CHAPTER FIVE

"But Blood Whitened": Nursing Mothers and Others in Early Modern Britain

Rachel Trubowitz

I begin this essay with the following sixteenth-century Salesian folktale:

> A Jew offered to buy milk from a Christian wet nurse who instead sold him the milk of a sow. He then got a poor peasant who owed him money to execute his orders on the promise that his debt would be erased. He brought him to the foot of a gallows, made him cut off the head of the hanged man's corpse, and had him place it in a receptacle filled with the milk. Afterward the Jew ordered the peasant to put his ear to the head and asked him, "What do you hear?" The peasant responded, "The grunting of a herd of pigs!" "Woe is me!" the Jew then cried, "the woman tricked me!" The next day all the pigs within a radius of eight kilometers gathered at this spot and killed one another.

The story ends with a question: "What would have happened if the good Christian had obtained human milk for the Jew?"[1] This exemplum is one of many enduring anti-Semitic tales of Jewish duplicity, sorcery, and heinous crimes against Christians, which circulated throughout Europe during the early modern period. Claudine Fabre-Vassas includes it in her fascinating recent study of Christian discourse on the pig and on Jewish dietary prohibitions against eating pork to underscore the instruction that it, and the myriad of tales like it, provides on the relationship between Jews and pigs. "In every case," she writes, "the pig is introduced as a substitute, serving to denounce the Jew."[2]

I single out this story for a somewhat different reason: to underscore its encapsulation of the intimate relations between mothers' milk, wet nurses, and Jews as forged in the cultural imagination of early modern Christian Europe; it is these triangulated relations that this essay explores. I use this folktale as a point of entry into a discussion of gendered and racialized "boundary panic," to borrow Janet Adelman's apt phrase, as recorded in, mostly, English texts from the late sixteenth- and first half of the seventeenth century.[3] In this turbulent historical moment, England's geographical and political borders underwent

rapid and repeated revision through the dynastic shift between the Tudor and Stuart states, accelerated imperial expansion, and, at mid-century, revolution and civil war – breeding mounting anxieties about England's cultural and racial (in)coherence. The "texts" I examine within this temporal space are generically quite distinct – domestic guidebooks, travel narratives, pamphlets, engravings, Shakespeare's plays, among others – but they betray similar preoccupations with breast milk, blood, and the racialized construction of English national identity. This essay, in short, considers texts that both assess and help to shape and stabilize the maternal body, the foreign body, and the body politic in conditions of rapid social change and cultural fragmentation. I concentrate, more specifically, on representations of nursing mothers, wet nurses, and Jewish men as a trinity of culturally constructed types, in which the wet nurse occupies an intermediate position between, on the one hand, the idealized Christian mother, feeding her child with the milk from her own virtuous white body and, on the other, the dark demonized/criminalized figure of "the Jew" hungering for the blood and bodies of Christian children.

i

One of the resonant narratives submerged in the bit of Salesian folklore with which I began is a cautionary tale about the commodification of human breast milk through wet nursing. By offering maternal milk as a marketable good, the wet nurse creates, as the story's concluding question suggests, the potential for corrupting this "purest" – at once most natural and spiritual of foods – into a deadly Jewish potion inciting fraternal and civil warfare. This tale narrates, in short, a crucial linkage between unpolluted breast milk – that which is lovingly and freely offered by "good" mothers – and the health and welfare of the Christian *polis*. It also demonstrates how wet nursing might weaken this vital tie by turning human milk into potentially deadly currency, and hence subjecting it to the worldly vice and corruption associated with Jews, who, in the lurid anti-Semitic "imaginary" of early modern Europe, dirtied Christian money through usury and befouled Christian bodies through ritual mutilation and murder, a subject to which this essay returns.

Cautionary tales about wet nurses that link non-maternal breast milk and social instability also find culturally resonant articulation in early modern didactic literature about the English home, especially that literature printed during the historical frame this essay considers. Cutting against the upper-class norm for infant and child care, domestic-guidebook writers, like Robert Cleaver, John Dod, and William Gouge, uniformly celebrate maternal breast-feeding over wet-nursing by exalting nursing mothers and by delineating the various ways in which the unregulated and "strange" milk purchased from wet

nurses could endanger the physical health and moral integrity of both children and families. Some of the twenty-three arguments Gouge offers in his much-reprinted *Of Domesticall Duties* (which went through twelve printings over the course of the seventeenth century) on the benefits of maternal breastfeeding are strictly medical in emphasis – babies breast-fed by their mothers are less susceptible to disease and death, for example. But, more often than not, he and other writers of texts attempting to account for and offer advice on breast milk and breastfeeding register concerns that are as much moral as medical, that medicalize morality and moralize the medical. Guidebook advice on domestic "manners" and mores is in this regard akin to the accounts of reproduction written by early modern physicians, like Edward Jordan (James I's doctor), in which as Gail Kern Paster notes "no stable semantic demarcations separated ethics from physiology."[4]

One key medical/moral concern was that breast-milk physically transmitted the moral and bodily character of the nurse to her charge, ideally complementing, but more often compromising or even eradicating the familial identity the child had inherited from its parents. "We may be assured," maintains James Guillimeau in *The Nursing of Children*, "that the Milke (wherewith the child is nourish'd two yeares together) hath a power to make the children like the Nurses, both in bodie and mind; as the seed of the Parents hath to make the children like them."[5] The guidebooks' perception of nurse-milk's competition with and perversion of parentally transmitted identity surfaces as well in Shakespeare's plays, especially at heightened moments of familial conflict. Hence, in *The Winter's Tale*, Leontes demands that Mamillius be removed from the powerful shaping influence of what he jealously presumes is Hermione's corrupt and hostile foreign body. He laments that "[t]hough he does bear some signs of me," his son has too much of her adulterous, female, and hence, innately unstable and illegitimate, "blood in him." His only solace is: "I am glad that you did not nurse him" (II.i.57–8, 56).[6] When Lord Capulet disowns Juliet for refusing to marry Paris, he but formalizes the familial estrangement and loss of hereditary identity that his daughter has experienced not only through her love for Romeo but also through the likeness she bears to the bawdy Nurse – and the Nurse bawdy/body – who suckled her.[7]

As these examples suggest, children put out to wet nurses or breastfed by unfit mothers not only were thought more likely to die than those offered "tender" maternal care and nourishment – "The number of nurse children that die every yeare is very great" – but they were also believed to experience a social "death" unknown to their properly suckled counterparts.[8] To the extent that they were transformed and remade by the base or noxious qualities of unfamiliar breast milk, they were forever estranged from their families. "Such children as have sucked their mothers breasts, love their mothers best," writes Gouge, "yea we observe many who have sucked others milke, to love these

nurses all the daies of their life."[9] David Leverenz's summary of the ethical divide in the guidebooks between "tender" mothers and "strange" milk is especially apt: "Tender mothers and tender children go together. Mothers should not be surprised if children deny them later in life, ran the warnings, when they deny children the breast early in life. Strange milk would lead to strange manners."[10]

The affective ties between nurse and child thus had the potential to generate strangeness and strangers, to interrupt the genealogical transmission of identity, and so to tarnish a family's good name and disrupt the hereditary transmission of properties and titles – hence, the emphasis in the guidebook literature on creating synonymity between maternal love and maternal breast milk. "How can a mother better express her love to her young babe, then by letting it sucke of her owne beasts?" writes Gouge.[11] For Dod and Cleaver, women acquire "the sweet name of Mother … full of incredible love" by breastfeeding, their first and most important maternal duty.[12] "Incredible" love and milk, affective ties and familial bonds, maternal duty and desire, all cohere at the idealized breast of the nursing mother, which in turn guarantees the spiritual and physical "prosper[ity]" and intact identity of children. "Daily experience confirmith," writes Gouge, that children tenderly breastfed by their mothers, "prosper best. Mothers are most tender over them and cannot indure to let them lie crying out, without taking them up and stilling them, as nurses will let them crie and crie againe, if they be about any businesse of their own."[13] Indeed, as Fabre-Vassas notes, the deprivation of milk and motherly love through wet nursing or an overly abrupt weaning process from the maternal breast is associated in French folklore with a potentially fatal depletion of appetite, desire, happiness, to which children are especially vulnerable. This melancholic "sickness of lack," which in French (particularly in the Pyrenean dialects), is termed, *anaigament*, is etymologically linked to liquefaction and deliquescence. The illness, which results from and implies deprivation of the affective relation with the mother and her nourishing, vital fluids, manifests itself by sapping the child of all energy and dissolving him or her into liquid, a symptomatic insignia of the slow leakage of origin and identity.[14]

It is precisely the beloved duty and dutiful love which maternal breastfeeding bespeaks that underpins guidebook definitions of maternal breastfeeding as a spiritual vocation "the most proper work of [a mother's] speciall calling," even as guidebook writers simultaneously attempted to rationalize nursing motherhood by redefining maternal nurture as governed by natural law. As Cleaver and Dod maintain, "We see by experience, that every beast and every fowle is nourished and bred of the same that beare it: onely some women love to be mothers, but not nurse. As therefore every tree doth cherish and nourish that which it bringeth forth: even so also, it becometh naturall mothers to nourish their children with their owne milk."[15] The desire to nurse one's own baby is

defined as a biological drive or law of nature to which even trees correctly respond. This slide from "sacred" to "natural," and back again, points to an important conceptual paradigm shift that, as Stephen Greenblatt has recently argued, finds its beginnings in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For Greenblatt, it is precisely at this moment that "the natural" comes to replace "the sacred" as the conceptual category that governed early modern English attempts to think through and chart the boundaries between England and the radically different cultures it increasingly encountered through trade, missionary work, and colonial conquest. Indeed, that maternal breastfeeding is defined as at once a natural drive and a sacred calling reflects this moment of conceptual transition. Greenblatt's comments are most illuminating: "the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also saw the beginning of a gradual shift away from the axis of sacred and demonic and toward the axis of natural and unnatural … but the natural is not to be found, or at least not reliably found, among primitive or uncivilized peoples … The stage is set for the self-congratulatory conclusion that European culture, and English culture in particular, is at once the most civilized and the most natural."[16] In guidebook formulations, the "naturall" nursing mother shores up this "self-congratulatory" construction of English cultural identity by interpellating her suckling children into the natural order and thus, in the same gesture, also into the English state as civilized subjects. By contrast, the wet-nurse undermines the intact identity of the nation-state by rendering children unnatural and uncivilized or, in other words, not English.

Closely allied to these concerns about lactation, civilization, savagery, and England's national identity was the widely embraced notion of breast-milk as white blood – "nothing else but blood whitened" as Guillimeau notes.[17] "Experience teacheth, that God converteth the mothers bloud into the milke where with the child is nurse," write Cleaver and Dod.[18] If nurse milk can, through the powerful affective ties it creates, pervert or eradicate familial identity and social bonds, it is also a blood carrier of color-coded character – a conception that generated concerns about the pollution of bloodlines through morally and physically tainted human milk. "Now if the nurse be of an evill complexion," write Dod and Cleaver, "… the child sucking of her breast must needs take part with her."[19] The emphasis on "evill complexion" is striking, given the nuances that "complexion" newly acquires in this historically specific moment, when the term, which refers to "moral character," begins to allude for the first time to hair and skin color.[20] As deployed in the passage from Dod and Cleaver, "evill complexion" encapsulates an easy slide from an ethical to a proto-racialized notion of identity that paints both the spirit and body of the wet nurse in diabolically dark hues. To return to Guillimeau's formulation, "Milke … hath a power to make the children like the Nurses, both in bodie and mind." Embedded within these medical and moral perceptions of breast milk as "blood whitened" are concerns about safeguarding white English complexions from the darkening powers of "unnatural" lactation. To the extent that they affiliate human milk and body color, the guidebooks help to document the cultural construction of whiteness in the early modern period.

This cultural project becomes particularly pressing during the first few decades of the seventeenth century, when much of the guidebook literature is first printed or reprinted. This is, as noted, the historically specific moment in which English foreign trade, travel, and colonization accelerate and intensify, breeding racialized "boundary panic" about the distinctions between Englishness and otherness. As Kim F. Hall argues, "it is England's sense of losing its traditional insularity that provokes the development of 'racialism.'"[21] England's "discovery" of racialized differences between the intact national home and uncharted foreign worlds, I suggest, silently inflects the guidebooks' preoccupations with "white blood" and the tainted milk of morally, and physically, dark-complexioned women. To put this another way, newly racialized anxieties about England's global presence and national integrity are displaced onto the familiar and more easily regulated site of the maternal breast and its identity-sustaining milk/blood, as represented in and circulated by the domestic guidebooks and affiliated texts, such as early modern drama. But such attempts to monitor the maternal breast tended less to cure the "boundary panic" that generated racialized difference in the early modern period than to restate this "panic" about race and national identity in gendered terms. While serving as an affecting icon of English domesticity, the idealized white-blooded maternal breast always threatens to lapse into the reviled, morally dark-complexioned breast, despite the guidebook writers' energetic efforts to dichotomize them.[22]

It is this inevitable conjunction between "good" breast and "bad," reverence and repulsion that the guidebooks attempt to sort out by characterizing wet nurses as strangers and expelling them from the English home. To put this another way, the wet nurse evokes the subversive threat of the requisite alien who must be expelled in order to achieve social and personal cohesion. Such a threat, however, had long attached itself, in the Christian "imaginary," to anti-Semitic perceptions of "the Jew" as unintegrable and, therefore, deportable.[23] It is, as such, possible to read guidebook vilifications of the wet-nurse as encrypted rehearsals not only of longstanding Anglo-Christian constructions of Jewish difference but also of prevailing English anxieties about hidden "judaizing" tendencies within the nation, anxieties that persisted long after the large-scale deportation of Jews from England under the Expulsion Act of 1290. It is to these concerns about the absent presence of Jews in early modern England and to the specter of "the Jew" in English discourse on breastfeeding that this essay now turns.

ii

The fraught relations between "others," nursing mothers, and wet nurses, as reflected in the guidebook literature, can be discerned in many of the period's travel narratives, such as those of Samuel Purchas, which I shall investigate in this second part of my essay. While their detailings of the so-called exotic peoples and traditions of Asia, Africa, and the Americas might seem to be literally at a distance from the English household, travel narratives can be seen as allied with the domestic guidebooks of Gouge, Guillimeau, and others in their efforts to help their readers establish a clear sense of their Englishness and to secure their personal and national boundaries. Just as the domestic guidebook is perhaps most interesting in its proximity to the travel narrative, i.e. when it reveals its fascination with and anxieties about places and people outside the familial and national home, so too the travel narrative is especially revealing when read as a kind of domestic guidebook that defines the white English domestic "norm" in opposition to the "deviance" visible in dark, foreign worlds. I am particularly interested in travel-narrative depictions of Jews, especially Jewish men, who, as suggested earlier, I believe can be glimpsed in the guidebook's racialized formulations of wet nurses and nursing mothers. In my reading, it is "the Jew," as glimpsed in the travel narrative, (and elsewhere) who shadows the guidebooks' idealized representations of maternal nurture and who is shadowed in the dark figure of the wet nurse and her unfamilial milk.

Let me underscore that while, "officially," no Jews lived in England within the temporal frame this essay considers, unofficial Jews, i.e. secret Jews or Marannos, Jewish-Christian hybrids, Jewish converts to Christianity, continued in fact to populate the nation, as is well documented by Shapiro's important study. Stepped-up colonial expansion and foreign travel and trade also brought an increasing number of Englishmen into more frequent and closer contact with Jews outside of England, and hence it is to the travel narrative that I turn to find early modern records of English impressions of Jews. These impressions are key, since they chart the ways in which, by gathering first-hand observations of "real" Jews outside of England, English travelers tried to document the "fact" of racialized Jewish difference, occluded by the unofficial presence in England of Jews who passed for English; in this way, the travel narratives helped to stabilize England's own rapidly shifting and newly color-coded boundaries.

Travel-narrative attempts to clarify the differences between Jewishness and Englishness are, however, complicated by the unacknowledged intimacies between these two officially distinct identities. While the Jews were expelled from England in 1290, "the Jew" continued to reside quite openly in England as a familiar scriptural and legendary type or "shadow" – a presence, however spectral, that shapes the cultural construction of not only Jewish identity but

English national identity as well, especially during this moment of intensified "boundary panic." The imaginary English Jew is, as such, inseparably intertwined with the foreign "real" Jews encountered and depicted by English travelers. The travel narratives hence "document" the confused interface between real and imagined, familiar and strange, white and black that frames English perceptions of Jews as much as they report on the lived experiences of actual Jews in the early modern period.

Perhaps most relevant for my purposes here is that "the Jew," witnessed by Purchas and other English travelers plays an important role in the "racialism" that Hall believes is discovered at this historically specific moment, since this part-real/part-imagined figure not only confirms Jewish difference but is embedded as a precursor figure, or "type," of the foreign peoples given newly racialized representation in the travel literature. Emergent formulations of racialized difference were, as Shapiro argues, "almost always skewed by what [English travelers] had first read about the Jews."[24] The Jew, as constructed by the dominant culture, thus implies and is implicated in English travelers' first-hand accounts of black, "tawny," red, and other variously colored non-white, non-English people. This essay urges that the stranger-figure of the wet nurse, found in the domestic guidebooks and elsewhere during the same temporal frame in which the travel narratives were first printed and circulated, be counted among these racialized/Judaized "others." I would also add that it is in relation to the part-real, part-imagined Jews who emerge in the travel literature and in other early modern texts that the wet nurse's intermediate position between mother and "other" becomes most clearly visible. Just as she, in practice, stands in for the maternal breast, she metaphorically acts and speaks for "the Jew."

Perhaps the most striking instance of the affinities I detect is the conflation that Samuel Purchas creates between wet nurses and Jewish men in *Purchas His Pilgrimage*. One of his text's most bizarre bits of exotica – against which he establishes the domestic "normality" of England – is a detailing of Jewish male breastfeeding. "If you believe their *Gemara* (can you choose?)," Purchas writes, "a poor Jew having buried his wife and not able to hire a nurse for his child, had his breasts miraculously filled with milk, and became nurse himself." Purchas also alludes to the figure of a breastfeeding Mordecai represented in a Midrashic interpretation of the Book of Esther.[25] Purchas's examples demonstrate the fuzzy boundary between the "breasts" of Jewish men and wet nurses – note that the poor Jew "became *nurse* himself" (my emphasis), not mother. Here, the "mirac[le]" of lactation and breastfeeding is less sacred than profane.

To be sure, Galenic physiology implied biological likeness between men and women, especially in relation to sex and reproduction. As Thomas Laquer has argued, in Galenism's one-sex, one-flesh model of human anatomy, male

and female genitalia were understood as inversions of one another and identical in function. Both men and women were thought to have "seed," or sperm, for example, and breasts, for that matter.[26] Gender differentiation was, in the early modern period, much more clearly a function of the enculturation process, in which guidebook literature, conduct books, and travel narratives played a key role. Marking distinctions not only between men and women, but between "true" men and "false" is thus a key part of the work that Purchas's image accomplishes. Evoking long-standing anti-Semitic perceptions of Jewish manhood as impaired and degenerate, and hence as "female," the image is deployed as a gendered sign of Jewish difference. This kind of "female" encoding of Jewish men was reinforced by the commonly held assumption that Jewish men menstruated. Jewish male bodies, like those of women, were thought of as leaky vessels, which discharged a monthly flow of unclean blood. Thus, the Spanish physician Juan de Quinones wrote "a special treatise to prove the claim that male Jews have a tail and, like women, a monthly flow of blood."[27] Samuel Purchas's observations about Jewish male breastfeeding can be read as an extension of this theory of Jewish male menstruation, since mothers' milk was believed to be formed from menstrual blood.[28]

Most important for my purposes here is that Purchas's image not only aids in the cultural work of differentiating men from women (and "false" men), but it responds as well to the "boundary panic" that seems to rule this historical moment by gendering the difference between Englishness and Jewishness, even though these racial/national/religious categories had, in fact, been impossibly blurred by forced and voluntary conversion, intermarriage, and the formation of small Portuguese Marrano communities in and outside of London. It is important to note, however, that if it vividly underscores the differences between the normative English "self" and the marvelous/repellent "other," Purchas's account of Jewish male wet-nursing cannot completely sustain the gendered racial, national, and religious differences it appears so indelibly to inscribe. In the distinction he implies between nurses and mothers, Purchas suggests that mothers resemble Christian Englishmen more than they do Jews – a resemblance reinforced by the key role maternal milk plays in the transmission of hereditary identity, both familial and national. The "good" Christian mother, in short, is closer to the normative English "father" and Stuart fatherland than she is to the aberrant wet-nurse or infidel Jew.

The leakage of blood/milk thus places Jews in close proximity to wet-nurses as a "female" threat to social and familial stability – a perception strengthened by anti-Semitic attitudes toward circumcision, a subject to which I shall return. Such leakage was also perceived as both symptom of and explanation for what was thought to be Jews' insatiable thirst for Christian blood. This blood-thirst, which points to a lack both physical and spiritual, was believed to drive Jews to abduct, forcibly circumcise, and ritually murder young gentile boys and drink

their blood. This signature Jewish crime – the so-called "blood libel" – also finds a point of origin in the cluster of presumed ritual murders in medieval and Renaissance Europe, all following the same pattern. The most famous include Richard de Pontoise (1163), Dominguito de Saragoss (1255), Hugh of Lincoln (1255), Werner d'Oberwesel (1287), and Simon of Trent (1472).[29] The enduring strength of English belief in the "reality" of these Jewish "crimes" cannot be over-estimated: as Shapiro points out: "Not even the Holocaust put to rest such allegations [of Jewish ritual murder] in England."[30] These enduring anti-Semitic assumptions about blood, sucking, and Jews also form an important, if lurid, subtext for the guidebooks' and other idealized images of the Christian mother suckling her (male) child with her "white blood."

Perhaps the most notorious of these was the murder of the two-and-a-half-year-old Simon. In a colored German engraving of 1480, the standing figure of the small beatified boy is shown surrounded by seven vicious Jewish tormentors, all with carefully inscribed Hebrew names. The figures closest to Simon make incisions in his body with sharp needles and chisels, while one, tellingly named "Israel" collects the blood in a small bowl, while another, "Moses," operates on the boy's genitals to circumcise him as part of the death ritual. This engraving and the "event" itself can be read from a number of different perspectives, but what is most important to my argument here is that the supposed ritual murder of "Simonet" and other "cases" linking Jewish men and Christian children through the drinking of blood (the consumption of bloody animal flesh is, of course, strictly prohibited by Jewish dietary law) and death invert the idealized mother-child dyad created and circulated by the domestic guidebooks and other texts. The "blood-libel" mythology helps to generate grotesque images of Jewish men drinking the blood of a dead gentile child that inversely, and perversely, shadow model constructions of the Christian mother whose "white blood" is suckled by her vital infant. This inversion is key since it makes legible the differences between white Christian mothers and dark Jewish men, while concealing the similarities between their secret rites and rituals (both the birth room and the synagogue were closed to Christian men) and, as such, the unmarked filiation between Anglo-Christian domesticity, both familial and national, and unregenerate Jewish strangeness.

Inversion, as Stuart Clark notes, functioned in the early modern period, "as a universal principle of intelligibility as well as a statement about how the world was actually constituted."[31] Not unlike "the world turned upside down" created by, for example, folkloric rites, festival celebrations, and the court masque, the blood-libel cases and other legends of Jewish crimes against Christians engender an inverse world of essentialized disorder and vice, (mis)ruled by the devil-Jew, in which the perverse bond between blood-thirsty Jew and dead gentile child at once threatens and legitimizes the primal bond between the idealized nursing Christian mother and child. This same demonized Jewish

counter-world is conjured up almost as a cultural necessity during the festive moment of Easter to reinforce the radical break between Jew and gentile that occurred during the Crucifixion and Passion, the founding events of Christianity celebrated by the rituals of Holy Week. It is not accidental that the ritual murders of Simon of Trent, William of Norwich, and other supposed "child-crucifixions" were thought to occur at Easter, an association reinforced by the belief that Jews needed Christian blood for ritual use during the Passover seder, specifically for making matzah.

Equally important is that Easter also commemorates the Crucifixion's guarantee of gentile freedom from, and erasure of, the ritual mark left by circumcision, the sign of God's covenant with Israel as mandated in Genesis 17:10–14: "This *is* my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised …" (Authorized KJV). In Milton's poem, "Upon the Circumcision," Christ's circumcision, the sign of his Hebraic manhood, is, in fact, typologically linked to his Crucifixion, the sign of his Christian divinity: he "now bleeds to give us ease" (l. 11).[32] It is precisely this linkage between circumcision and crucifixion that is profaned by the dramatic events played out through the blood-libel cases, in which the charge that Jews circumcised their victims before "crucifying" them was a standard feature Thus, we see in the engraving depicting Simon of Trent's ritual murder that "Moses" circumcises the young boy's penis while the other Jews collect his blood from various limbs and bodily organs, notably his heart and breast, thereby creating, as it were, *faux* stigmata. The young English boy, Hugh of Lincoln, was also thought to have been circumcised before being eviscerated. Purchas himself "documents" this kind of imagined Jewish crime, noting especially its "devilish" parody and inversion of the "original" events commemorated by Easter, and hence its desecration of Christianity's foundational moment as well: "One cruel and (to speak the properest phrase) Jewish crime usual amongst them every year toward Easter, though it were not always known … [is] to steal a young boy, circumcise him, and after a solemn judgement, making one of their own nation a Pilate, to crucify him out of their devilish malice to Christ and Christians."[33] The salvific "progress" from circumcision to crucifixion, which Milton traces in his poem, is thus transformed by Jewish ritual murder into a diabolical descent into barbarism. The blood-libel case, in short, reduces entangled Jewish–gentile relations to an (over-)simple binary, in which Judaism represents the realm of the "savage," Christianity that of the "civilized" – a categorical distinction reminiscent of that between the natural nursing mother and the unnatural wet nurse, and one that affiliates Jews with so-called primitive, non-European "others," whom English colonists and travelers, such as Purchas, encountered especially in the New World.[34] Although it falls outside the scope of this essay, I would nevertheless like to suggest that "the cannibal," the standard early modern icon of American

wilderness and primitivism, might be fruitfully read in relation to anti-Semitic European perceptions of Jewish hunger for Christian blood and bodies.

In the English cultural imagination then, Judaism, in some very specific contexts, implies the primitive and pagan, and hence the idolatrous worship of material objects and graven images rather than Christianity's transcendent Trinitarian deity, of whom objects and images are simply material symbols and signs. This literalizing pagan preference for matter/flesh over spirit implicit in "the Jew" is made explicit by the blood-libel cases, which both de-allegorize the typological connection between circumcision and Crucifixion and carnally reverse Christianity's miraculous supersedure of the old Hebraic covenant, of which circumcision is the bodily sign. Most relevant to my purposes here is that by emptying the Crucifixion of its spiritual and allegorical content and hence by denying Christianity its foundational miracle, "the Jew," as both the circumcised and the circumcisor, perfects his most standard stereotypical role as devil or anti-Christ, who inverts and negates Christian origin and identity – the very entities preserved by the idealized gentile mother and transmitted through her milk to her suckling child.

Martin Luther's revealing comment about himself and his wife underscores precisely the fraught interconnectedness of circumcised penis and maternal breast: "I hope I shall never be so stupid as to be circumcised. I would rather cut off the left breast of my Catherine and of all women."[35] To the extent that in Luther's text the circumcised penis implies and can be substituted for the cutting off of a maternal breast and its identity-forming milk, the two severed body parts achieve an imagined synonymity. Their figurative linkage carries tragic, and one might even say traumatic, resonances since it metonymically evokes the devastating loss of both mother and father and the terror of being orphaned. As such it signifies the near-death consequent to deracination, homelessness, and diaspora, all of which are subsumed and performed by anti-Semitic typifications of Jews as wanderers or literally errant, i.e. "the wandering Jew." Given the insistent threat of homelessness, (im)migration, and loss of insular national identity that early modern English "boundary panic" bespeaks, it seems unsurprising that Jewish "vice" and "villainy" haunt English texts written during the period, especially those like the guidebooks and travel narratives that attempt to remedy England's "identity crisis" and to renegotiate the relations between home and world, mothers and others.

Luther's affiliation of circumcised Jewish penis and female Christian breast was no doubt facilitated by Christian perceptions of circumcision as a metaphor for castration and emasculation, one that was thought in certain instances to be literally acted upon. To return to Purchas's image, if circumcision turned Jewish men metaphorically into women or feminized men, then this hermaphroditic transformation might "naturally" result in their growing of breasts and becoming wet nurses for their children. The alliance between Jewish men

and wet nurses is further strengthened by the strikingly parallel threats that forcible circumcision and nurse milk present to inherited familial identity. Like nurse milk, forcible circumcision marks and threatens forever to alter (change and make "other") the identity of children. Just as the affective attachment of child to nurse can never be weakened or redirected – "yea we observe many who have sucked others milke, to love these nurses all the daies of their life" – so too the mark of forcible circumcision forever makes a child "one of their own nation," thus denoting a tie to Judaism that can never be erased – even when, in the case of the Jewish convert, the spirit was willing. Some Jews who converted to Christianity employed gentile doctors to reverse their circumcisions surgically and thereby erase the telltale sign of the Judaism they had renounced. The sixteenth-century French doctor Laurent Joubert describes the procedure as follows: "To remake a foreskin, one must cut the skin of the virile member against its roots all around. When it has thus lost its conduit, one pulls it little by little from below, as one strips a branch of willow, to make a trunk, until the head is covered with it."[36] But by a strange irony, the procedure did not erase but in fact doubled the Judaic mark of circumcision. As Fabre-Vassas points out, "the *langue d'oc* term that designates someone who has undergone this operation is clear: *re-talhat*, twice castrated. For Christians, then, Jews cannot escape their destiny."[37] To the extent that forcible circumcision attempts to bequeath this inescapable destiny to gentile children, it, like the dark-complexioned nurse-breast vilified in the domestic guidebooks, threatens permanent alteration both of normative gentile European identity and of the "natural" and hence "civilized" white European, and, more specifically, English body. Cleaver and Dod's morally dark-complexioned wet nurse and Purchas's "devilish" Jew move toward convergence as racialized types in the English cultural "imaginary," despite the rather different generic and cultural contexts in which their stories find expression.

Christian eyewitness accounts of the circumcision ceremony contain perhaps the most striking expressions of the imagined convergence of circumcised Jewish penis and gentile female breast, and it is to the early modern travel narrative that we once again must turn to find these reports. Driven by post-Reformation interest in Hebraic rituals and customs and desirous of touring hitherto closed exotic worlds, English travelers happily accepted invitations to witness circumcisions. Perhaps the practice that seemed most surprising to these "tourists" was the *metzizah*, the (not always enacted) part of the ritual in which the rabbi or *mohel* sucks the blood off the infant's circumcised penis. In his journal entry for January 15, 1645, John Evelyn notes of a circumcision he witnessed in Rome that when "the circumcision was done the priest sucked the child's penis with his mouth."[38] The Elizabethan traveler, Thomas Coryate underscores "the strange manner, unused (I believe) of the ancient Hebrews" in which the *mohel* "did put his mouth to the child's yard, and sucked up the blood."[39] Alluding to the circumcisions witnessed by Evelyn, Coryate, and Frynes Moryson, yet another English traveler, Shapiro notes the homoerotic implications that *metzizah* must have had for these witnesses: "Apparently, this innovative practice, introduced during the Talmudic period, though not universally practiced by Jews, must have seemed to these English observers to have sodomitical overtones."[40] I would add that *metzizah*, (the Hebrew word for "sucking") might have also seemed to English travelers (busily engaged in measuring the "normality" of the English home against examples of foreign "deviance") to be a shocking inversion of idealized maternal breastfeeding, that celebrated "sucking," which, as we have seen, provides didactic texts on English domesticity with their most affecting icon. When the "exotic" circumcision ceremony is read against the domestic ritual of maternal breastfeeding, a reading that English travelers would have been likely to perform, the vice evoked by *metzizah*, and elliptically suggested by Coryate's phrase, "strange manner," is, I would argue, not sodomy but wet nursing, the "strange" and "unnatural" sucking that forever shadows idealized maternal breastfeeding as its "evil" double. Rather than sodomy, the "deviance" presented by the Jew-as-wet-nurse, (a version of Purchas's lactating Jewish men) summoned in Anglo-Christian accounts of *metzizah*, suggests incest and pedophilia; *metziah*, that is, ritually performs, in these accounts, the carnal and perverse (re)inscription of precisely that spiritual and natural love of child which Cleaver and Dod, among others, equate with "the sweet name of Mother."

Like Coryate and other travelers, Montaigne also witnessed a circumcision, and his depiction of the ceremony he attended in Rome is notable for its resonant account of the practice of *metzizah*: "As soon as the glans is uncovered, they hastily offer some wine to the minister, who puts a little in his mouth, and then goes and sucks the glans of the child, all bloody, and spits out the blood he has drawn from it, and immediately takes as much wine again, up to three times." After the child's penis is bandaged, the circumcisor is given another glass of wine: "He takes a swallow of it, and then dipping his finger in it he three times takes a drop of it with his finger to the boy's mouth to be sucked … He meanwhile still hath his mouth all bloody."[41] Montaigne's description of the "minister['s]" bloody mouth and of the "blood," as wine, that metaphorically drips from the boy's mouth after he sucks the (phallic) finger of the *mohel* or rabbi must have confirmed gentile impressions of Jewish blood-thirst and perverse sexuality. But the wine/blood on the boy's mouth in Montaigne's account also recalls with uncanny exactitude the domestic guidebooks' depictions of the "white blood" that adheres to the mouth of the idealized nursing child. The resemblance between these wine- and milk-stained children's lips acquires further precision when considered adjacently with the scene of blood and violence that ever-threatened to interrupt and

overturn the idealized scene of nursing maternity celebrated by the guidebook authors. "[Ambrois]Pare" as Audrey Eccles notes, "considered it a great dispensation of nature that the blood turned white, otherwise people would be shocked by 'so grievous and terrible spectacle of the childes mouth so imbrued and besmeared with blood."[42] To the extent that Montaigne's description of the practice of *metzizah* evokes this "grievous and terrible spectacle" of the child's blood-besmeared mouth and the blood-spurting lactating breast, it underscores the striking alliance between gentile suckling and Jewish "blood sucking" constructed by early modern texts. If, as Kathryn Schwarz incisively argues, "nursing threatens to produce the image of the bloody child" and, I would add, the bloody breast, it also evokes and is evoked by gentile depictions of the bloody child and the circumcisor's knife.[43] To put this another way, at the point at which women's breasts fail to live up to the idealized maternal breast imagined in the guidebooks and affiliated texts, they threaten to "turn Jew."

iii

This is precisely the threat, however veiled, suggested by Purchas's image, if we can return once more to that resonant bit of text. If Jewish men can be miraculously (and demonically) transformed into wet nurses, then perhaps, wet nurses might "turn Jew," or at least carry in their breast milk the traces of the Jew and other infidel "exotics," for whom, as we have seen, Jews served as either substitutes or precursors. Such is the fear indirectly conveyed in *The Winter's Tale*, in which Hermione, as we have seen, is thought by Leontes to transmit infidel(ity) to Mamillius just by the close proximity and affective ties between their bodies. The threat that unfit mothers and nurses might foster infidel children emerges as well in texts, such as the guidebooks, that delineate household programs for the education of children. David Leverenz has shown that Puritan mothers served as the primary educators of their children during their early years, a responsibility that was linked specifically to their intertwined duty and desire to breastfeed their children.[44] As Robert Pricke proclaims in *The Doctrine of Superiority*, mothers are charged with the "tender care of noursing & bringing [children] up in their younger & more tender years."[45] At birth and while the child was in swadling bands and still nursing, "the care especially lieth upon the mother." As the child grew older, mothers were expected to provide some religious instruction along with their love and nourishment. Cleaver, in fact, maintains that Christian education be concurrent with breastfeeding or at least immediately follow upon the weaning process. St. Paul, he writes "would have them sucke in religion, if not with mothers milke, yet shortly after as-soone as they are capable of it."[46] Religion,

in Cleaver's Pauline formulation, is, in short, almost identical to "mothers milke." The Word is literally sucked in at the maternal breast – a perception that underscores the crucial role that lactating motherhood is mandated to play in the transmission of official discourse. To put this another way, maternal breastfeeding, as represented in the didactic literature on the English home, secures the shifting parameters of English national identity by interpellating children into the state as normative speaking subjects.

Understood in these terms, the figure of the nursing mother, as constructed by the official culture, can be allied to such ideological state apparatuses as the Church, among others, in which discourse is used to repress or eradicate cultural and religious difference.[47] It is not surprising, given the parallel role that the lactating maternal breast and the Church are shown to play with respect to the dissemination of official discourse, that ministers of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Puritan churches conventionally depicted themselves as lactating mothers who could provide spiritual milk, in the form of scriptural truth, to their congregations. Thus Cotton Mather could state at the very end of this long rhetorical tradition: "*Ministers* are your *Mothers* too. Have they not *Travailed in Birth* for you, that a CHRIST may be seen *formed in you*? Are not their *Lips* the *Breasts* thro' which the *sincere Milk of the Word* has pass'd unto you, for your Nourishment?"[48] In relation to this conjoining of maternal (and paternal) breast to scriptural text, mothers' milk to divine Word, non-maternal nurse milk is implicated as an infidel source of linguistic fallibility and insurgence. Wet nurses, in other words, could be said to bear the potential to provide children with a counter-language through which they might eventually articulate unofficial and subversive political and religious truths. Just as she, in practice, stands in for the nursing mother, so the wet nurse represents a substitute or supplemental form of discourse, which gives speech to those (like Jews) disenfranchised by official English language, culture, and nationhood. It is precisely these concerns about language, culture, nation that Spenser voices in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, when he dictates against the English colonial practice of hiring Irish wet nurses: "for the first the childe that sucketh of the [Irish] nurse must of necessity learn his first speech of her, the which being the first that is enured to his tongue is ever after most pleasing unto him, insomuch as though he afterwards be taught English, that the smack of the first will always abide with him, and not only of the speech, but of the manners and conditions."[49] That these same concerns about breast milk, language, and identity can, outside the Irish context, acquire distinctive anti-Semitic valences is exemplified by the story of the Expulsion that the sixteenth-century Jewish historian Samuel Usque narrates in *Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel*. The most salient part of this tale for my purposes here is that which concerns a group medieval English monks who attempt to convert a group of Jewish children by first stealing them from their parents. Their aim was to make the

children forget "their ancient Law" by depriving them of the "nourishment of the Jewish milk they had imbibed," and by filling them instead with "Christian doctrine and faith," or, in other words, "*the sincere Milk of the Word*,"to repeat Cotton Mather's highly suggestive phrase.[50]

It is important to note, especially in light of Fabre-Vassas's important study, that "Jewish milk," as alluded to in the passage above, was habitually linked in the gentile "imaginary" of medieval and Renaissance Europe to pig's milk, or, more specifically, the milk of the *Judensau*, as depicted by, to take but one example, Renaissance German engravings of Jewish men suckling the teats of a sow. As Fabre-Vassas's study makes clear, this perception of Jews' filial relationship to the pig, rendered by the engraving's noxious debasement of the Jewish mother–child relationship, is central to the ways in which Jewishness is racialized as redness, the color of porcine "skin." Red hair, freckles, measles, burns, skin inflammations, leprosy, fevers, among other kinds of red markings and "red" sicknesses that manifest themselves on the skin or elsewhere on the body were associated with Jews, most notably, the red-bearded Judas, the archetypal Jewish Christ-killer. The relevance of Fabre-Vassas's highly suggestive linkage between Jews and redness, as made through the pig, to the issues upon which my essay has focused is further underscored when the "red Jew," to borrow her apt term, is read adjacently with the nursing scenes and sites depicted in the guidebook literature and other early modern texts.[51] "Grievous and terrible" redness, as we have seen, is ever-implicit in the bloody act of breastfeeding, or, to restate Kathryn Schwarz's incisive argument, "nursing threatens to produce the image of the bloody child." I would add that the nursing's latent image of blood-spurting breasts and blood-splattered infants can be affiliated with the racialized and diseased redness that is associated with Jews, even as the horrific red specters potentially evoked by both nurse and Jew are simultaneously repressed by the conversionary act of idealized gentile maternal breastfeeding, which changes red blood into white and, by extension, Jews into Christians.

In all of the texts this essay considers, gentile perceptions of Jews seem fixated on perverse forms of redness, blood, and sucking as signs or symptoms of the so-called diseased, demonic, and unnatural Jewish body and character. Given these preoccupations, it is not surprising that anxieties about Jewish and other forms of racialized difference enter English discourse through the suckled, gentile female breast. This "boundary panic" feeds, and is fed by, the cultural reconstruction of nursing maternity into a political mechanism through which children can be interpellated into the state as normative subjects – a governing reinscription of motherhood that necessitates the demonizing or, more precisely, the Judaizing of wet nurses and other "deviant" maternal figures. It is this same cultural pathology that underpins early modern English attempts to conjoin nation-building and maternal breastfeeding as interlocking social projects, both designed to secure the always-permeable borders between nursing mothers and "others."

Notes

1. Cited by Joshua Tractenberg, *The Devil and Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jews and His Relation to Antisemitism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), 145.
2. Claudine Fabre-Vassas, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, and the Pig*, trans. Carol Volk (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 145.
3. Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*, (New York: Routledge, 1992), 29.
4. Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 169.
5. James Guillimeau, *The Nursing of Children. Wherein is set downe, the ordering and gouernment of them, from their birth*; affixed to *Childbirth, or the Happie Deliverie of Women* (London, 1612), sig.Ii4.
6. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are taken from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, updated fourth edition, ed. David Bevington (New York: Longman-Addison Wesley Longman, 1997) and are noted in the text. Janet Adelman reads these lines in relation to "the fantasy of male parthenogenesis" in *Suffocating Mothers*, p. 225. Gail Paster discusses nursing and orality from a psychoanalytical perspective in *The Body Embarrassed*, pp. 260–80.
7. For illuminating analysis of wet-nursing and maternal surrogacy in *Romeo and Juliet*, see Paster, pp. 220–31.
8. William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties. Eight Treatises*, (London, 1621), p. 518.
9. Gouge, p. 512.
10. David Leverenz, *The Language of Puritan Feeling: an Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1980), p. 72.
11. Gouge, p. 509.
12. Robert Cleaver and John Dod, *A Godly Form of Household Government: For the Ordering of Private Families, according to the Direction of God's Word* (London, 1621, 1st edn., 1614), sig. S4v.
13. Gouge, p. 289.
14. Fabre-Vassas, p. 57.
15. Cleaver and Dod, sig. P4r.
16. Stephen Greenblatt, "Mutilation and Meaning," in *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe*, ed. David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 230, 236–7.
17. Guillimeau, *The Nursing of Children*, Preface, I.i.2.
18. Cleaver and Dod, sig. P4r.
19. Cleaver and Dod, sig. P4v.
20. See "complexion," (entry 4), *Oxford English Dictionary*, which dates the term's first reference to "the natural colour, texture, and appearance of the skin, *esp.* of the face" to 1568.
21. Kim F. Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 3.

22. Illuminating commentary on the "good" breast/"bad" breast dichotomy from perspectives different from my own can be found in Peter B. Erickson, "Patriarchal Structures in *The Winter's Tale*," *PMLA* 97 (1982), 819, and Kathryn Schwarz, "Missing the Breast: Desire, Disease, and the Singular Effect of Amazons," in *The Body in Parts*, p. 157.
23. Mary Janell Metzger argues that prevailing notions of Jews as "resistant and finally integrable," epitomized by Shylock, also led to the construction of "deserving" Jews, i.e. Jessica, who might be "truly convertible" in "'Now by My Hood, a Gentle and No Jew': Jessica, *The Merchant of Venice*, and the Discourse of Early Modern English Identity," *PMLA* 113 (1998): 52–63.
24. Shapiro, p. 171.
25. Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (London, 1626), p. 182.
26. Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 25, 37, 38, 171–4. Laqueur's study is contested by, among others, Gail Paster (*The Body Embarrassed*, esp. Chapter 2 and 4.)
27. Quoted in Shapiro, p. 38.
28. On early modern perceptions of breast milk as a derivative of menstrual blood, see Adelman, p. 7, and Audrey Eccles, *Obstetrics and Gynaecology in Tudor and Stuart England* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1982), pp. 49–50.
29. Notable studies of the myth of Jewish ritual murder include Trachtenberg, R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), Shapiro, pp. 100–111, Fabre-Vassas, pp. 129–36.
30. Shapiro, pp. 101.
31. Stuart Clark, "Inversion, Misrule, and Witchcraft," *Past and Present*, 87 (1980), 110.
32. References to Milton's poetry are taken from *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957) and noted in the text.
33. Purchas, *Pilgrimage*, p. 152.
34. Achsah Guibbory discusses the commingling of "Heathenisme" and "Judaisme" in Herrick's "sacrifice" poems in *Ceremony and Community From Herbert to Donne: Literature, Religion, and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 95–105, and in "The Temple of *Hesperides* and the Anglo-Puritan Controversy," in *"The Muses Common-weal": Poetry and Politics in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (University of Missouri Press, 1988), p. 142.
35. Cited in Leon Poliakov, *A History of Anti-Semitism*, 3 vols. (New York: Vanguard Press, 1974), I, p. 223, and Shapiro, p. 113. Neither provides the source for this quotation. The quotation also implicitly elevates a wife made Amazonian by mastectomy over a gentile man judaized by circumcision.
36. I borrow this translated passage from Fabre-Vassas, p. 119. The original French text appears in *Erreurs populaires* (Paris, 1578), p. 205.
37. Fabre-Vassas, p. 119.
38. Cited in Shapiro, p. 260–1.
39. Thomas Coryate, *Coryate's Crudities; Reprinted from the Edition of 1611. To which Are Now Added, His Letters from India* (London, 1776), vol. 3, sig. U7r–U8v.
40. Shapiro, p. 116.
41. Michel de Montaigne, *Montaigne's Travel Journal*, trans. Donald M. Frame (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1983), pp. 81–2. That the passage was recorded by one of Montaigne's servants charged with compiling the journal may account for its almost complete occlusion of Montaigne's own Jewish lineage, which complicates any reading of this "testimony."

42. Eccles, p. 51.
43. Schwarz, "Missing the Breast," p. 156.
44. Leverenz, p. 73–5. I follow Leverenz's argument very closely here, even though my aims fundamentally diverge from his. While Leverenz argues that the confluence between Christian education and maternal breastfeeding helps to weaken traditional norms of masculinity, I argue, on the contrary, that sucking in the Word, as it were, reinforces official discourses and identities.
45. Robert Pricke, *The Doctrine of Superiority, and subiection, contained in the Fift Commandment* (London, 1609), section K.
46. Robert Cleaver, *A Briefe Explanation of the Whole Booke of the Proverbs of Salomon* (London, 1615), pp. 352–3.
47. My thinking about language and lactation has benefitted from Mihoko Suzuki's theorizing of the (gendered) public sphere and women's political subjectivity in *"Subordinate Subjects": Gender, Class and Nationhood, 1588–1688* (in manuscript), and I would like to thank her for allowing me to see a draft of her study.
48. Cotton Mather, *A Father Departing* ... (Boston, 1723), pp. 22–3.
49. Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. W.L. Renwick (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), p. 67
50. Samuel Usque, *Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel* (Ferrara, 1553), trans. from the Portuguese by Martin A. Cohen (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1965), pp. 181–4. Shapiro counts the threat of Jewish contamination as one of the "more striking aspects of Usque's story," while my focus is on the imagery of "Jewish milk" and breastfeeding, both spiritual and material.
51. Fabre-Vassas, on the *Judensau*, pp. 108, 126, 135; on "The Red Jew," pp. 105–9; the section on "The Mark of Judas," pp. 109–12 is also pertinent.