions of Toledo and Valladolid when, in February 1683, Ramos’s daughter Maria da Paz also presented the names of defence witnesses residing in Spain. In this case, Lisbon sent missives to the tribunal at Toledo on 23 February with a detailed list of questions to be put to defence witnesses residing in the locality of Los Yébenes, located south of the town. In response to this letter, the tribunal of Toledo dispatched one of its agents, its commissary Juan Nieto Marin, to Los Yébenes. Maria da Paz had resided in Los Yébenes with her now deceased husband Pedro Enriquez Flores, the father of her two daughters, in the late 1670s. Most of the witnesses interrogated in Los Yébenes appear to have become reticent once they learnt that Maria da Paz was a prisoner of the Inquisition in Lisbon. The majority of them claimed only to be acquainted with her “*de trato y comunicacion*” and volunteered little further information. The testimony that they did provide to their interrogators served only to further incriminate Maria da Paz. Many claimed that following the sudden arrival of officials of the Holy Office in the village, and their arrest of a certain Diego de Zamora, Maria da Paz had contrived to warn her absent husband not to return. She had then disappeared herself and no one in Los Yébenes had known where she had gone.³² At rou-

³² A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 6304* (no foliation): “Dice que abra ocho años poco mas o menos que Pedro Enriquez flores caso de segundo matrimonio con la dicha maria de la Paz en

ghly the same time, the tribunal of Valladolid ordered one of its familiars to visit Salamanca to interview Maria’s defence witness there. The commissary, Matheo de Figueroa, was forced to report back to his superiors in Valladolid that he had not been successful despite thorough enquiries:

“I received the list of defence witnesses that Maria da Paz presented to the Holy Office of the Inquisition in Lisbon and I have not been able to find a single one, except for Beatriz de Almanza, the daughter of Mathias Mendes, a producer of worsted cloth and a resident of [Salamanca] (...). People have informed me of a man named António de Almanza but they do not know if he is the one [named by Maria da Paz]. He left the city many years ago and they do not know if he is dead or alive.”³³

Even the Beatriz de Almanza that Figueroa was able to find claimed not to know any woman named Maria da Paz who was the widow of Pedro Henriquez.

The participation of the Valladolid tribunal in the trial of Diogo Ramos did not, however, limit itself to the investigations carried out by its agents in Cordobilla. In the cover letter they sent to Lisbon on 12 June 1683, the Vallisoletan tribunal informed Lisbon

madrid desde adonde viniera a vivir a esta villa de Yebenes donde estubieron de asiento asta el año de mil y seiscientos y ochenta el ultimo dia del mes de março que aniendo preso el presente notario del Santo Ofiçio a diego de Zamora (reconciliado por dicho Santo Ofiçio en la casa de dicho Pedro enriquez y maria de la paz su mujer ballandose ausente dicho pedro mando a francisca hija de dicho Pedro Henriquez de primer matrimonio salieze al camino y que se dijese a su padree lo que pasana para que se ausentase lo qual susedio pues desde aquel dia no a parecido dicho pedro Enriquez ni a podido ser auido aunque por los ministros del Santo Ofiçio se an echo diligencias de prender le y se le an embargado sus bienes y despues pasados quinze dias poco mas dicha maria de la paz hizo [au?] y se fue a m[adri]d adonde oyo este testigo estaba despues de dicha ausencia (todo lo qual saue este testigo por auerlo oido dezir y auerlo [visto?] ser y pasar asi), etc...”. Some witnesses state that Pedro Enriquez Flores was in nearby Orgaz at the time of the arrest of Diego de Zamora.

³³ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 6304* (no foliation): “Recibi el ynterrogatorio de defenza que presento Maria de Paz en el Santo Ofiçio de la Inquisicion de Lisboa y pasando a examinar los testigos que en el tienen citados no he podido encontrar con ninguno, solo con Beatriz de Almanza hija de Mathias Mendes frabricante de estameñas, v° desta ciudad y se lo me dan notiçia de Anontio, de Almanza que conocieron deste nombre que no sauen sea el contenido y que este a muchos años salio desta ciudad que no saben donde fue ni tienen notiçia si es vibo o muerto...”.

that they were also including the summaries of depositions made by Elena de Robles Elena Gonzalez, Bernardo da Paz and João da Paz. These summaries provided further evidence of judaizing by Diogo Ramos.³⁴ Whether the Inquisition of Valladolid was acting on its own initiative, or sent this evidence at the request of Lisbon, is unclear from the documents preserved in the trial dossier. There is no indication that Lisbon specifically asked for these summaries and it is perhaps more probable that Valladolid conducted a search of their registers when they received the news that Diogo Ramos has been arrested in Lisbon. The surviving correspondence exchanged between various tribunals of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions suggests in fact that such searches were a fairly routine procedure. The new evidence sent by Valladolid consisted of summaries from the trial dossiers of Elena Gonzalez, Bernardo da Paz and Elena de Robles, who had all been prosecuted by the Inquisition de la Corte in 1680.³⁵ The tribunal of Valladolid possessed copies of their depositions as they had been used during its own trial of Diogo Ramos's eldest son João da Paz by the tribunal of Valladolid in 1681. We thus learn that the rumours Francisco Gomes had heard concerning the arrest of his brother-in-law had been correct, although he had confused Salamanca with Valladolid.

³⁴ The original letter from Valladolid to Lisbon is included in A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 56r: "...y en su cumplimiento executado lo que Vuestra Señoría ordena lo remetimos con esta de 36 fojas y asimismo han en ellas incluidas las testificaciones que se an ballado con este Santo Oficio contra el dicho Diego Ramos que son las de Elena Gonçalez, Bernardo de Paz, Elena de Robles, Juan Antonio de Paz. Los que los no han rratificados em plenario por no auer podido ser auidos como Vuestra Señoría reconocera por los autos y en todo lo demas que se ofreriere del servicio de VS acudiremos con mny buena voluntad. Guarde Dios a Vuestra Señoría de Valladolid Junio doçe de 1683."

³⁵ JUAN BLÁSQUEZ MIGUEL, "Catálogo de procesos inquisitoriales del Tribunal de Corte", *Revista de la Inquisición*, 3 (1994), pp. 211 and 214-5. I have not been able to find any trace Elena Gonzalez sentenced for crypto-Judaism by the Inquisition de la Corte in 1680. Nevertheless, a woman named Elena Gonzalez was sentenced for crypto-Judaism in 1689. See Also J. del Olmo, *Relacio 'n histo'rica del auto ge'ne'ral de fe': que se celebrou' en Madrid este an~o de 1680 con asistencia del rey N.S. Carlos II. y de las magestades de la reina N.S. y la augustissima reina madre*, (Madrid, 1680).

The summary of the trial of Elena Gonzalez, who was nineteen years old at the time of her arrest, does not shed any light on the nature of her relationship with Diogo Ramos or his family. A native of Zamora, who declared herself to be unemployed at the time of her interrogation on 12 July 1680, Elena Gonzalez testified that she had first arrived in Madrid "in the year in which the Plaza Mayor burnt down", a clear reference to the conflagration that ravaged the Spanish capital's Plaza Mayor in August 1672.³⁶ She confessed that whilst in Madrid she lived in the house of Gregório Mendes and his wife Josefa Ramos. Elena told the inquisitor António Zambrana de Bolaños that in that house "and in others" she had taken part in clandestine gatherings (*juntas*) in which Diogo Ramos, his wife and children, along with the other participants, performed Jewish fasts and had "declared themselves to be Jews". Interestingly, Elena Gonzalez also claimed that members of the group read from a book during these gatherings. This statement would appear to be at odds with the claims of Diogo Ramos and his family that they could neither read nor write, although the names of those individuals who did the reading were not specified in the summary of her deposition.³⁷

Elena de Robles identified herself as a native of Mogadouro in northern Portugal and a resident of Madrid. She declared herself to be forty-five years old "more or less" and not to have any trade

³⁶ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fols. 20r-20v: "Y auindo venido a esta corte que fue el año que se quemo la plaça y habiendo venido tambien abibir a esta los dichos Gregorio Mendez y Jusefa Ramos su muger y los dichos Diogo Ramos Juana da Paz su muger Bernardo Juan Sebastiana y Maria sus hijos y Beatriz y Josefa, tambien sus hijos se Juntaran muchas vezes en cassa del dicho Gregorio Mendez..."

³⁷ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 20v: "...los dichos Gregorio Mendez y Josefa Ramos su muger y los dichos Diogo Ramos Juana da Paz su muger Bernardo Juan Sebastiana y Maria sus hijos y Beatriz y Josefa, tambien sus hijos se Juntaran muchas vezes en cassa del dicho Gregorio Mendez Vibiendo Junto a San Lorenzo y en diferentes cassas [...] se mudo y estando Juntos leyan por el dicho libro en las conformidad que la deja declarado y no baçian otras [...] mas que decir vnos a otros como vibian en la ley de Moyses y la vltima junta en que esta se ballou fue poco tiempo antes que esta se casase que fue por el mes de Mayo hiese tres años..."

other than looking after her husband and caring for her children. We learn through her testimony that she was the mother-in-law of Bernardo da Paz and also participated in clandestine gatherings in which Diogo Ramos was present:

“The defendant gathered with her [own] husband, the aforesaid Diogo Ramos, his wife Joana da Paz, Bernardo da Paz, his sisters Sebastiana and Beatriz and another sister whose name she does not remember and her own daughter Francisca (...). Due to the trust that was inspired by their kinship and familiarity, they declared themselves to one another to be followers of the Law of Moses. From that time onwards they all remained followers of the Law of Moses, holding it to be the best [faith] with which to save their souls”.³⁸

The summaries of the evidence provided by his two sons during their trials in Spain were just as damaging to their father. At first, João da Paz had proved to be uncooperative with his captors and had refused to confess to any heretical practices or implicate any of his relatives. Under torture, however, he confessed that he had been taught to judaize by his mother at the age of eight or nine. He had observed the “Law of Moses” with his father when the two were working together in Madrid and Zamora.³⁹ João da Paz con-

³⁸ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 25r: “...y dichos sus hijos no le a pasado mas que lo que tiene declarado que [...] estando Juntos esta confessante Diego Nunez su marido el dicho Diego Ramos Bernardo de Paz Juana su madre, Juan de Paz su hermano Sebastiana y Beatriz sus hermanas y otra hermana menor que no se acuerda el nombre y Francisca su hija desta y muger del dicho Bernardo con la rrazon de confiança del Parentesco y conocimiento que an[...] tenían y auendosi tratada la prision del dicho Diego Ramos y que estaban culpados sus hijos se declararon vnos con otros por obserbantes de la ley de Moyses y aunque no huvieron ningun ayuno ni cerimonia de la dicha ley de Moyses, Juntos desde el dicho tiempo quedaron todos declarados por obserbantes de la ley de Moyses teniendo la por la mejor para salvarse...”.

³⁹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 35r: “...Dixo que el quiere decir la verdad, por descargo de su conciencia y que es certo que se a comunicado en la obserbançia de la ley de Moyses con Diego Ramos su Padre desde edad de ocho o nueve años que le enseñó Maria de Paz y que respecto desto se tratava así delante de sus hermanos como su madre y en ausencia stya quando andaba con el trauijando y así antes como despues de su prision quando se ofreçia declatandose y comunicandose en la obserbançia de dicha ley de Moyses en dichos tiempos quando y como se ofreçia y en esa conformidad en zamora y en Madrid y fuera de Madrid y luego dijo que fuera de Madrid no se acuerda no auer comunicado con su Padre cosas de la Ley de Moyses, ni fuera de Zamora porque no andubo con el travajando por los lugares...”.

fessed that his attempt to hide his judaizing had been motivated by “the blood that ran through his veins” and “more particularly because of the fact that his father had already been arrested on a previous occasion by the Holy Office, with which the devil has brought him into conflict.”⁴⁰ The testimony provided by the younger Bernardo da Paz against his father, whom he named Diogo Alexandro although he also informed the inquisitors that “his father has had and used other names”, was equally damning. During his interrogations, conducted by the Tribunal of Madrid on 23 March 1680, Bernardo declared that he had been educated in the “Law of Moses” by his father and mother at the age of four and that “it was his father who taught his siblings and mother [to judaize]”.⁴¹

How useful these witness statements, sent to Lisbon in June 1683, actually were to the Lisbon Inquisition is open to question. The regulations of the Inquisition specified that no evidence could be used if it had not been ratified by the witness. As a significant interval has elapsed since Elena Gonzalez, Bernardo da Paz and Elena de Robles had originally made their depositions for the Inquisition of Madrid, the tribunal of Valladolid followed the standard procedure and sought to have the witnesses ratify their testimony. Original letters contained in the trial dossier of Diogo Ramos reveal that the tribunal of Valladolid attempted to locate these three individuals. On 26 March, the tribunal Valladolid sent a letter to the tribunal of Toledo requesting information as to the present whereabouts of the three witnesses. The inquisitors of Toledo replied to this query on 30 April 1683, informing their colleagues that Elena de Robles had died over six months ago “in a place close to Salamanca”, Bernardo da Paz was known to have crossed the border over into Portugal and Elena Gonzalez was reported to be living in

⁴⁰ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 36v: “...porque la sangre corria por las venas aia callado al dicho se Padre (...). Dijo que la rrazon particular era proque su Padre aia estado presso otra vez en el Santo Offiçio y que el Diabolo le Zegara con ella...”.

⁴¹ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fol. 23v: “...el dicho su padre fue el que enseñó a los dichos sus hermanos y madre...”.

Madrid though “it is not known in which street”. The matter did not end there, however, as a second letter concerning the ratification of the testimony, and dated 5 May 1683, was sent by Valladolid to the Holy Office of Toledo. The wording of Toledo’s reply, made on 11 May, is ambiguous but it seems that the Lisbon tribunal may have pressed Valladolid to contact Toledo a second time in the hope that further information had been uncovered since the end of April. Once more, the inquisitors of Toledo were compelled to reply that they had no more news concerning the fate of these three individuals since their reconciliation by the Inquisition in Madrid.⁴²

Conclusion

Unlike his wife and daughters, the inquisitors were unable to make Diogo Ramos confess to the heretical errors with which they reproached him. Diogo Ramos’s defiance was in any event futile as the testimony provided by the Gomes brothers, the jailers in Lisbon as well as his womenfolk was more than sufficient to convict him. Having been found guilty of being a relapsed heretic and apostate, he was therefore condemned to be handed over, “relaxed”, to the secular justice for execution. The sentence that concludes his trial dossier carried the usual and highly nominal request, made in all cases in which the defendant was “relaxed to the secular arm”, that the culprit be treated “benignly and piously and that he be spared the death penalty and no blood be spilt”.⁴³ The sentence of execution was in fact carried out and Diogo Ramos was burnt at a public *auto-da-fé* held on the riverfront *terreiro do paço* (the modern-day *Praça do Comércio*) on Sunday 8 August 1683. Joana da Paz, Maria da Paz and Beatriz da Paz were similarly sentenced at the same *auto-da-fé*,

⁴² The two letters sent from Toledo to Valladolid are included in A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, fols. 18r and 19r.

⁴³ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processo n° 1237*, unfoliated (at the end of the trial dossier), “...relaxão a justiça secular, aquem pedem, com muita instançia, se baga com elle benigna e piedocamente e não procede a pena de morte nem effusão de sangue.”

but as repentant first-time offenders, they were condemned to lesser penalties and spiritual penances. His daughter Maria da Paz, for instance, was sentenced to present herself for confession at each of the four festivals of Christmas, Easter, Corpus Christi and the Assumption of Our Lady in the year following her sentence. Furthermore, during that same year, she was to pray a rosary and an *Ave Maria* everyday of the week. Every Friday, Maria was also to pray the *Pater Noster* as well as five *Ave Marias*. Lastly, she was to hear mass in the Church of São Lourenço in Lisbon wearing her penitential *sambenito* every Sunday and on Holy days. On 20 August 1683, all three women were deemed by the instructors of the *Colégio da doutrina da fé* to be sufficiently instructed in the mysteries of the faith and were subsequently released.

The trials of Diogo Ramos and his family by the tribunal of the Holy Office in Lisbon during 1682-3 offer a fascinating insight into a hitherto little-studied aspect of the history of the Inquisition in the Iberian Peninsula. To convict Diogo Ramos and his family, the Inquisition of Lisbon was in direct contact with no less than three tribunals of the Spanish Inquisition, namely those of Seville, Valladolid and Toledo. The relative speed and effectiveness with which these tribunals acted upon the information they received from Lisbon ensured that the trials, which lasted a little over a year, were not unduly delayed. This inquisitorial cooperation was not just limited to the exchange of information concerning suspects. The Inquisition of Lisbon was able to depend upon its counterparts in Spain to examine defence witnesses on its behalf and forward incriminating evidence contained in other trials. Furthermore, the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions had also established a bilateral agreement relating to extraditions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although the trials of Diogo Ramos and his family did not necessitate any extraditions.⁴⁴ This work has only examined a single case study but there can be little doubt that this is not an

⁴⁴ A.N.T.T., *Inquisição, Conselho Geral, livro n° 386*.

isolated case and that many other trials exist in the archives of the *Torre do Tombo* that contain correspondence from the Spanish Inquisition.⁴⁵ Modern studies of the Inquisition have to a large extent overlooked the manner in which the Inquisitions in Spain and Portugal were able to cooperate in the repression of heresy across the boundaries of their kingdoms. This oversight is all the more striking since there has been an increasing interest in *converso* communities residing astride the border.⁴⁶ Likewise, there has also been rising scrutiny of the social, cultural, political and economic interaction between the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal in the early modern period.⁴⁷ In spite of this, the state of current research in this area means that the nature of relations between the Inquisitions of both Iberian kingdoms, and their evolution during their three centuries of coexistence, remains elusive. A clear picture of the level of collaboration between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions between 1536 and 1821 will only emerge through further research in this particular domain in both Spanish *and* Portuguese archives.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ To cite but a few examples see, for instance, A.N.T.T., *Inquisição de Lisboa, processos* n.ºs 1431 and 5035. Also *Inquisição de Évora, processo* n.º 3538.

⁴⁶ PILAR HUERGA CRIADO, *En la Raya de Portugal: Solidaridad y Tensiones en la Comunidad Judeoconversa* (Salamanca, 1994).

⁴⁷ See the work of ISABEL M. R. MENDES DRUMOND, *Um espaço, duas monarquias: inter-relações na Península Ibérica na época de Carlos V*, (Lisbon, 2001).

⁴⁸ I would like to express my thanks to the Awards Committee of the Leverhulme Trust for their grant of a two-year postdoctoral research award (2006-8) that is currently enabling me to conduct research on the theme of collaboration between the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. My gratitude also extends to Ms. K. Chambers, who read and edited this article.

Women as religious leaders: the sources biblical and Rabbinic

Isaac S. D. Sassoon

Institute of Traditional Judaism, Teaneck, N. J., U.S.A.

What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet;
(*Romeo and Juliet* II, 2, 43-44)

Juliet was articulating a simple yet profound truth, that entities are not objectively impacted by their names – whether inherited or given. But what about titles? Do people not change, both in their own and in their fellows' eyes, when honorifics are conferred upon them? For some mysterious reason we humans often react differently to people once we discover them to be persons of title. It is almost as if an invisible barrier has gone up. Victorian etiquette manuals devote chapter after sonorous chapter to correct forms of address, which if breached, heads could roll. Today, especially in democracies, we may be less touchy about points of honour. Even so, in a diluted form, titles have their place in any civilized society, because over and above protocol, titles serve a practical purpose. A title can convey information as to its holder's qualifications, which (though nobody's business!) is not without its usefulness. As to religious titles, they serve as seals not merely of competence, but also of integrity. Additionally, such titles identify the faith-community or denomination of the bearer, and his or her allegiance.

Did I say his or her? While we may find the phrase 'his or her' unexceptional, there are those who are bothered by its use in the context of religious titles. For such use of gender-inclusive language can be construed as taking sides in the debate over religious roles for women. It is certainly not our intention to be partisan. However, the ancient sources are far from monolithic, and while some