

Chapter 6

UPHOLDING THE DIGNITY OF THE FAITH AND SEPARATING BELIEVERS AND UNBELIEVERS IN MEDIEVAL CHRISTIAN SOCIETIES

Introduction

The opposition to shared practices in the Islamic world examined in the previous chapter, was, for the most part, directed at actual behaviour by Jews, Christians, and Muslims. This impression is upheld by ample descriptions of these customs by members of multiple communities, both in favour and against. This is not to say that the representation of these practices was not shaped by the agendas of their authors, but the prohibitions and rhetoric in anti-*bida'* treatises, *responsa*, and *fatāwā* were designed to prevent and/or (re)shape the actions and understanding of their authors' co-religionists regarding these mixed practices. By contrast, imagined Jewish behaviour or imitation of Jewish behaviour are themes which pervade Western European, Byzantine, and Armenian legal sources and polemic. Thus, in analyzing oppositional literature in Christian lands, the category of "shared" practices, is, at times, entirely a rhetorical one. The ways in which "imagined" Jewish practice or shared ritual functioned in Western Europe vs. Byzantium and Armenia were quite different however. In Western Europe, the language of legal discourse and literary representation became entangled, one mirroring the other in depicting Jews (and devils) as a disruptive and disrespectful presence during Christian holy days and history. Legal, literary and dramatic depictions of Jews and Muslims participating in and/or mocking Christian rituals and concomitant objections to the same in Western Europe were responses to real situations of Jewish or Muslim interaction with Christians, even if the representations of those interactions were shaped by Christian anxieties. They were also directed at Jews and/or Muslims or at the Christian authorities responsible for regulating Jewish and Muslim behaviour. Latin Christian law, rhetoric, and ritual regarding Jewish and Muslim participation in or mockery of Christian ritual, and use of Christian servants prompted Jews to justify or regulate these interactions, and, to develop counter-rhetoric and rituals, which served as a hidden transcript of resistance against the requirement to participate in papal processions or ritualized violence against the Jewish community.¹ Muslims may have done the same, but as yet no documentation of Muslim counter-rhetoric or ritual has come to light.

In contrast to what one finds in Western Europe, Byzantine and Armenian Christian depictions of Christians imitating Jewish rituals are predominantly directed at other Christians whom a given author found problematic. Although some other, seemingly Christian, groups were also targeted, the primary focus of these accusations was,

¹ Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 7–9, 48–49; Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*.

in fact, contested doctrinal differences between the Armenian, Byzantine, and Western European Churches, as expressed, or imagined to have been expressed, in a select set of rituals.² In discussions of “Judaizing” Christian communities in Asia Minor, the polemical agenda is so strong that without additional or autochthonous testimonies, determining whether there were any actual connections or shared practices between Christians and Jews or Muslims remains tentative, at best.³ While indications of Jewish populations in Armenian territories are anecdotal and scattered, substantial, and often thriving Jewish communities existed in Byzantine lands.⁴ Despite the long-standing presence of a Jewish population, or perhaps because of it, Byzantine prohibitions against Jewish-Christian socializing largely repeat older legislation without further elaborations indicating new anxieties or developments, except in so far as to draw parallels between Jewish and Armenian or Latin Christian practice. These assertions of Judaizing divorced from living Jews are relevant to a study of shared practices because the accusations are constructed around the imitation of another’s sacred rituals, so that such imitation is a core element of the polemic itself. In western medieval Europe, “hermeneutical” Judaism, namely the use of the concept or (biblical) history of Jews to comment on Christian behaviour, or “spectral” Judaism, in which Jews, though absent, affected Christian society through Christians’ fantasies about them, took a number of forms. These included: the evocation of biblical stories about the Israelites (through the lens of Christian interpretations of them) to comment (positively or negatively) on aspects of Christian behaviour; descriptions of feared Jewish behaviour linked to that of Christians the better to condemn those Christians or “heretics”; the use of parallel animal symbolism in which animals traditionally associated with Jews were then linked (usually unfavourably) to some Christian(s), or the corporeal characteristics; attributing the eating habits or purity status of Jews to certain Christians as a form of chastisement.⁵ Therefore, while spectral Judaism in Western Europe may have targeted Jewish ritual, especially Passover/Easter, accusations of shared practices were not the only, or even the primary form of this type of polemic. Armenian and Byzantine hermeneutical or spectral uses of Jews, on the other hand, were especially ritual-centred.⁶ Thus, these accusations and legal regulations formally resemble what we have seen in other Jewish, Christian, and Muslim communities’ discourses about

2 Ohanjanyan, “Armenian–Jewish Connections”; Siecienski, *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory*; Gardette, “The Judaizing Christians”; Kolbaba, “East Roman Anti-Armenian Polemic”; Kolbaba, “Byzantines, Armenians and Latins”; Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 115, 138–39, 148, 153–55, 174–83.

3 Gardette, “The Judaizing Christians.”

4 Stone and Tochyan, *Jews in Ancient and Medieval Armenia*; Holo, *Byzantine Jewry*.

5 Krummel, *Crafting Jewishness*; Krueger, *The Spectral Jew*; Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 201, 210–12, Tomasch, “Postcolonial Chaucer”; Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*; Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, 82–111.

6 On Armenian expressions of hermeneutical or spectral Judaism see Ohanjanyan, “Armenian–Jewish Connections”; Pogossian, “Gli ebrei e il giudaismo nelle fonte armene”; Pogossian, “Jews in Armenian Apocalyptic Traditions”; Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*.

shared practices, but stand somewhat apart, because the connection between accusations of Christian imitation or participation in Jewish practices and actual socialization between Christians and Jews is very thin. Injunctions to avoid imitating Jews, in Byzantine and Armenian texts, were designed to denigrate a particular behaviour and shame members of the author's own community into abandoning it. Alternatively, accusations of Judaizing rituals served to mark one another (Armenians, Byzantines) or other Christian groups, as undesirable. In both cases, "Jewishness" is an internal, Christian tool. Among those studied so far, Byzantine and Armenian authors were not the only ones to use imitation of another community's practices as a form of intra-religious insult and regulation. For example, Sunni Muslims targeted Shi'a Muslims and women by accusing them of adopting the practices of Jews and Christians.⁷ The predominance of this kind of discourse, however, suggests that intra-Christian difference was more threatening and a greater priority to Byzantines and Armenians than the regulation of real-life Jewish-Christian interaction, whereas the latter was imperative to Western Christians, even when that regulation was also imbued with a certain degree of fantasy on the part of Christian authorities.

Byzantine and Armenian objections to Muslim participation in Christian rituals, on the other hand, seem to be rooted in actual interactions between Muslims and both of these Christian communities. I argue that Byzantine refusal to recognize that Muslims and Christians worshipped the same God, and strict prohibitions against allowing non-Christians into churches, and, in the case of Armenians, purity prohibitions regarding non-Christian presence or touch of sacred objects inhibited the development of shared religious practice between Muslims and these Christian communities. This legal trajectory set Byzantine and Armenian Christians apart not only from other Christians, including Eastern Christian communities but also Muslims and Jews.⁸ Byzantine and Armenian accounts of Muslims seeking baptism for their children need to be examined in the context of similar accounts by Muslims and Western Christians in Egypt and the Levant. Tentatively, I would suggest that for Muslims and Christians alike, baptism, particularly bathing in certain pools, was understood to have an apotropaic effect, a belief which Christians from all regions attribute to Muslims, while assigning more lofty theological motives to members of their own community.

What should become apparent in the pages which follow, is that Latin, Byzantine, and Armenian Church authorities struggled to insist that local lay people, priests, and rulers follow the restrictions laid out regarding interactions with non-Christians, often to no avail. Indeed, by the late early modern period, attitudes had changed enough among Armenian church authorities, that they embraced certain similarities between themselves, Jews, and Muslims, and challenged Catholics for not following the same regulations. Evidence of shared practice increases, but further research is needed to confirm the nature and extent of these, an endeavour that is beyond the scope of this book.

7 Cuffel, "From Practice to Polemic" and Chapter 5 of this book.

8 On this see Chapter 4 of this book.

Giving Gifts and Mocking Holy Days: Real and Imagined Shared Practices in Latin Europe

The repetition and adaptation of older prohibitions in western canon law may have been especially pertinent to Iberia and southern Italy where Christians had regular contact with Muslims as well as Jews, but such concerns were not limited to Mediterranean lands. Socialization between Christians and Jews was an issue throughout most of Europe, and certain regions, like medieval Hungary, with its combination of Christians, Jews, Muslims, and Cumans, were viewed by the Church as problematic for many of the same reasons as Mediterranean lands inhabited by populations with a high level of religious diversity.⁹ Building new or repairing old synagogues or mosques was often forbidden, though exceptions were also made or regulations circumvented.¹⁰ Similarly, the papacy and Christian polities sought both to protect Jewish and Muslim buildings and rituals from Christian violence, while at the same time taking measures against Muslim and Jewish mockery of Christian festivals.¹¹ Papal and other decrees regularly prohibited Christians from being servants of Jews and, where relevant, Muslims, and condemned or even excommunicated Christians who served in Jewish homes and were supported by Jews.¹² What I will argue in this section is that while Christian authorities attempted to impose laws, both old and new, to limit shared practices and even conversion between Christians and Jewish and Muslim minorities, at the same time, these prohibitions frequently serve as significant testimony to the extent of shared practices between Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Europe. Christians increasingly suspected Jews and, to a lesser extent, Muslims, of actively luring or compelling Christians, especially Christian servants, into adopting their rituals. Instructions that Jews or Muslims remain inside with closed windows during Holy Week were simultaneously a measure to protect religious minorities from Christian violence, and an attempt to curtail both Jewish and Muslim participation in Christian religious events, and the mockery and even violence which Christians imagined Jews (and Muslims) would direct at Christians and their festivals. Part of Christians' fear, I will suggest, derived from the assumption that Jewish behaviour during their holidays would mirror that of the Christians; just as Christian celebration entailed ritual violence and mockery of Jews, so too, they supposed, must Jewish celebration of their holy days or reaction to Christians' rituals, consist of mockery and violence.

Turning to Jewish and Muslim sources from Latin Europe, leaders also sometimes sought to prevent cross-religious associations during holidays. Jews and Muslims

9 Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, 74–108, 149–89.

10 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:106/107, 2:107, 108, 109; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, pp. 30–31; Riera i Sans, *Els poders públics i les sinagogues*; Assis, *Golden Age*, 210–13; Echevarria, *City of Three Mosques*, 107–10.

11 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:92/93, 308/309, 316–19, 332/333, 2:56, 71, 107–10, 140; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 30–31; Novikoff, "Plateas Publice Discurrentes?"; Cohen, *Christ Killers*, 62.

12 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:296/297, 300/301, 330/331, 2:107–8; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 34. Echevarria, *The City of Three Mosques*, 120.

adapted their laws and practices to accommodate the limitations imposed upon them by Christian law. On occasion, new rituals developed as a direct reaction to Christian practice and expectation. However, some of their practices, like gift-giving on Purim, allowed for the inclusion of non-Jews, and these behaviours were misconstrued by Christian authorities as an attempt to lure Christians to Judaism.

Legal Background

The legal status of Jews in medieval Western Europe, whether according to church law or local, secular laws, has long captured the attention of scholars.¹³ The basis of some of these laws go back to early codes and canons, though in Byzantium and Western Europe the Theodosian Code (439 CE) offered a working foundation.¹⁴ Thereafter, for the early period, Pope Gregory the Great (ca. 540–604 CE) is significant for promulgating laws against undue pressure to convert to Christianity, or Jewish ownership of Christian slaves, and for equitable treatment of Jewish converts to Christianity, the protection of Jewish property, and affirming their continued licit status according to Roman law. He also sought to regulate as well as protect Jewish behaviour in the synagogue, issuing one of the first decrees beginning with the phrase “Sicut Iudaeis non...”, a phrase which was to be repeated by numerous subsequent lawmakers in specifying the rights and restrictions of Jews under ecclesiastical law in Catholic-controlled Europe.¹⁵ Analyses of the legal status of Muslims under Western Christian rule are substantial in number but still fewer in comparison to similar studies on the status of Jews. Generally, before the fourth Lateran Council (1215), Muslims were designated as “Pagani” or “Sarraceni”, and were treated as political, not religious enemies.¹⁶ The terminology largely follows that of eastern Christian communities in their legal discussions of proper interactions with

13 Champagne and Resnick, *Jews and Muslims under the Fourth Lateran Council*; Foschia et al., eds., *Jews in Early Christian Law*; Freidenreich, *Foreigners and their Food*, 107–26; Stow, *Popes, Church and Jews in the Middle Ages*; Abulafia, “The Servitude of Jews and Muslims”; García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula”; Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews*; Synan, *The Popes and the Jews*.

14 Champagne and Resnick, *Jews and Muslims under the Fourth Lateran Council*, ; Hartmann and Pennington, *History of Byzantine Canon and Eastern Canon Law*, 28–30, 44–49, 125–26; Foschia et al., eds., *Jews in Early Christian Law*; Linder, “The Legal Status of the Jews”; Linder, *Jews in the Legal Sources*.

15 Synan, *The Popes and the Jews*, pp. 40–49.

16 Szpiech, “Saracens and Church Councils”; Echevarria, “The Marks of the Other”; Freidenreich, *Foreigners and their Food*, 203–8; Freidenreich, “Muslims in Western Canon Law”; Freidenreich, “Muslims in Canon Law, 650–1000”; Constable, “Regulating Noise”; Jaspert, “Zeichen und Symbole”; Metcalfe, *Muslims of Medieval Italy*, 112–21, 150–54, 170–71, 266–72; Nader, “Urban Muslims, Latin Laws”; Burns, “Jews and Moors in the Siete Partidas”; Abulafia, “Servitude of Jews and Muslims”; Herde, “Christians and Saracens at the Time of the Crusade”; Echevarria, “Política y Religión frente al Islam”; Kedar, “De iudeis et sarracenis”; García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law”; García y García, “Judíos y moros en el ordenamiento canónico medieval”; Bussi, “La condizione giuridical del musulmani ne diritto canonico.”

Muslims.¹⁷ The use of the first of these terms can make identifying when a law code is actually referring to Muslims somewhat challenging.

The crusades and the movement toward greater codification of canon law in Western Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries certainly affected the legal status of Jews and Muslims under Christian rule in Europe; however, John Gilchrist warns against seeing these as drastic shifts from earlier church law. He argues that the increased regulatory tendencies toward Jews evident in Gratian's *Decretum* (ca. 1141 CE) and subsequent legislation were already present in the early eleventh centuries, and that many of these canon collections, like that of Burchard of Worms (d. 1025 CE), continued to remain popular and circulate, often to a greater degree than Gratian's *Decretum*.¹⁸ Many of the laws or papal decrees, predictably, were designed to maintain what Christians considered to be the appropriate hierarchy between Christians and Jews. A good example of this tendency is the letter of Pope Gregory VII (ca. 1015–1085, became pope in 1073 CE) to King Alfonso VI of Castile-Leon, which castigates the king for allowing Jews to hold authority over Christians.¹⁹ Others, however, sought to protect Jews from persecution or forced conversion. Nevertheless, the push toward more systematic codification in general during Pope Gregory VII's reform, also targeted Jews and worked toward eliminating avenues for conversion, socializing, etc.²⁰ Likewise for Muslims, or "Saracens," there were efforts to restrict fraternizing between Muslims and Christians, and Christian military support to Muslims, as well as to protect Muslim converts to Christianity in eleventh century local and papal law. By the Third Lateran Council (1179) Muslims were more frequently mentioned explicitly and grouped with Jews, a trend that continued through the Fourth Lateran Council, which scholars have often seen as a major shifting point for Christian ecclesiastical legislation regarding religious minorities. Central to that shift was Pope Innocent III, who composed a number of letters and rulings which attempted to curtail socialization between Christians, Jews, and Muslims, and to control more strictly Jewish and Muslim behaviour in their religious buildings and homes relative to Christians. As a number of scholars have pointed out, this legislation by Innocent III (ca. 1160/1–1216 CE, r. 1198–1216), culminating with the Fourth Lateran Council, constituted a hardening of papal policy toward the Jews and Muslims generally.²¹

Recently however, researchers have begun to see Lateran IV as a consolidation and application of earlier legislation, rather than a drastic shift in church policy.²² Further-

17 Szpiech, "Saracens and Church Councils."

18 Gilchrist, "Perceptions of the Jews in Canon Law."

19 Gilchrist, "Perceptions of the Jews in Canon Law"; Synan, *The Popes and the Jews*, 65.

20 Gilchrist, "Perceptions of the Jews in Canon Law."

21 Cuffel, "Seductive Sounds"; Champagne and Resnick, *Jews and Muslims under the Fourth Lateran Council*; Tolan, "Of Blood and Milk"; Cohen, "Pope Innocent III, Christian Wet Nurses and the Jews"; Chazan, "Pope Innocent III and the Jews"; Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews*, 63; Synan, *The Popes and the Jews*, 83–102.

22 Szpiech, "Saracens and Church Councils"; Kedar, "De iudeis et sarracenis"; and more generally *Jews and Muslims under the Fourth Lateran Council*; Gilchrist, "Perceptions of the Jews in Canon Law."

more, as Ana Echevarria emphasizes, local and papal law were not identical; indeed, often, royal or local ecclesiastical legislation regarding minorities in Iberia was far more extensive and detailed than papal degrees. This greater level of detail in local law makes sense since this region, along with Sicily, was one of the few to have a substantial Muslim as well as Jewish population. Nor did papal law have jurisdiction over all Muslim populations under Christian rule in Iberia. Also, while Jews and Muslims were frequently bound by the same regulations, there were times when regulations about the two groups differed, or rather certain areas of regulation, such as those dealing with usury or conversion, were discussed and applied more to Jews than to Muslims. Furthermore, rulers in Iberia resisted applying aspects of Lateran IV to varying degrees, and the integration of canon law into local custom and ecclesiastical regulations, or royal policy, thus varied between kingdoms in Iberia. There was, however, an incremental rapprochement between royal law in Iberia and Lateran IV in the thirteenth-century.²³ Ryan Szpiech and Ana Echevarria both suggest that the Council of Vienne (1313–1314 CE) and some of the legislation leading up to it which dealt with Muslims was more significant than the Fourth Lateran.²⁴ In addition to being more restrictive toward Muslim–Christian interaction, these laws also addressed issues specific to current encounters between Muslims and Christians, including but not exclusive to the problem of Christians overhearing the Muslim call to prayer.²⁵

What is significant for the current work, is that while canon law in Latin Europe repeated older legislation designed to prevent or discourage Christians from socializing with, being employed by, or joining the festivals of Jews and later, Muslims, concern about these issues increased from the eleventh through the fourteenth centuries. Local needs and customs had substantial sway over the application of papal and other ecclesiastical decrees designed to regulate these behaviours. Laws were expanded to include socialization between Christians and Muslims, in part to reflect the reality of the rise in the number of Muslims under Christian rule and the concomitant apprehension which that situation provoked. Legislation about the Jews also reflected Christian concerns. Thus, as we have seen in chapter three and will see further in this chapter, these regulations were not supernumerary repetitions of irrelevant legislation dealing with long-defunct issues of interreligious interaction. Rather, they reflected real anxieties, such as those over conversion, or breaches in preferred behaviour of religious minorities (at least from the perspective of the papal see) during festivals and holy days.

Jews and Muslims living under Christian rule were likewise concerned with policing the boundaries between their own community and Christians. Some Muslim legalists insisted that Muslims living under non-Muslim rule should leave in order to settle in Muslim polities.²⁶ Yet many Muslims were unable or unwilling to leave their homes,

23 Echevarria, “The Marks of the Other.”

24 Szpiech, “Saracens and Church Councils”; Echevarria, “The Marks of the Other.”

25 Szpiech, “Saracens and Church Councils”; Echevarria, “The Marks of the Other”; Dohm-van Rossum, “Campanile und Minarett”; Constable, “Regulating Noise”; Jaspert, “Religious Movements in Mudéjar Communities”; Jaspert, “Zeichen und Symbole.”

26 Verskin, *Islamic Law and the Crisis of the Reconquista*; Miller, “Muslim Minorities.”

despite being under Christian rule. Muslims living under Iberian Christian rule drew from standard collections of Muslim law but also adapted these to suit their own circumstances and wrote new legal guides, such as the one by the fifteenth-century Segovian jurist, Yça Jabīr, which provided guidelines for navigating interreligious relations under Christian rule.²⁷

As Talya Fishman has demonstrated, North African and Andalusī Jewish legal thinkers emphasized the importance of orality and traditions of interpretation, and rejected the notion that the Talmud could be used as a direct source of law, although some complained that students attempted to use the Talmud in this way. Sephardi legal traditions after Christian conquest continued in this vein. Jewish leaders and legal thinkers from Christian-ruled Iberia eschewed dependence on the Talmud if it went against Gaonic and custom-based interpretation of the law, and much of the production of legal literature was focused on the creation of legal compendia, of which the *Mishnah Torah* may be seen as an example.²⁸ Moses Maimonides was both very much a product of the legal cultures of medieval (Muslim-ruled) Iberia and North Africa and an influence on subsequent legal thinkers of Christian-ruled Iberia, as well as other parts of the European Mediterranean and in Northern Europe. While the reception of his legal code, *Mishnah Torah*, was not without criticism, the potential impact of his interpretation of laws dealing with non-Jews needs to be kept in mind.²⁹ Yet as we have already seen in the case of charity to non-Jews, European Jews sometimes differed in practice from their more eastern neighbours, even when the basic principle was accepted.³⁰ Thus, attention to local difference in Jewish legal practice and the symbolic significance attributed to those practices are paramount in assessing their potential impact on Jewish relations with Christians or Muslims in a given region.³¹

Christian Servants and the Adoption of Jewish or Muslim Ritual

In later medieval prohibitions against Jews and Muslims having Christian servants or slaves, fear that Jews and Muslims would encourage these servants/slaves to celebrate Jewish or Muslim rituals, and even worse, convert occasionally, appears as a reason for these laws. For example, Pope Gregory IX writing to church officials in German speaking lands (Theutonium) in 1233 complains that Jews made Christian servants adopt Jewish rites. In this he was drawing from very early precedents, in this case, the Council

27 Echevarria, "Food as Custom"; Echevarria, *The City of Three Mosques*, 79, 97–98, 141–42; Wieggers, *Islamic Literature in Spanish and Aljamiado*, 115–33.

28 Fishman, *Becoming the People of the Talmud*, 65–90, 155–67.

29 Fishman, *Becoming the People of the Talmud*, 74–75, 83, 84–85, 159–60; Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides*, 30–37, 43–47, 147–48, 402–6, 452–70, 518–37; Septimus, *Meir Abulafia and the Maimonidean Controversy*; Silver, *Maimonidean Criticism*, 69–108.

30 For a discussion of charity to non-Jews and relevant literature, see Chapter 4.

31 See for example, Micha Perry's analysis of practices of and attitudes toward circumcision in various parts of Europe and the Byzantine Empire; Perry, "Byzantium's Role in the Transmission of Jewish Knowledge."

of Toledo of 589 CE.³² First Honorius III and then Gregory IX expressed the same alarm at Christians slaves and poor in Hungary adopting the rituals of Muslims and, to a lesser extent, Jews and sometimes converting, either freely out of envy for the more comfortable situation of Muslims or Jews, or because they were pressed into doing so by their masters.³³

Expecting servants or slaves to follow the regulations of diet and basic religious guidelines was common, indeed, part of the reason slaves were expected to convert according to Jewish law, was to ensure that they could be trusted to know and follow Jewish law as they served the family. Ideally according to Jewish law, slaves should be converted to Judaism within one year or resold.³⁴ In the past, scholars have maintained that conversion to Judaism or active Jewish proselytization was rare during the Middle Ages, whether in Europe or Islamic lands, because of prohibitions against it.³⁵ Recent scholarship has demonstrated that in Muslim-ruled lands, Jews actively encouraged or expected non-Jewish slaves to convert to Judaism, and that free Christian conversions to Judaism were not uncommon in the Middle East, since most schools of Islamic law did not prohibit conversion from one *dhimmi* religion to another.³⁶ In Europe the situation was more difficult, since prohibitions against abandoning Christianity in favour of another religion were stringent and entailed harsh punishment. Nevertheless, Paola Tartakoff has demonstrated that, for the high Middle Ages as well as the ninth to eleventh centuries, Christians did occasionally convert to Judaism and Jews had specific rituals for such occasions and strategies for assisting such individuals, even if doing so could be quite dangerous for both parties.³⁷ Furthermore, she argues that during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries religious and some secular authorities became especially preoccupied with cases of Christian conversion to Judaism and accused Jews of actively “seducing” Christians from the true faith, or even more nefarious, of kidnap-

32 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:198/199.

33 Grayzel, 1:172/173 208/209; Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom*, 110–11, 152–53; Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 29, 31, 101. Christian lawmakers expressed similar concerns about Muslim slaves of Jews, or even free Jews or Muslims who elected to convert to one another's religion. See Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:324/325; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 97. On Muslim concubines and slaves of Jews in Christian lands, see Asis, *Golden Age*, 265–67.

34 Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 1:136–37; Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 73.

35 Segal, “Conversion to Judaism.”

36 Cuffel, “Conversion and Religious Polemic”; Yagur, “Religious Identity”; Perry, “Conversion as an Aspect of Master–Slave Relationships”; Perry, “Daily Life of Slaves”; Friedman, *Jewish Polygyny*, 32–34, 291–339. On Islamic law on this topic see Yagur, “Religious Identity,” 6–7, 25–27.

37 Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 70–98. For examples of earlier European Christian conversions to Judaism see Chapter 4 and Colafemmina, “La conversion al giudaismo di Andrea arcivescovo di Bari”; Löwe, “Die Apostasie des Pfazdiakons Bodo (838)”; Blumenkranz, “La conversion au judaïsme d'André”; Blumenkranz, “Un pamphlet juif médio-latin”; Blumenkranz, “De nouveau sur Bodo-Eleazar?”

ping Christian children for the purposes of circumcising them and converting them to Judaism.³⁸ Christian authorities made similar accusations against Muslims.³⁹

Concomitant with these charges was the accusation that they induced Christians to follow Jewish (or Muslim) ritual. These two claims are related but cannot always be assumed to be identical. As noted, having servants adopt Jewish ritual was grounded in practical necessity, however, whereas in the Islamic world, discussions of what slaves may or may not do in a Jewish household are usually couched in the expectation that the slave was already Jewish or would be soon, in Europe this expectation does not seem to have been the norm.⁴⁰ One may see this difference and the difficulties of having a non-Jewish servant in a Jewish household quite well in a *responsum* by the Aragonese legal expert, Solomon b. Abraham ibn Adret (1235–1310 CE). Ibn Adret states that uncircumcised servants may not engage in activities forbidden to Jews and he outlines various legal opinions about whether or not food prepared by such servants was permissible, especially in regard to wine and cheese. Ultimately he decides against the kashrut of these foods if prepared by an uncircumcised (i.e. Christian) servant.⁴¹

What is clear in this Jewish text is that Christian servants regularly worked in Jewish homes—Ibn Adret treats this as a commonplace—however, their non-Jewish status limited their usefulness for their Jewish masters. Here there is no discussion of the conversion so feared in Christian legal texts.⁴² However, what is also evident, is that despite these servants not being fully integrated into the Jewish household, they were expected to abide by certain Jewish laws. This regulation would be in part to protect the servant (from the Jewish perspective) and prevent Jews from violating the Torah by proxy. A similar dilemma and set of tensions is evident in a *responsum* by the earlier, influential northern biblical and Talmudic commentator, Shlomo b. Yitzḥaq of Troyes (1040–1105 CE), also known as Rashi:

There was a gentile serving woman who used the unleavened bread of Passover for her own need without separating an offering or measuring it. It was asked of the rabbi and he said, it happens during this time that people follow

38 Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 18–58.

39 Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 29–33, 39–40.

40 Cuffel, “Conversion and Religious Polemic”; Perry, “Daily Life of Slaves.” Tartakoff asserts that Jews in Europe did convert their slaves, although this seems to have been a sporadic occurrence rather than an automatic event. Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 6, 23–24, 27, 73.

41 Ibn Adret, *She’elot ve Teshuvot*, pt. 1 sign 68 (סח). Accessed through the Bar Ilan Database and through Relmin, www.cn-telma.fr//relmin/extrait252566/. Accessed 27 February 2020. Compare with Ibn Adret, *She’elot ve Teshuvot*, pt. 1 sign 59 (ט) Accessed through the Bar Ilan Database 27 February 2020.

42 However, compare with Ibn Adret, *She’elot ve Teshuvot*, pt. 1, sign 124 4.5 (אלף רמ ד"ה) “*teshuvah shifḥah*” Accessed through the Bar Ilan Database 29 February 2020. The question of the status of the children of female servants was an issue in Iberia as well as in the Middle East. Assis, *Golden Age*, 265–67; Friedman, *Jewish Polygyny*, 32–34, 291–339. For Christian servants in the home see Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children*, 122–25, 129–44.

this custom according to the rabbis so that the law of *hallah* not be forgotten by Israel. It is a commandment observed in the land (of Israel). And every command they do in the land (of Israel) is not observed anywhere but the land (of Israel). The *hallah* which is separated from the dough, there is nothing but what is decreed; we do not have to separate *hallah* from the dough which she eats for we did not find that the rabbis decreed to take *hallah* from the dough which male and female slaves/servants eat.⁴³

As in the text by Ibn Adret, the question and then Rashi's answer suggest that Jews were uncertain about the degree to which their non-Jewish servants should follow Jewish law. Rashi's response implies that many Jews expected their servants to comply with Passover regulations—"during this time people follow this custom"—however, ultimately Rashi rejects the obligation of the servant to separate a piece from the dough for her bread, saying this rule only applies in the land of Israel. In both queries, the impulse seems to have been to integrate servants more fully into the Jewish household by accepting food prepared by their hands and expecting the servants to follow Jewish practice. Indeed, queries about what Christian wet nurses should or should not be encouraged to eat, despite very young Jewish children being allowed to eat non-kosher food, upholds the impression that many Jewish householders urged their non-Jewish servants to follow Jewish dietary law.⁴⁴ Jewish leaders were more cautious in their replies, however, and, at least in these two cases, insisted on the servants' status as outsiders in matters of food.

The acceptance of such regulations or customs on the part of the Christian servant (or slave) was precisely what many of the Christian canonists feared. From the description of Ibn Adret, there is no question of Christians celebrating the Jewish holiday, just observing some basic laws governing daily activities. Yet we know from other *responsa*, that Jews, like their Muslim counterparts in North Africa and the Middle East, did give presents to people outside of their community on particular Jewish holidays, such as Purim. Wet nurses collected gifts for the families for whom they worked, and were given gifts themselves. Some rabbis objected to this custom, whereas others understood it as part of their duty to give to the poor of the nations. How widespread this custom was, is unclear; R. Abraham b. Nathan of Lunel, in his *Sefer ha-Manhig*, written at the beginning of the thirteenth century, indicates that giving gifts to wet nurses was a French custom.⁴⁵ Yet Katherine Aron-Beller has shown

43 היתה לו שפחה נכרית שלשה בפסח מצה לצורכה בלא נטילת תרומה ובלא מדידה. ונשאל לר' ואמר חלה בזמן הזה שנוהגין מדרבנן כדי שלא תשתכח תורת חלה מישראל, דמצוה הנוהגת בארץ היא וכל מצוה התלויה בארץ אינה נוהגת אלא בארץ. וחלה הפוטרת בעיסה אינה אלא משום גזירה ואין אנו צריכין להפריש חלה מן העיסה שהיא אוכלת שלא מצינו שגזרו רבנן לישול חלה מן העיסה שהעבדים והשפחות אוכלין; Shlomo b. Yitzḥaq of Troyes *Teshuvot* no. 107. Accessed through the Bar Ilan Database and Relmin, www.cn-telma.fr//relmin/extrait254504/. Also available through Sefaria www.sefaria.org/Teshuvot_Rashi.107.1?vhe=Teshuvot_Rashi_vol.1_New_York_1943&lang=bi.

44 Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children*, 137–38. Most of the sources she gives are from northern Europe. Cohen, "Pope Innocent III, Christian Wet Nurses and the Jews."

45 Abraham b. Nathan of Lunel, *Sefer ha-Manhig*, *hilkhot megillah*, 248–49. R. Samson b. Ṣadok argues that giving gifts to wet nurses is part of Jews' obligation to the poor of the nations. See:

that by the seventeenth century, the expectation that Jews would give gifts to poor Christians on Purim was so ingrained that two constables along with other Christians went to Jewish homes in Modena collecting Purim money in 1625. Problems arose when an elderly Jewish banker, Moisè de Modena declined to give them any money. The constables then accused him before the inquisition saying he had attempted to convert them with the words: "Become Jews and I will give you good Purim." Moisè himself explained that he had declined to give the Christians money for Purim, reserving charity for that holiday for poor Jews and preferring to give Christians the "customary money gift once a year at Christmas" and had told the constables "You're not Jews and this is not your festival, so I am not giving you anything."⁴⁶ Clearly, the custom had spread beyond France. More to the point, Christian anxieties about this custom being a path to conversion had not dissipated over time. Some Jews also continued to find it inappropriate to give gifts to Christians during the Jewish holiday, though one of the many ironies of this case, is that while declining to include Christians within the Jewish holiday of Purim, Moisè de Modena had adopted the Christian custom of giving gifts at Christmas and thus "joined" a Christian festival instead. What should be clear from this example is that despite resistance from both Jews and Christians, the holidays, particularly as they related to gift-giving and sociability between Jews and Christians on a personal level, were becoming increasingly intertwined. As Elisheva Carlebach has demonstrated, Jews from the early modern period, at least, kept careful record of Christian holidays, though generally for practical reasons, *not* to celebrate them.⁴⁷ Christians likewise kept track of Jewish festivals when it suited them or they were a cause of anxiety.

From the Christian perspective, receiving and giving such gifts especially as part of a Jewish religious celebration, would have fuelled the impression that Christians were being drawn into Jewish holidays. Christian leaders considered this expectation by Jews and their Christian servants' compliance with it was tantamount to Christians adopting Jewish rituals. While doing so was sometimes seen as a gateway to conversion, as in the papal letters regarding practices in Hungary, having Christians adopt these rituals was regarded as horrific in its own right. For example, in 1267 Dominicans and Franciscans are encouraged to seek out Jews who have led Christians of either gender into "their execrable rite" (*eorum ritum execrabilem*) and punish them.⁴⁸ Also in 1267, Pope Clement IV used similar language in his bull to the bishops and archbishops of Provence, Toulouse, and Poitiers, complaining that he had heard that "they (the Jews) labour to attract simple Christians of both sexes to their damnable rite"⁴⁹ In the missive, Clement attributes the Jews' success and confidence to their ability to mix easily with Chris-

Samson b. Zadok, *Sefer Tashbats*, no. 172. Rashi opposed the custom, or at least his teacher did. See Shlomo b. Yitzḥaq of Troyes, *Teshuvot* no. 131 accessed through Bar Ilan Database; Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children*, 131.

⁴⁶ Aron-Beller, "Buon Purim." Citation on 162.

⁴⁷ Carlebach, *Palaces of Time*.

⁴⁸ Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2:102–3.

⁴⁹ 'Christianos utriusque sexus simplices ad suum ritum dampnabilem retrahere moliuntur';

tians, having eschewed regulations against any special dress or prohibitions against free socializing. He goes on to cite the usual prohibitions to be enforced, although he begins with the ban against having a Christian serving woman to care for Jewish children and also forbids Christians nurturing Jewish children in their own homes.⁵⁰ While Clement complains about Jews attracting Christians of both sexes, the repeated reference here and in other bulls to female Christian servants engaged in childcare being drawn into joining Jewish rituals combined with Jewish sources describing such women joining in *Purim* celebrations indicates that this particular holiday attracted interreligious participation. This pattern parallels evidence in many of the Muslim sources discussed in the previous section, suggesting that holidays involving gift-giving and children seem to have been a particularly powerful enticement for people to overlook boundaries of religious affiliation. In Western Europe this tendency takes a sinister turn, as Christians come to imagine that Christian children's involvement with Jewish rituals would lead to their death.⁵¹

Condemning Conviviality, and Fearing the Lure of Others' Festivals

There are also indications that the Jewish (or Muslim) rituals into which authorities feared Christians were being seduced were far more extensive than mere household regulations of everyday life or the exchange of occasional presents. In a papal letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1286, the Franciscan John Peckham, one finds the following complaint:

One should not forget the crime of those Jews that invites the orthodox to worship with them on the day of the Sabbath or other solemnities or instantly leads them into the Synagogue so that they (Christians) should listen to their (Jews') offices (liturgy), so that according to the custom of his ritual, they show reverence to a scroll rolled in parchment, rather, the book, in which their written law is stated, reverently exhibited, so that many Christians Judaize no less than the Jews themselves.⁵²

Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2:108. See discussion in Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 32–33.

50 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2:106–7, 108. On Jews having children nursed in Christian homes, as well as having Christian wet-nurses and servants, see Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children*, 139–43; Cohen, “Pope Innocent III, Christian Wet Nurses and the Jews.”

51 Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*; Rubin, *Gentile Tales*.

52 Non omittit Judaeorum ipsorum nequitia, quin fidei orthodoxae cultores quolibet die Sabbati, ac aliis sollemnitatibus eorumdem invitet, ac instanter inducat, ut in Synagogis suis ipsorum officium audient, illudque juxta sui ritus consuetudinem solemnizent rotulo involuto membranis, seu libro, in quibus lex eorum conscripta consistit, reverentiam exhibentes: quamobrem plerique Christicolae cum Judaeis pariter judaizant. Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2:159 and 158 for a slightly different translation. Compare with Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2: 179–80.

What is striking about this passage, is that whereas other, earlier Christian texts protesting such behaviour place the initiative and blame on Christians for going to the synagogue, this text seems to imply that Jews themselves *invited* Christians to the synagogue service and other holy days, and thus were desirous of having them there.⁵³ Presenting the Jews as the ones who invite the Christians follows the rhetorical strategy which Tartakoff noted in relation to Christian fears of Jews luring Christians to convert to Judaism. This passage may thus represent an effort on the part of the Christian author to further condemn the Jews as ones who lead Christians astray, rather than a real record of Jews actively seeking the participation of Christians in their holy days. What becomes especially apparent in this passage in combination with repeated prohibitions against Christians staying and serving in Jewish (and Muslim) homes and participating in non-Christian rituals there, is that what Christian officials imagined and feared was the two-sided desire for and by Christians to join the celebrations and rites of Jews and Muslims. Indeed, in this letter, not only does the author protest that Jews made their Christian servants work on Sundays, but he fears the consequences of daily familiarity and conviviality:

Nevertheless, other Christians and Jews in turn knowingly come together in their own homes in order to idly eat and drink together, (thus) the groundwork for error is prepared.⁵⁴

The anxiety in this letter regarding Jewish efforts to entice Christians to join their rituals or engage in unnecessary and friendly socializing needs to be placed in the context of the turmoil caused by the accusation that a Jew, Seniore b. Josce, had circumcised Edward, son of the physician Benedict, in Norwich. The charge eventually led to the execution of a number of leading Jews, the flight of several others, and the elaboration of this case into a ritual murder accusation.⁵⁵ Four years after the composition of this letter, Jews were expelled from England entirely.

While the reaction to this particular case was extreme and long-lasting, the picture of casual commensality was hardly unique to England. Ana Echevarria notes that in Iberia guilds and confraternities had both Muslims and Christians as members, and that Muslims dined at the homes of Christian colleagues. The regulations of such organizations sometimes required that all members, Muslims and Christians alike, attend celebrations, such as weddings, or pay a fine.⁵⁶ Requirements by guilds and local officials

53 Occasionally during the early Middle Ages, Christians feared that Jews actively enticed Christians to participate in Jewish religious services. See Gerhardus Mongontiacensis, *Der Brief*, 112–14, also in Linder, *Jews in the Legal Sources*, 622–25 and Relmin, Notice no. 137014, projet RELMIN, “Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l’espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e–XV^e siècle),” Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait137014/.

54 Alii nihilominus Christiani et Judaei vicissim in domibus propriis saepe convenient; et dum simul commensationibus, et potationibus vacant, erroris material praeparatur; Grazyel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 2:159 and 158 for a slightly different translation.

55 Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 1–10, 49–67.

56 Echevarria, “Food as Custom.” See especially 97 and nn27–28.

that Jews or Muslims contribute to Christian festivities, ran directly counter to other prohibitions, usually enacted by representatives of the church, which sought to curtail such interactions.⁵⁷ Local and papal canons regularly prohibited Jews and Muslims from attending the funerals, weddings, and baptisms of Christians, whether as guests or as professional mourners or entertainers, and they forbade Christians from attending equivalent ceremonies, such as circumcisions, etc.⁵⁸ A fifteenth-century version of such a law from Valladolid listed a variety of jobs that Christians could not do for Muslims or Jews and vice versa, then went on to stipulate that Muslims and Jews:

neither come nor go to the weddings, neither to funerals nor to the tombs of Christians, they should not be godmothers or godfathers (literally “co-mothers” *conmadres* or “co-fathers” *conpadres*) of the Christians nor should Christian men or Christian women of them, neither going to their weddings nor tombs.⁵⁹

The impression that this passage gives is that Muslims, Jews, and Christians did not merely hire one another to perform in private and public events, women and men of each community also developed close, deep ties of friendship and family, provoking sufficient grief that they visited one another’s graves beyond the confines of the funeral and took responsibility for one another’s children. It is possible that the prohibition against visiting the sepulchres of members of other communities is a reference to a kind of localized *ziyāra*, and that these were members of the “special dead” to whom the living could turn for intercession.⁶⁰ Given the very familial, personal level of activities which are forbidden, however, it seems more likely that the passage refers to visiting the graves of friends and family.⁶¹ In either case, these were exchanges authorities sought to discourage. Disobedience risked a fine.

These laws were part of an increasing body of regulations against socializing between Christians, Jews, and Muslims, and prosecution of Christians who violated such dictates. For example, according to a short register of inquisitorial denunciations from fourteenth-century Aragon, a group of Christians, including guards and minor officials

57 On the requirement for Jews or Muslims to participate in Christian festivities see Chapter 3.

58 Archives de Perpignan, livre 1er des “Ordinaciones” de la cour du bailli de Perpignan fol. 7v, cited in Régéné, *History of the Jews in Aragon*, no. 2592; 1481 Synod of Avila, in García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula,” Tit. VII, Cap. 2, p. 46; Baer, *Die Juden in Christlichen Spanien*, 2:141, 166, 263–70; Baer, *History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, 1:313; Catlos, *Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom*, 438, 472–74, 482; Montenegro, “Actividades socio-profesionales de la mujer judía”; Balbás, *Algunos aspectos*, 71, 78–79.

59 “nin vengan nin vayan a honras ni a bodas ni a sepolturas de christianos, nin sean comadres nin conpadres de los christianos nin los christianos e christianas dellos, nin vayan a sus bodas nin sepolturas”; Baer, *Die Juden in Christlichen Spanien*, 2:266, para. 4.

60 On the practice of local *ziyāra* in Iberia, see Jaspert, “Religious Movements in Mudéjar Communities.”

61 Which is not to say that the two activities were mutually exclusive. Jews at least, visited and prayed at the gravesites of family members, seemingly also hoping for their intercession. Cuffel, “Gendered Visions”; Cuffel, “Between Reverence and Fear”; Horowitz, “Speaking to the Dead”; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 5:183–84.

in Gerona were reprimanded for celebrating, playing, drinking, and eating with Jews in the Jewish quarter during a Christian holy day. Upon further investigation, the bailiff was found to have sold the license to engage in these activities in the Jewish quarter on that day, which resulted in Christians “playing” (*luserant*) with the Jews.⁶² Here the tension between local custom and efforts to curtail shared festivities by royal or higher ecclesiastical authorities is quite clear. Additional costs imposed for such behaviour was not always an effective deterrent.

Particularly intriguing for the question of shared religious practices are chapters four and six of title VII of a synod of Avila which took place in 1481. These laws were recopied for the synod of 1556, suggesting their enduring relevance.⁶³ Chapter four addresses whether Jews and Muslims are allowed to be in churches, in particular, during mass. In general, the text prohibits Muslims and Jews from entering churches, but if extenuating circumstances provide good reason for their presence, they should still be made to leave during the Eucharist ceremony. Attending church in order to hear a sermon, or for catechism, on the other hand, was allowed.⁶⁴ Already in 1222, a similar but less elaborate prohibition against Jews entering churches was issued in Oxford.⁶⁵ Presumably such proscriptions were enacted in reaction to the seemingly common practice of having Jews and Muslims perform as part in religious celebrations.⁶⁶ In the synod of Avila, the fact that clerics and sacristans were particularly charged with carrying out these stipulations as well as ceasing rites funerary rites if Muslims or Jews were present weeping and lamenting, suggests that local church officials were in the habit of allowing Jews and Muslims to enter churches and to participate in Christian funerals, all customs that the higher clergy were eager to end.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, contestations over whether non-Christians should be allowed to share religious spaces or saints, or even enter sanctuaries which the Christians deemed “theirs,” are also occasionally reflected in hagiographical literature, albeit in a more dramatic fashion than in legal decrees. In Lucas de Tuy’s *Miracula Sancti Isidori*, as we have seen, miracles involving Jews or Muslims frequently delineate boundaries between Christian and non-Christian in starkly triumphalist terms. One of these recounts the impulse of some Muslims and Christians to share holy sites and people. Already the anxiety which underlay the composition of the *Miracula* is expressed early in the book, in chapter one:

62 Omant, “Mémorial de l’inquisition d’Aragon,” esp. p. 265, fols. 12–13v; Nirenberg, “Les juifs, la violence et le sacré,” esp. 112–13. Compare with ACA: C 13: 276v/Reg. 13. fol. 276v from James I cited in in Régéné, *History of the Jews in Aragon*, no. 339; 1481 Synod of Avila, in García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula,” Tit. VII, Cap. 1, Cap. 3, Cap. 5, pp. 45, 46, 47–48.

63 García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula.”

64 García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula,” 47.

65 Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth century*, 1:314/315.

66 On this topic and relevant bibliography, see Chapter 4 of this book.

But of the outrages by the enormous cooling of the faith of Christians and the abominable growing sect of the Saracens, the state of Spain is deprived of Christians as it is led by means of (literally: “by the hands of”) the sacrileges of the infidel.⁶⁷

Strikingly, what is depriving Spain of Christians is not depredations due to war with the Muslims, but rather the weak faith of Christians and the growing strength of the Muslim one, which, the text implies, leads to conversions to Islam, or, at least toward the “sacrileges” of the Muslims. This apprehension about the allure of Islamic practices and potential Christian conversion very much parallels the anxieties expressed in the legal texts discussed above.⁶⁸ Connected to this issue was Christian apprehension about the competition with Christian religious noise which the *adhān*, i.e. the Muslim call to prayer, might pose, objections to the doctrinal content of the *adhān*, its connection to Muslim pilgrimage to local holy individuals, and finally its potential to draw Christians (including former Muslims) to convert.⁶⁹ The most famous expression of this unease is in the Council of Vienne in 1311–1312, which, among other decrees, prohibited the *adhān*, yet, as Olivia Remie Constable and others have demonstrated, this was not the first attempt ruling in this direction, nor did it definitively halt the sounding of the *adhān*.⁷⁰ In chapter 20 of the *Miracula Sancti Isidori* these various concerns are reflected in dramatic detail as Christians and Muslims compete spatially and aurally for access and eventually domination of a holy gravesite. The conflict begins when the king hears “that they approached the holy tomb together, Ishmaelite with Christian, about to petition blessings from Christ.”⁷¹ When the king prohibits Muslims access to the site on pain of death, tensions escalate. Muslims eventually build their own tower and one of their clerics, Almodonus:

ascended the tower; in order that he proclaim a certain devil, with unfortunate expressions, as is their custom of the sect. Who, by beginning to bring forth sacrilegious words, he fell from the top of the roof and perished, every member smashed to pieces.⁷²

The narrative continues, accrediting Isidore for vindicating the Christians, and emphasizing that the unfortunate Almodonus, “most perfect in the law of Muhammad” (*in lege*

67 “Sed facinorum enormitate tepescente fide christianorum, et sarrecenorum nafaria secta crescente, civitas Hispanalensis a christianis orbata et, ut manibus sacrilegis infidelium est ducta”; Lucas de Tuy, *Liber de Miraculis Sancti Isidori*, chap. 50, fol. 1b.

68 Also see Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 18–58.

69 Constable, “Regulating Religious Noise.”

70 Szpiech, “Saracens and Church Councils”; Dohm-van Rossum, “Campanile und Minarett”; Constable, “Regulating Religious Noise”; Jaspert, “Zeichen und Symbole”; Tolan, “Affreux vacarme.”

71 “quod Hismaelito cum christianis ad sanctum simul accederent tumulum, beneficia petitori a Christo”; Lucas de Tuy, *Liber de Miraculis Sancti Isidori*, chap. 20, fol. 46.

72 “ascendit turrim, ut ex more eorum sectae diabolicum quodam infaustis vocibus aclamaret. Qui incohando verba sacrilege promere, de summo fastigio corruit, et membris, ferè omnibus frustatim comminutis interiit”; Lucas de Tuy, *Liber de Miraculis Sancti Isidori*, chap. 20, fol. 47.

Macometi perfectissimis) died for his blasphemy, having “quickly ascended and begun to crow a miserable song with a tremulous voice.”⁷³

In contrast to many other tales in travel narratives or hagiographies of real or imagined Muslim or Jewish veneration of a Christian saint or holy place, in this instance, Muslim reverence brings no honour to St. Isidore. Rather, when Christians and Muslims visit a holy grave together, the king bans the Muslims, much as Muslims are proscribed from entering churches in the legal texts discussed above. When that prohibition is challenged, only the utter destruction of the Muslim antagonist suffices, in contrast to mere punishment by the saint, as was common in travel narratives.⁷⁴ Lucas de Tuy emphasizes that Almodonus should be understood as Isidore’s (living) Muslim equivalent when he says that Almodonus is most perfect in Muslim law; the unspoken but obvious parallel to Almodonus is Isidore, one of the first “doctors” of Christian thought from Iberia. Almodonus’ perfection in his own religion heightens the miraculous power which may be attributed to Isidore by defeating him. In this text, the description of Muslim religious noise as ugly—“crow(ing) a miserable song with a tremulous voice”—and blasphemous, follows what a number of scholars have observed regarding Christian descriptions of the Muslim call to prayer, namely that by portraying it as cacophonous or aurally repellent in other ways, Christians marked Muslim religious sound as evil and undesirable.⁷⁵ In the context of thirteenth-century Iberia and later, where competition between Muslim and Christian religious noise was being constantly renegotiated, a tale in which a Christian saint brutally cuts off the sound of Muslim prayer would have been appealing to those who sought to silence Muslim religious noise. That the tale is told as part of a narrative about shared veneration is also significant, for as a number of scholars have pointed out, Christian condemnations of the *adhān* and other forms of Muslim celebrations were frequently tied to attempts by Christian authorities to limit the practice *ziyāra* to the graves of local holy figures.⁷⁶ In this light, chapter twenty of *Miracula Sancti Isidori* is designed to countermand Christian acceptance of Muslims in churches or other holy spaces, or tolerance of Muslim religious sound or pilgrimage destinations that might be shared, wittingly or otherwise by Christians. Instead, Isidore is set up as the uncompromising, true saint, and the correct focus for pilgrimage.

Related to such practices, chapter six of the laws enacted by the synod of Avila, entitled, “That in those town councils or processions held in honour of God, neither Jews nor Muslims should participate nor those so called,” as the title suggests, attempts to restrict Jewish and Muslim involvement in Christian processions.⁷⁷ This particular text speci-

73 “festinus ascendit, et misera carmina voce tremula canere coepit”; Lucas de Tuy, *Liber de Miraculis Sancti Isidori*, chap. 20, 48. The entire chapter runs 45–49.

74 See, for example, Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d’Outremer*, 40 and discussion in Chapter 2.

75 Cuffel, “Seductive Sounds”; Tolan, “Affreux vacarme.”

76 Jaspert, “Religious Movements in Mudéjar Communities”; Constable, “Regulating Noise.”

77 “Que en los ayuntamientos o processions que se fizieren a honor de Dios, non intervengan ni estan los judios y los moros, ni para ello sean llamados”; García y García, “Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula,” 48.

fies that Jews and Muslims were *compelled* to join such festivities, a custom the author protests vigorously:

An abuse we have seen done in this city of Avila, at which we have seen in no other place of the Christians; that Jews and Muslims are compelled to walk in procession and to make dances and other (expressions of) joy on the day of Corpus Christi and other general processions of the religion and Christian celebration, which, for some well-known benefits of God are made to belong to the Christian faithful, giving the thanks to God that they can for the benefit that he has given to them. And we do not know for what reason or what blindness by such holy and faithful councils have to agree and require infidels to participate, to make a monstrous body, unifying two species of infidelity, a head of a faith like ours, so holy and true, where, in place of God's honour, one follows shame, because as the Wise one said, "praise in the mouth of a sinner does not seem good" in place of which they blaspheme among themselves the holy name of Jesus Christ which is invoked over us...we establish and command in this our bishopric, in the processions and councils of the clergy and the people that are made in honour of God, the aforementioned Jewish and Muslim infidels who proceed from here, do not go and cannot participate nor may they be compelled to do so on pain of further excommunication which, for this same fact, judges, both ecclesiastical and secular incur, who call, cause to call or give it authority or favour, or counsel or aid or any other person; and we request beyond this punishment you fine each one of those ecclesiastical judges a penalty of six *doblas*...Nor for that do we seek that they (Muslims and Jews) be excused from processions and councils that are made to receive kings, princes and other secular acts.⁷⁸

78 "Una abusion havemos visto fazer en esta ciudad de Avila, la qual en ningun lugar de christianos vimos: que los judios y moros son compelidos a andar en procession y fazer danças y otras alegrías el día del Cuerpo de nuestro Señor y otras processiones generales de la religiosa y Christiana alegría que, por algunos beneficios rescibidos de Dios, pertenesce fazer a los fieles christianos, dando las gracias que pueden a Dios por el beneficio que les ha hecho. Y non sabemos por que razon o con que ceguedad, a tan santos y fieles ayuntamientos hayan de concurrir y ser necessitados a intervenir los infieles, a fazer un cuerpo monstruoso, ayuntadas dos especies de infidelidad a tan santa y verdadera cabeça de fe como la nuestra, donde, en lugar de honor de Dios, se sigue vituperio, porque, como dize el Sabio, 'no paresce bien la alabança en boca del pecador', en lugar de la qual, ellos blasfeman entre si el sancto nombre de Jesuchristo que es invocado sobre nosotros... statuimos y mandamos que en este nuestro obispado, en las processiones y ayuntamientos del clero y del pueblo que por honra de Dios se fazen, los dichos judios y moros infieles de aqui adelante no vayan ni puedan intervenir, ni puedan ser a ello compelidos, so pena de excomunion mayor, la qual incurran por ese mismo fecho los juezes, asi ecclesiasticos como seglares, que los llamaren o fizieren llamar o diereoridad o favor o consejo o ayuda, o qualquier otra persona; y queremos, allende desta pena, caiga cada uno de los juezes ecclesiasticos en pena de seys doblas, ... Ni por eso queremos sean excusados de las processiones y ayuntamientos que se fazen a recebimientos de reyes y princepes y otros actos seglares"; García y García, "Jews and Muslims in the Canon Law of the Iberian Peninsula," 48.

Avila was not exceptional in engaging in such behaviour, as we have seen.⁷⁹ In this particular passage, however, the tension between local authorities, both clerical and secular, and higher ecclesiastical officials is clear. The church sought to differentiate between secular and religious celebrations; in the former, Muslims and Jews could participate, in the latter, not. Yet, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, according to local custom in Iberia, the games, music, and dance of Muslims and Jews became such an ingrained element of certain kinds of ceremonies, in particular processions, that Christians could not conceive of festivities without them, even to the point of requiring Jews and Muslims to perform in them—a practice clearly described in this passage. When Muslims and Jews were no longer present and available in Iberia, Christian dressing up as such and took on their former roles. Indeed, while the phrase to “those so called (Muslims or Jews)” in the title of chapter six probably refers to new Christians, i.e. Jewish or Muslim converts to Christianity or their descendants, it is possible that this is an oblique reference to the custom of Christians disguising themselves as Muslims or Jews in order to take on their usual roles. The episcopal author of the text cited above desperately sought to curb such behaviour through penalties, especially against clerical perpetrators. Although I have shown that royal entries often contained religious elements, this author distinguished between those, which he considered secular and therefore open to non-Christians, and religious processions, in which, he argued, the participation of Jews and Muslims was utterly inappropriate. Part of the reason he condemned Jewish and Muslim participation, was that, according to him, they blasphemed Jesus. Thus, their presence brought shame rather than honour to God and the Christian holy day.

These same tensions and mores were likewise addressed in more playful terms in satirical literature from Iberia. In *The Book of Good Love* (*El Libro de Buen Amor*), by the Castilian poet Juan Ruiz (ca. 1283–1350 CE), after a series of stanzas outlining the death of Jesus and the Jews’ villainous role in killing him, the narrative turns to the contest between “Lady Lent” (*Doña Cuaresma*) and “Sir Carnal” (*Don Carnal*), presented as the opponent of Lent and unrepentantly devoted to the pleasures of food. Sir Carnal flees the church where Holy Week services are being conducted and goes to the Jewish quarter (*la jodería*) when Passover was about to begin—signified, appropriately enough, by a kind of food—the unleavened bread of Passover—and is welcomed there. He sees that it is a “good day” (*buen día*) i.e. a holiday, and his escape is further assisted by the Jews.⁸⁰ As Michelle Hamilton has pointed out, a further difference between Sir Carnal and Lady Lent, is that Carnal embraces Jews and Muslims’ participation in the festivities and calls to them specifically for aid and offers them beef, whereas Lady Lent begins the Christian holy season by blessing priests and clerics—provided that they are not fornicators.⁸¹ Then, during Easter, Sir Love, a friend of Sir Carnal, is greeted with a procession, com-

⁷⁹ See Chapter 4.

⁸⁰ Juan Ruiz *El Libro de Buen Amor*, stanzas 1050–1055, 1063–1065, 1181–1184. For the strife between Lent and carnality, see stanzas 1067–1209. Hamilton, “Carnal, Carnival and Purim.”

⁸¹ Juan Ruiz *El Libro de Buen Amor*, stanzas 1193, 1069. Hamilton, “Carnal, Carnival and Purim.”

plete with flowers, fancy birds, multiple colours, townspeople, various types of churchmen and nuns, tents, dancing, *and* Muslim and Jewish musicians and music.⁸²

In this text, like the synod of Avila, the Christian religious holiday is in competition with more worldly or “secular” expectations of festive events, represented by Sir Carnal, which Hamilton translates as “Sir Carnival.” Jews and Muslims, with their foods and music, are very much part of and welcomed into this worldly approach to festivities, as they were in actual processions and celebrations in Iberia. By contrast, the stricter, more ideal religious view, represented by Lent, allowed only (good) Christians. Clergy of various types, as indicated in legal texts relating to such events, were on both sides. Indeed, the caveat that Lady Lent blesses only those clerics and priests not engaging in fornication is, perhaps, intended as an insinuation that the number of Christian religious leaders who adhered strictly to the churches’ regulations was quite sparse. Thus, as in the legal texts, this satirical poem presents a church divided based on who should participate in religious as well as other types of processions, and how festivals should be celebrated, while at the same time, providing evidence of how common such interreligious “sharing” was. More insidious, is the depiction of Sir Carnal leaving the church during Holy Week in favour of Jewish space, food, and religious celebration. Here again, the fear that Christians would be lured into the observance or co-celebration of non-Christian, in this case Jewish, holy days is presented this time in poetic form. The poet signals that these are sinful behaviours which dishonour the Christian holiday, first by reminding the readers of the Jews’ actions against Jesus in the stanzas before the contest between Lady Lent, Sirs Carnal and Love, and secondly, by linking such behaviours explicitly with carnality, in the form of gluttony and other sensual pleasures, and the Jews, who were likewise linked with carnality in the Christian tradition.⁸³

Fear of Real and Imagined Violence of Tongue and Deed

The fear of blasphemy, of dishonourable or even violent deeds and tales by Jews and Muslims, which related to Christian holy spaces, days, or people, was frequently evoked in canon law texts. Included in these were expressions of fear that Jews would not only engage in insulting behaviour toward Christianity, but that they would force Christians working for them into actively insulting Christianity.⁸⁴ Christian fears that Jews in particular would engage in ritual behaviour insulting to Christianity, either during their own festivals, such as Purim, or during Christian ones which the Jews especially scorned, such

⁸² Juan Ruiz *El Libro de Buen Amor*, stanzas 1225–1312. For the characteristics of processions in Iberia, see Chapter 3 and Cuffel, “Seductive Sounds”; Ruiz, *A King Travels*; Ruiz, “Elite and Popular Culture”;

⁸³ Abulafia, “Bodies in the Jewish–Christian debate.”

⁸⁴ Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:114–17, 182/183, 198/199, 250/251–252/253, 308/309, 316/317–318/319, 341–43, 2:106–10; Baer, *Die Juden in Christlichen Spanien*, 2:40, 45, 227, 331; Omont, “Mémorial de l’inquisition d’Aragon,” esp. p. 265, fols. 12–13v; Tolan, “Blasphemy and Protection of the Faith”; Tolan, “Of Blood and Milk”; Cohen, “Pope Innocent III, Christian Wet Nurses and the Jews.”

as Easter was an old one, already addressed in the Theodosian code.⁸⁵ The Theodosian code also stipulates that Jews' synagogues and their right to celebrate the Sabbath according to their own customs were protected.⁸⁶ This protection is elaborated upon and repeated in Christian legislation, specifying that none should disturb them or throw stones at the Jews during their festivals, or desecrate their cemeteries.⁸⁷ Legislation requiring Jews and Muslims to stay inside their homes, close their windows and doors and not travel about on the streets served a two-tiered function; to protect non-Christians from Christian festive violence on the one hand, and to prevent Jews and Muslims from participating in or disturbing Christian holidays on the other.⁸⁸ The dual function of such regulations is expressed mildly and clearly in a text from the spring of 1227 of the council of Narbonne, wherein Jews are ordered not to leave their homes during Holy Week unless necessary, "lest they scandalize the Christians or be scandalized by them."⁸⁹

In the thirteenth century, however, a new element enters these expressions of concern, namely references to the Talmud or to blaspheming Mary or Jesus in particular.⁹⁰

85 Theodosian Code 16.8.18; Notice no. 979, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait979; Tolan, "The Rites of Purim."

86 Theodosian Code, 16.8.20; Notice no. 244151, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait244151/.

87 "Sicut Iudeis" of Pope Clement III, Notice no. 87468, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait87468/; Sicut Judaeis of Pope Alexander III, Notice no. 103877, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait103877/; Raymond of Peñafort Notice no. 136266, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait136266/; Grayzel *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:92/93–94/95, 2:56, 70–71, 140, 148–49; Grayzel, "The Papal Bull *Sicut Judaeis*."

88 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:308/309, 316/317, 332/333, 2:107; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, pp. 30–31, also in Notice no. 238333, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait238333/; *Liber provinionum et reformacionum comunis Placentie*, busta 2, registro 11, 24r, Notice no. 254508, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait254508/.

89 "Et ne Christianos scandalizent, vel scandalizentur ab iis"; Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:316/317.

90 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:106/107–108/109, 250/251, 2:107, 157–59; Baer, *Die Juden in Christlichen Spanien*, 2: 40, para. 3, 2:227 para. 1; *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 30–31, also in Notice no. 238333, projet RELMIN, "Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e-XV^e siècle)," Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait238333/.

In 1205 Pope Innocent III wrote to King Philip-Augustus of France (1165–1223 CE, r. 1180–1223) protesting that Jews were: “blaspheming against the name of the Lord, they publicly insult Christians by saying that they (the Christians) believe in a peasant who had been hanged by the Jewish people.”⁹¹ The letter goes on to complain how the Jews “contrary to old custom” (*contra veterem consuetudinem*) run about publicly, deriding the Christians for venerating the cross, and trying to dissuade them from it.⁹² Of particular significance here and in other texts by Innocent III, however, is the fear of Jewish mockery and abuse of Christianity and Christian ritual. His reference to the Jews going against “old custom” suggests that he saw Jews’ behaviour as a new development, which was especially disturbing to him.⁹³ In contrast to the missive of Pope Innocent IV (ca. 1195–1254 CE) to the ruler of France in 1244, which was written in the aftermath of the Paris Talmud trial of 1240, here there is no direct reference to the Talmud nor details which allow an unequivocal connection between the reputed polemic which Innocent attributes to the Jews here and the Jewish anti-Gospel, the *Toledot Yeshu*. Nevertheless, the biographical details given of Jesus here echo the tone of those in the Babylonian Talmud and versions of the *Toledot Yeshu*, suggesting that Christians were aware of and disturbed by such Jewish counter-narratives in the very early thirteenth century, at least.⁹⁴ Concerns about insulting renditions of Jesus and Mary’s life-stories were one element in a larger Christian discourse about Jewish mockery, verbal and even physical violence against adult Christians, their children, or their sacred objects, especially during Holy Week. Jews’ enactment of ritual murder and desecration of Christian holy objects are presented in both legal and hagiographic texts such as Alfonso the X’s *Siete Partidas*, or the *Miracles of Our Lady*, by Gonzalo de Berceo (ca. 1197–before 1264 CE), as activities which the Jews undertake during Christian holy week, or in other texts, during Pass-over, which was closely associated with Easter.⁹⁵ Thus, Christians imagined that Jews engaged in a variety of synchronic, counter-rituals, which were, in according to some

91 “nomen Domini blasphemantes, publice Christianis insultant, quod credant in rusticum quemdam suspensum a populo Judeorum”; Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:106/107.

92 Grayzel, *Church and the Jews in the XIII Century*, 1:108/109.

93 Tolan, “Of Blood and Milk.”

94 Meerson and Schäfer, ed. and transl., *Toledot Yeshu: The Life Story of Jesus*; Certainly, versions of the *Toledot Yeshu* were known in Iberia, and had been known in France during the early Middle Ages. Schäfer, “Agobard’s and Amulo’s *Toledot Yeshu*”; Meerson, “Meaningful Nonsense”; Tartakoff, “The *Toledot Yeshu*,” all in *Toledot Yeshu (“The Life Story of Jesus”) Revisited*, ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch, 27–48, 181–95, 297–309 respectively; Cuffel, “Between Epic Entertainment and Polemical Exegesis”; Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud*; Jordan, “Marian Devotion and the Talmud Trial of 1240”; Biale, “Counter-History.”

95 *Alfonso X and the Jews*, 30–31, also in Notice no. 238333, projet RELMIN, “Le statut légal des minorités religieuses dans l’espace euro-méditerranéen (V^e–XV^e siècle),” Edition électronique Telma, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes – Orléans, www.cn-telma.fr/remlin/extrait238333/; Gonzalo de Berceo, *Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, stanzas 413–430; See n82 above for further sources; Hamilton, “Carnal, Carnival and Purim”; Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 47–69; Resnick, *Marks of Distinction*, 194–206; Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 171–72; Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 135–204; Rubin, *Gentile Tales*.

Christians, inextricably intertwined with Christians' own celebrations, and harmful to the Christian community and the honour of Jesus and Mary. Indeed, as Alex Novikoff has demonstrated, the language used in Christian drama depicting the activity of devils and Jews and those in the letters of Innocent III closely paralleled one another, again suggesting a blurring of the lines between Christian imaginings and legal, social, and ritual realities.⁹⁶ The mockery by Jews of Christian ritual presented in these Christian texts, portray Jews as doing what Christians themselves did to the Jews and, to a lesser extent Muslims, i.e. engage in theatrical ritual violence, ranging from tales, games, to acts of physical aggression, as part of a specific religious holiday designed to humiliate religious outsiders and reiterate their subordinate position within the spiritual hierarchy. Because these elements had become standard in Christians' own celebrations of Holy Week and Easter, Christians assumed they must be present in Jewish celebrations, and likewise, just as Jews were a key element in Christian ritual (even if elements of the Church opposed such behaviour), Christians assumed that they must feature in Jewish rituals.⁹⁷ This is not to say that Jews never engaged in any kind of mocking counter-ritual or narrative against Christianity or others they counted among their oppressors; evidence does exist of such behaviour during Purim and of the use of the *Toledot Yeshu* as a tale of entertainment and resistance to Christianity.⁹⁸ Yet, in examining such evidence, particularly from the Christian side, the role of the Christians' own suppositions must be taken into account.

In fact, Christians and ritualized violence did become part of Provençal Jewish Passover ritual and from there part of Iberian and Italian Jewish ritual, though not in the way Christians imagined.⁹⁹ In general, the Passover ritual features the liberation of the Jewish people from oppression by non-Jewish overlords by remembering and retelling the story of Moses, who, at God's behest, confronted Pharaoh and led the Israelites from Egypt to the promised land.¹⁰⁰ Already this narrative lends itself to an interpretation of Jews' redemption from and punishment of current oppressors, and indeed, in the illuminations and supplementary poems in many medieval *Haggadot* these sentiments are expressed.¹⁰¹ More specifically pertinent, however, was the development of a liturgical tradition for the "day of confinement/shutting in" (*yom ha-hesger* / יום ההסגר), namely the day(s) in which

⁹⁶ Novikoff, "Plateas Publice Discurrentes?"

⁹⁷ Cecil Roth also suggested a connection between laws protecting the Jews and Christian beliefs about Jewish violence; "The Eastertide Stoning."

⁹⁸ Tolan, "The Rites of Purim"; Tartakoff, *Between Christian and Jew*, 122; Tartakoff, "The *Toledot Yeshu* and the Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Medieval Crown of Aragon," in *Toledot Yeshu* ("The Life Story of Jesus") Revisited, ed. Schäfer, Meerson, and Deutsch, 297–309; Horowitz, *Reckless Rites*.

⁹⁹ Einbinder, "Hebrew Poems for the 'Day of Shutting In'"; Roth, "The Eastertide Stoning."

¹⁰⁰ Exodus 6–18.

¹⁰¹ Loewe, ed. and transl., *The Rylands Haggadah*. For examples of poems with relatively clear polemical content see fols. 45a, 46b, 47a, 49b, 50b, 53b and nos. 46, 53, 55, 67, 70, 81 pp. 52, 54, 55, 60, 61, 66 respectively. For polemical imagery and its possible meaning see Barlow, "The Muslim Warrior at the Seder Meal"; Epstein, *Medieval Haggadah*; Epstein, *Dreams of Subversion*; Shalev-Eyni, "Who are the Heirs to the Hebrew Bible?"; Laderman, "Two Faces of Eve"; Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 213–15, 220–23; Harris, "Polemical Images in the *Golden Haggadah*."

Jews were forced to remain indoors and were subject to having their homes stoned and other acts of violence by Christians during Holy Week. One of the earliest poems for this event is entitled *Nishmat hadufim dehufim / Soul of those driven and pressed in haste*, by the thirteenth-century poet from Provence, Isaac ha-Seniri. This poem, as Susan Einbinder demonstrates, exists in several versions, whose contents, like those of many songs, were treated as mutable, depending on the transmission and need of the community.¹⁰² In the version contained in the Rylands Haggadah, the Jews' sense of fear and being trapped and the specific nature of Christian violence are clearly described:

The soul of those pressed and driven in haste to call in your name, they went out—
will honour You—to honour your name they were brought to an enclosed space
and in prisons they were concealed

The soul of the fearful remnants,¹⁰³ they were not proud—will extol Your
Name—

The day they went out to intercede for their lives

From holes¹⁰⁴ (in) which they had hidden themselves there (1 Sam. 14:11)

The soul of those lamenting and fearful are trampled underfoot with crushing
oppression—will sing Your Name—with their call he arrived at the doors of
afflicted ones

A time to throw stones (Eccl. 3:5)

The soul of those alone and isolated between a wicked nation and (who) sets a
snare—will proclaim Your unity—

in his saying my god for my false god you have laid a trap

and I will seek his blood from your hand. (Ez. 3:18, 20, 33:8)

The soul of those crushed and broken (who) endure the blazing wrath—
will exalt You—

They throw (a stone) at a hair and do not miss (Jud. 20:16)

They have taken their stand at the gate (Is. 22:7)¹⁰⁵

102 Einbinder, "Hebrew Poems for the 'Day of Shutting In.'" Einbinder notes a number of other terms for this "holiday" and variations on the title of ha-Seniri's poem.

103 Einbinder suggests that remnant "*saridim*" (שרידיים) is a hint to Obadiah 13–14.

104 Note that *horim* (חורים) can also mean "noblemen" or "freemen," in which the verse would suggest that they were interceding with officials for their lives, something which also fits in context.

105 נשמת הדופים דחופים לקרא בשמך יצאו תהדרך \\ לכבוד שמך במסגר הובאו \\ ובבתי כלאים התבאו
נשמת שרידים חרדים לא נשאו ראשם תשגבך \\ והיום יצאו לבקש על נפשם \\ מן החורים אשר התחבאו שם
נשמת נוהים רוהים בפרך מונים תנגן לשמך \\ בקראם הגיע לפתחי מענים \\ עת להשליך אבנים
נשמת רעוצים רצוצים סובלים חמת צר בערה תרוממך \\ וקולעים לא יחטיאו השערה \\ שות שתו השערה;

Loewe, ed. and transl. *The Rylands Haggadah*, fols. 50b–51a. A very different translation on p. 61

Here the specific practice of throwing stones during this time is clearly evoked both in the last stanza and in the third one. The idea that Christians engaged in this violence as an act of revenge for what they said Jews did to Jesus, is also alluded to in stanza four when the non-Jews say: “for my false god you have laid a trap / I will seek his blood from your hand.” Likewise, the custom of Jews having to turn to the lord or local authorities for protection appears to be the subject of stanza two.

This poem and others of this genre were integrated into the Passover liturgy, usually for the Sabbath of Passover.¹⁰⁶ Thus, in Mediterranean Europe, Passover and the Easter season did indeed become inextricably bound together; Christians cultivated and acted out their version of Jesus’ death at Jewish hands, and enacted literal, ritualized revenge against the Jews, while increasingly conceiving of Jews engaging in their own version of mockery and violence against the Christian community. As Christians annually performed these stories, whether via ritual stoning and games, or through religious theatrical pieces (or both), they reinforced negative Christian memories and associations regarding the Jews. In addition, they inspired a Jewish ritual dedicated to lamenting and remembering Christian ritualized violence against the Jewish community. The poem(s) for the day of shutting in reinforced Jewish associations between Christians and Jewish oppressors of old, all the more so because of the poem’s recitation during Passover, wherein the wickedness of Pharaoh was recalled, and his eventual, devastating punishment at God’s hands. Thus, here is not a shared ritual in the sense of having a commonly revered place or person. Rather, Christian and Jewish celebrations of their respective holidays constituted entangled counter-rituals, but were shared in the sense that in the forms expressed in the Middle Ages, one would not exist without the other, and each served to delineate one group’s relationship with the other.

In many ways these observations resemble those of Israel Yuval, who has long argued for the liturgical, polemical interplay between Passover and Easter in the context of Jewish-Christian relations, although he has suggested that the liturgical poems (*piyyuṭim*) of Ashkenazim were particularly focused on divine vengeance against the Christians, in contrast to those of the Sephardim.¹⁰⁷ Yet as Einbinder has shown, vengeance, or at least divine punishment is implied by the biblical verses and contexts which Isaac ha-Seniri chose.¹⁰⁸ For example, 1 Samuel 14:11, is evoked in the second stanza with the comment about the Jews coming out from the holes where they were hidden. In its biblical context this passage referred to Jonathan, son of King Saul, and his companion appearing before the Philistines, who initially mistakenly assumed this act to be a sign of Israelite weakness, only to be slaughtered by Jonathan. Placed in its broader context, an apt description of Jews’ abjection in the poem, becomes an implicit threat against the enemies of

no. 70. This version of the poem is also transcribed by Einbinder, “Hebrew Poems for the ‘Day of Shutting In,’” 133.

106 Einbinder, “Hebrew Poems for the ‘Day of Shutting In,’” esp. 113.

107 Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 38–115, 123–34, 205–56. On relative lack of vengeance as a prominent theme in Sefardi poetry, see 110–15.

108 Einbinder, “Hebrew Poems for the ‘Day of Shutting In.’” She also shows that some later renditions move away from a sharply polemical focus on violence to the resolution of tensions.

the Jews. I would suggest, therefore, that difference between Passover and the Easter season as points of polemic and violent imaginings in Northern Europe vs Mediterranean lands lay largely in the formalization of these expressions, the incorporation of Jews into Christian Holy Week festivities, and the precise mirroring of Christian ritual in Jewish poetic narrative in Southern Europe.

What I have attempted to demonstrate in this section is that while Christian law had long contained references to the need to protect Jews from Christian violence and also to prohibit disrespectful behaviour or proselytism by Jews toward Christianity, with the approach of the thirteenth century and thereafter Christian concerns about these issues both intensified and became more specific. One may suspect, for example, the question of to what extent Christian servants should follow Jewish laws about food preparation, or the custom of giving gifts to non-Jewish servants predated Rashi, writing in the eleventh to very early twelfth century or Abraham b. Nathan in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; nothing in Rashi's response to the query about the status of Passover bread used by a Gentile servant, suggests that the scenario was an unfamiliar one. However, as Christian religious, and to a lesser extent, secular authorities became aware of the details of quotidian Jewish-Christian relations, anxiety increased, even as they misinterpreted or exaggerated what they thought they knew about the degree to which Jews were inclined to incorporate non-Jews into their holiday celebrations. As the incident surrounding Moisé de Modena shows, however, by the late Middle Ages and early modern period certain cross- or interreligious holiday exchanges had become assumed by both Christians and Jews.

As noted in the previous section, Islam and Muslim-Christian relations also came into specific, sharper focus for Christian authorities at this time. Whereas Jewish and Muslim (and some Eastern Christian) law recognized conditions under which attending celebrations or visiting the holy places of, and even willingly donating to members of the religious other and their institutions was allowed, for Western Christian authorities, such exchanges were a source of anxiety and outrage.¹⁰⁹ As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, when Christians in Western Europe did allow donations to or participation in Christian religious events and institutions, they sought to be in control, and at times forced Muslims and Jews into such "donations" and celebrations. Here in this chapter, the divide between clergy and local authorities who supported the participation of Muslims and Jews in Christian religious celebrations, and those who did not, already noted in Chapter 3, is even more pronounced. Christian objections to such laissez-faire attitudes on the part of their co-religionists who allowed and even encouraged Muslim-Jewish-Christian socializing and participation in Christian celebrations found voice not only in legal but also hagiographical and satirical literature. Given the number and variety of sources, both positive and negative, describing this kind of behaviour, it seems clear that casual conviviality and participation in certain types of events, sometimes familial, sometimes publicly religious, across confessional boundaries was the norm, especially though not exclusively in Iberia.

109 Compare with the discussion in Chapter 4 of legal traditions regarding donations or attending the celebrations of other religious communities in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Much more sinister, however, were Christian beliefs that Jews regularly engaged in mockery of Jesus, Mary, Christian holy objects, and Christianity as a whole and even committed violent acts toward Christians and their children either as an integral part of Jews' own holidays, or in defiance of Christian ones, in particular Holy Week/Easter and later, Corpus Christi. I argued in this chapter, that Western Christian imaginings of Jewish festal anti-Christian violence were a transposition of Christians own annual ritual violence toward the Jews. In essence Christians supposed that Jews were the mirror opposite of themselves, only, if anything, more violent. Christian assumptions of Jewish ill-will was further fed by increasing awareness of the Talmud and other extra-biblical Jewish literature, including the *Toledot Yeshu*, which contained negative portrayals of Jesus, his family, and followers. Indeed, anecdotal evidence hints that Jews may have occasionally indulged in ribald behaviour with anti-Christian content, however, much stronger, are indications of Jewish counter narratives and rituals. In addition to indications that the *Toledot Yeshu* served as a Jewish counter narrative, Southern European Jewish Passover rituals sometimes contained poetry which addressed Jews' relationship with both Christians and Muslims, and very specifically evoked Christians' annual rituals of anti-Jewish violence. Exactly how that violence was recalled shifted from manuscript to manuscript, community to community. Nevertheless, both Christians and Jews cultivated an annual memory of violence, one inflicted upon the other, whether in truth or imagined, so that the other's holiday, while not so much shared, was inextricably intertwined.

Real and Imagined Shared Practices in Byzantine and Armenian Sources

Byzantines and Armenians frequently used association with Judaism as an epithet against one another, a point which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. Later the same accusation was directed against Latin Christians as part of the polemic against unifying with the Western European Church.¹¹⁰ Significantly, however, as with the Byzantine hagiographies featuring Jews and other non-Christians, the basic topoi of Byzantine accusations of Armenian Judaizing, such their use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, was established already in late antiquity, especially during the iconoclastic debate.¹¹¹ Thus, early triumphalist hagiographical tales of saints assisting desperate or astonished Jews, Muslims, and other non-Christians, or punishing recalcitrant ones, and legal and polemical texts chiding various Christian populations for heterodox practices and likening them to Jews and, more rarely, Muslims, need to be seen as different aspects of a common polemical impulse. Imagined Judaism and shared rituals were at the core of both.

110 Ohanjanyan, "Armenian–Jewish Connections"; Déroche, "Regards croisés des hérésiologues"; Pogossian, "Jews in Armenian Apocalyptic Traditions"; Kolbaba, "East Roman Anti-Armenian Polemic"; Kolbaba, "Byzantines, Armenians and Latins"; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 65–70, 82, 97, 137, 151–55 169, 176–81.

111 Kolbaba, "Byzantines, Armenians and Latins."

Byzantine and Armenian legal and polemical discussions about “shared” or “imitated” practices focus on the following issues: foodways, both generally and ritualized foodstuffs, such as the bread or wine of the Eucharist or the consumption of meat from ritually sacrificed animals; joining Jews, Muslims or Christians deemed heretical, in their places of worship, or allowing non-Christians or “bad” Christians to enter Christian buildings; and finally, participating in, adopting or imitating the rituals of Jews or Muslims, or how to deal both with Muslims who claim to have undergone a Christian ritual, specifically baptism, or to have a Christian godparent, and with the clerics who officiated at such rites. Another factor, when considering whether and under what conditions shared religious practices might take place, are descriptions and/or prescriptions which designated outsiders as repulsive and/or impure. Before turning to these specific issues, however, it is necessary to understand where Jewish and Muslim populations could be found in Armenian and Byzantine territories, the impact of continually shifting and contested sovereignty of some of these lands on inter- and intra-religious relations, and, finally, the legal developments in Byzantium and Armenia.

Locating Muslims, Finding Jews

Recently, Byzantine Jewish communities have become the subject of renewed interest and study, although much still remains to be done.¹¹² Systematic studies examining even the presence of a Muslim minority in Byzantine territories are sparse, despite clear evidence that some Muslims did live in Byzantine-controlled lands.¹¹³ There was at least one mosque in Constantinople itself since the eighth century, ostensibly for prisoners of war, merchants or visitors. The number seems to have multiplied with time, as did a variety of sites in core Byzantine territories, which were venerated by Muslims or former Muslims whose affiliation with Christianity seems to have been tenuous.¹¹⁴ A good indicator of the religious and cultural diversity of Byzantium and surrounding territories is a brief discussion in a letter of Demetrius Khomatianos, archbishop of Ohrid to Constantine Cabasilas, the metropolitan of Dyrrachium, in what is now Albania. Writing in the first half of the thirteenth century, Demetrius Khomatianos specifies that “Jews, Armenians, Ishmaelites and Hagarenes and remain-

112 Robert Bonfil, et al., eds., *Jews in Byzantium*; Déroche, “Regards croisés des hérésiologues”; Gardette, *Une Culture entre Renaissance italienne et orient*; Holo, *Byzantine Jewry*; Von Falkenhausen, *Auf der Suche nach den Juden*; Kohen, *History of the Byzantine Jews*; Benin, “Jews, Christians, Muslims in Byzantine Italy”; Külzer, *Disputationes Graecae contra Iudaeos*; Sharf, *Jews and Other Minorities in Byzantium*; Eleuteri and Rigo, *Eretici Dissidenti Musulmani ed Ebrei a Bisanzio*; Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*; Galanté, *Les Juifs de Constantinople sous Byzance*; Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire 641–1204*.

113 Rotman “Jews and Muslims in Byzantine Italy”; Anderson, “Islamic Spaces and Diplomacy in Constantinople”; Reinert, “The Muslim Presence in Constantinople 9th–15th Centuries”; Brand, “The Turkish Element in Byzantium.” My thanks to Prof. Johannes Pahlitzsch of Mainz University for his bibliographical suggestions on this subject.

114 Sahas, *Byzantium and Islam*, 119, 278–79; Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 63–64, 86, 227–28, 297; Anderson, “Islamic Spaces and Diplomacy in Constantinople”; Reinert, “The Muslim Presence in Constantinople 9th–15th Centuries”; Balivet, *Romanie Byzantine*, 34–36.

ing ones of this type” may live in cities but that they should have their own section, lest they convert Christians to their customs.¹¹⁵

Understanding the function and implications of references to Jews in Armenian sources is complicated due to the paucity of systematic information about Jews in Armenian lands or Armenian–Jewish interactions outside of Armenian polities. Jewish and Muslim minorities in medieval Armenia or the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia are relatively little studied, although the frequency with which parts of this region changed between Armenian and Muslim hands, plus scattered archaeological indications and references in legal and other types of literature suggest that Jews and Muslims did dwell in or pass through these regions.¹¹⁶ In addition to evidence in the Cairo Geniza of trade, travel and interaction between Jews and Armenians and in Armenian lands, there is a reference to Ḥabīb ibn Maslama al-Fihri (ca. 617–662 CE), the Muslim leader of the forces which conquered Armenia providing safe passage to non-Muslim inhabitants of Dwin, the capitol of Armenia, and in his chronicle, the Armenian historian and Metropolitan of Syunik, Stepʿanos Ōrbelian (ca. 1250/1260–1303) mentions a “Jewish quarter” in Kapan, a town in southeast Armenia.¹¹⁷ This is also the period from which the Jewish cemetery in Yeghegis dates.¹¹⁸ Thus, while there are clear indications of Jewish presence in both Greater Armenia and in Cilicia during the Middle Ages, and of commercial relations between Jews and Armenians in Egypt, there is insufficient evidence to create a fulsome picture of Jewish life and culture and interactions with non-Jews in these lands. Contextualizing references to Jews in Armenian sources thus presents unique challenges, in which Jews are often hermeneutical rather than real.¹¹⁹ The same is true of descriptions of shared or borrowed practices between Jews and Christians, as Garsoïan has shown regarding the Tʿondrakicians.

115 “Ἰουδαίους, Ἀρμενίους, Ἰσμηλίτας, Ἀγαρηνοὺς, καὶ λοιποὺς τοιοῦτους”; Demetrius Khomatianos, *Responsa*, PG, 119, cols. 977/978; Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, 221–22, nos. 18, 30.

116 TS 13 J 21 fol. 17, translated in Goitein, “A Letter from Seleucia (Cilicia)”; MS Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum E 16 522, translated in Goitein *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*, 330–33. Both manuscripts are available through the Friedberg Geniza project. See also Pogossian, and Nucciotti, eds., *Medieval Yeghegis*; Cowe, “Patterns of Armeno-Muslim Interchange”; Pogossian, “Gli ebrei e il giudaismo nelle fonte armene”; Pogossian, “Jews in Armenian Apocalyptic Traditions”; Ter-Ghevondyan, *Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*; Vyronis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*; Goitein, “The Geniza Collection.”

117 Ōrbelian, *History of the Region of Sisakan*, 334 (My thanks to Prof. Zaroui Pogossian of the University of Florence, for this reference and explanation of its content); Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-Buldān*, 2015, 2:439; Russell, “On an Armenian Word List”; Sklare, “Ninth-Century Judeo-Arabic Texts”; Stone and Tochyan, *Jews in Ancient and Medieval Armenia*, 61–63; Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, 1:22, 4:182, 412; Goitein, “A Letter from Selucia”; Ter-Ghevondyan, *The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*, 131.

118 Pogossian and Nucciotti, eds., *Medieval Yeghegis*; Amit and Stone, “Report of the Survey of a Medieval Jewish cemetery in Eghegis.”

119 Pogossian, “Gli ebrei e il giudaismo nelle fonte armene”; Pogossian, “Jews in Armenian Apocalyptic Traditions.” Also see Chapter 3 and the bibliography cited there.

Changing Laws, Shifting Territories

Déroche has emphasized the unchanging nature of legal depictions of Jews, or even Muslims; others, such as Tia Kobaba, have underscored the importance of paying attention to what laws are emphasized or re-emphasized in a given period. Kolbaba suggests that there were periods in which controlling heterodoxy, foreigners, or other religious or cultural threats were deemed less important than, for example, economic prosperity or military security. During periods focusing on prosperity or security, one may identify relative disinterest or “tolerance” for religious difference. At other times, the presence of religious difference was seen as a pressing threat, at which point one sees a renewal or elaboration of older laws and polemical topoi. For example, she links the renewed concern to prohibit Jews from entering imperial service to a time when there was a more substantial migration of Jews to Byzantine territories from Muslim lands in the eleventh century.¹²⁰ Precisely in the eleventh century, the third revision of the *Basilica*, itself a revision or recodification of the Justinian code reinstated negative language against the Jews, even as laws favourable to Jews and their religious institutions were eliminated or altered.¹²¹ In addition to members of the church hierarchy, laypeople, who were involved in ecclesiastical diplomacy, served the government and/or were in some other way part of the Byzantine Christian intellectual elite, also had a stake in controlling religious, or even ethnic difference within the empire.¹²² At times their views ran contrary to imperial practice or policy. For example, despite prohibitions against doing so, by the twelfth century, Emperor Manuel I (1143–1180 CE) had a Jewish doctor in his pay. More telling is Manuel’s attempt to change the catechism which Muslims wishing to convert to Christianity had to say, so that the God of Islam would be recognized as the same as the God worshipped by the Christians, rather than forcing Muslims to abjure the God of Muhammad. His conciliatory proposal was roundly condemned.¹²³ Imperial gestures toward inclusion and concomitantly conservative revisions of Byzantine law may be seen as polar reactions to the increasing religious plurality—both in terms of non-Christians and of diverse Christian denominations—within Byzantine territories. The refusal to recognize Muslims’ God as being the same as the one Christians and Jews worshipped, potentially hindered the development of shared rituals and sacred sites between Muslims and Byzantine Christians, however, as Manuel’s actions show, this view was not shared by the entire Christian populace. Because of the highly polemical nature of statements about non-Christians and the degree to which discussions of them were intertwined with intra-Christian debates, assessing the existence of real or imagined shared practices becomes particularly difficult in the Byzantine, and, as we shall see, Armenian contexts.

¹²⁰ Déroche, “Regards croisés des hérésiologues”; Kolbaba, “Byzantines, Armenians and Latins.”

¹²¹ Linder, “The Legal Status of the Jews.”

¹²² Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 314–412.

¹²³ Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 103–4, 386; Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 54; Balivet, *Romanie Byzantine*, 41–43.

In the early part of the period addressed by this book, Armenia had established itself as independent of Arab rule, but it was frequently in conflict with or had territories in part ruled by Byzantium. By 1048 the Seljuks, a branch of the Oghuz Turks, who were, by that point, Sunni Muslims, were making their presence felt in the region, and by 1064 Ani, the capital of Baghratid-ruled Armenia, had succumbed to Seljuk advances. The eleventh century was marked not simply by Jewish, but also Syrian and Armenian Christian, emigration to Byzantine territories and the establishment of Armenian principalities in the former Byzantine province of Cilicia. From the late eleventh through the fourteenth centuries, Byzantines, Armenians, Western Europeans who had come as participants in the crusades, Georgians, Seljuks and later, Mongols, vied for and sometimes gained control over regions or individual cities in the territory of the original kingdom of Armenia, Cilicia, and surrounding regions.¹²⁴ Additionally, the presence of dissenting Christian groups, from whom we have relatively little self-representation, such as the Paulicians, complicate any assessment of religious rhetoric and representation.¹²⁵ Zaroui Pogossian warns, therefore, that one cannot speak of “Armenians” or “Muslims,” and, I would add, “Christians,” in an abstract, overarching way, because of the ethnic, religious, linguistic, and cultural diversity of Asia Minor during this period.¹²⁶

In practical terms, Armenian legal and other literature that depicts interactions between Armenian Christians, Muslims, Jews, and other, unspecified non-Christian or “heretical” Christian groups, was sometimes written by authors when their Armenian region or polity of origin was in a position of relative political independence, vassalage, or subjugation to a Byzantine or European Christian ruler, a Muslim one, or a Mongol one, who may or may not have identified as Muslim. For example, Mxit’ar Goš (1130–1213 CE) the author of the first law code composed in Armenian, wrote his work when his own town, Ganjak, was contested territory between Georgia and local Muslim rulers, and the kingdom of Armenia was no longer an independent polity. By contrast, Cilicia, where he was also active and where his law code was also used, was in Armenian Christian hands. Robert Thomson emphasizes that part of the motivation for composing the law code, was to provide an alternative to going to Muslim courts and to ensure that Armenians were no longer dependent on the laws of foreigners.¹²⁷ Mxit’ar was also intimately involved in negotiations for a rapprochement between the Armenian, Catho-

124 Cowe, “Patterns of Armeno-Muslim Interchange”; Cowe, “Armenians in the Era of the Crusades”; Pogossian, ed. and transl., *The Letter of Love and Concord*, 7–44; Dadoyan, *Armenians in the Medieval Islamic World*, 2:7–64, 145–96; Kolbaba, “Byzantines, Armenians and Latins”; MacEvitt, *The Crusades*; Ter-Ghevondyan, *Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*; Dagron, “Minorités ethniques.”

125 Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*.

126 Pogossian, “Jews in Armenian Apocalyptic Traditions.” Comment on 150. On the significance of medieval Christian plurality in these regions and in Europe, also see Weltecke, “Space, Entanglement and Decentralisation.”

127 Mxit’ar Goš, *The Lawcode*, 13–23; Hewson, *Armenia*, 83. As Thomson notes, Syriac and Greek canon law texts had been translated into Armenian, and penitential guides had been composed prior to Mxit’ar’s *Lawcode*. See 12–13, 15, 23–24; Hartmann and Pennington, eds., *History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law*, 323–24.

lic, and Byzantine churches. There, he demonstrated familiarity with practices according to Western canon law, as well as Byzantium and Armenian, and used commonalities between Catholic and Armenian practice to argue his points with the Byzantines, without compromising the Armenian position.¹²⁸ Thus, Mxit'ar's work simultaneously reflects: Armenian ties with Byzantine, Western European, and Syriac Christian cultures and laws; the need to address daily life under Muslim dominance; law as it should be under Armenian Christian rule; potential interactions with Muslims and Christians with whom Armenians were in varying degrees of agreement or conflict and in a variety of power relationships; and, finally, varied, local, Armenian customs. Dawit' Ganjekec'i (d. 1140 CE), who was from the same region, writing earlier in the same century, lacked the cosmopolitan experience of Mxit'ar Goš, although the latter based portions of his law code on Dawit's penitential. This penitential which also sheds light on life under Muslim rule and local custom, perhaps even more so than Mxit'ar, who was concerned with creating a standardized form of Armenian canon law for all.¹²⁹ The Armenian texts of both of these authors and others need to be read while keeping in mind how a given author sought to balance between or use multiple real and rhetorical others. For the purposes of this study, the primary "others" in focus are Muslims, Jews, and Byzantine Christians, who were, at times, likened to Jews, although I will touch on intersections with Zoroastrian practice, when relevant.

The polemical approach in Byzantine and Armenian law codes in which church officials associated those whom they deemed "heretics" with Muslims and or Jews and accused these "heretics" of mixed practices is quite old. For example, Nina Garsoïan notes that during the second council of Nicaea in 787 the Patriarch Tarsius (ca. 730–806 CE) stated that the Iconoclasts had imitated the Jews, Saracens, pagans, Samaritans, Manichaeans and Phantasiasts.¹³⁰ Here Judaism, along with a list of seemingly every other religious group whom Tarsius could think of as non-Christian, was applied to the Iconoclasts, as a form of insult. While in some instances, placing Jews, Samaritans, Pagans, Manichaeans, and heretics in the same category may have been a legal practicality, in some texts from the fifth century onwards, Judaism is treated as a "sect" and described as equivalent to a kind of heresy. Thus, in legal literature, abjuration lists for those who converted to Byzantine orthodoxy, some chronicles and directly polemical literature not only from Byzantine authors, but also Armenian ones, the term "Judaizing" or comparisons with Judaism came to be applied to movements or individuals deemed heretical, even though any real connection to Jewish practices were often minimal. Occasionally the association between heresy and Judaism was based on proximity or contact with Jews, or those deemed similar to them, as in the case of accusations against Emperor Michael II (r. 820–829 CE), who was said to have been a member of the Athinganoi, a religious group described as adopting elements of Mosaic law and being in close association with the neighbouring Jewish community. However, even in this case, descriptions

128 Pogossian, ed. and transl., *The Letter of Love and Concord*, 37–39, 43–44.

129 Dorfmann, "The Admonitory Exhortations of Dawit"; Mxit'ar Goš, *The Lawcode*, 23, 27, 32–36, 48, 52, 56; Thomson, *Bibliography of Classical Armenian Literature*, 111.

130 Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*, 200.

of Michael and the Athinganoi are so fraught with polemicizing, the exact nature and extent of any connection to Judaism or a Jewish community is difficult to ascertain.¹³¹ Armenian discussions of “Judaizing” Christian groups are no less problematic. For example, the eleventh century Armenian scholar and eventual governor of Edessa, Gregory Magistros (ca. 990–1058 CE) asserted that the T’ondrakīans, a group considered by both the Armenian and Byzantine churches to be heretical, not only resembled sectarians but added Judaism and circumcision to their error, which made them much worse than their predecessors.¹³² Accusing them of both Judaism and circumcision seems a bit redundant, however, the comparison is more precisely directed based on practices, rather than a broad association with all condemnable groups as in Tarsius’ remark. The T’ondrakīans was a later name for the Paulicians, a Christian group variously reported as having a dualist theology and a docetic, or adoptionist stance regarding Jesus’ nature. Their insistence on God’s unity (Monarchianism) and assertion that Jesus was not divine may have prompted the association with Jews (and Muslims) not only by Armenian authors but also by Greek writers, such as the chronicler, Georgios Monachos (842–867 CE). However, as Garsoïan points out, their putative founder, Paul of Samosata (200–275 CE) had also long been associated with Judaism by a wide variety of Christian authors.¹³³

The Armenian legal tradition (like the Eastern and Western Syrian, Coptic, and Ethiopian churches) rejected the Council of Chalcedon, and thus had a somewhat different legal/theological trajectory than their Byzantine and Latin counterparts. Furthermore, although until Mxit’ar Goš’s lawbook, Armenians depended on translations of Greek and Syriac canon law collections, these translations often included interpolations, which addressed local issues and customary law, and, in late antiquity, Zoroastrian practice.¹³⁴ By the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, efforts to unify the Armenian, Byzantine, and Catholic churches intensified and prompted debates and a revisitation of long-standing disagreements regarding both ritual and the theology behind them. Armenian theologians sought to justify liturgical practices highlighted as questionable by Catholics, such as the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, while at the same time becoming more familiar with Latinate style polemical debate, and theological issues. Greek and Syriac, and then later Latin and Old French materials, both legal and polemical were translated into Armenian, some of which included anti-Jewish material.¹³⁵ As

131 Gardette, “The Judaizing Christians”; Holo, *Byzantine Jewry*, 43. Gardette notes that the Jewish elements of the Athinganoi resemble practices and attitudes of the Samaritans more than those of Jews.

132 Conybeare, ed. and transl., *The Key of Truth*, 142; Grigor Magistroṣi, *Letters*, ed. K. Konstantis (Alexandropol, 1910) 166 (Armenian) as cited by Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*, 213.

133 Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*, 210–13. On the two different branches of Paulicians see: 232–33. On the T’ondrakīans as equivalent to the Paulicians, see 13, 95–96, 139–40. The link between Paulicians and Muslims was mostly political, though doctrine also seems to have played a role. See 15, 128, 232, 233.

134 Mardirossian, *Le livre des Canons arméniens*, 25–30, 52–53, 103–4, 207, 479, 580.

135 Hartmann and Pennington, *History of Byzantine Canon and Eastern Canon Law*, 314–26; La Porta, “Armeno-Latin Intellectual Exchange”; La Porta, “A Fourteenth-Century Armenian Polemic”;

noted above, included in this anti-Jewish tradition and language, was the comparison of theologies or practices deemed undesirable by a given author with those of Judaism.¹³⁶

Impure, Disgusting and Symbolically Wrong: Foodways as a Barrier to Shared Practices

When Byzantine Christians used foodways as a form of religious or ethnic division, the language used seems designed to evoke disgust at the choice of food and the bad manners involved in its consumption rather than outrage at a violation of ritual purity laws.¹³⁷ For example, the Byzantine chronicler, Niketas Choniates (ca.1155–1217 CE) frequently attributed unchecked, gluttonous behaviour to emperors or other individuals of whom he disapproved, asserted that Byzantine soldiers became ill from eating unaccustomed food, described the smelly, bizarre (to him) combinations of foodstuffs concocted by Latin Christians, and detailed Europeans', specifically Sicilians', willful destruction and mockery of Byzantines' food by urinating in it and farting.¹³⁸ He did not, however, speak of foods which were unclean in the sense that they violated divine or church law. The twelfth-century canonist and patriarch of Antioch, Theodore Balsamon, complains that the Latins ate blood and strangled animals, which was, in fact prohibited by Byzantine canon law, but does not describe the food of Western European Christians as unclean or able to pollute people or utensils.¹³⁹ Some members of the Byzantine clergy were inclined to condemn the Latins and other Christian communities for more than the use of leavened bread or the consumption of blood, however. In the mid eleventh century, Peter, the Patriarch of Antioch felt compelled to chide Michael I Keroularios (ca. 1000–1059 CE), Patriarch of Constantinople, for his criticisms of other communities' eating habits as unlawful, by citing 1 Timothy 4:14 and Acts 10:11–15, both of which insist that all food is licit. Chapter 10 of Acts especially, overturns Jewish food proscriptions. A number of scholars have emphasized that Peter of Antioch's comments largely represent the norm regarding food impurity in the Byzantine church.¹⁴⁰

Kolbaba, "Byzantines, Armenians, and Latins"; Pogossian, ed. and transl., *The Letter of Love and Concord*, 22–44.

136 See above for references and below for more detailed discussion.

137 Bayri, *Warriors, Martyrs and Dervishes*, 70–88; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, 145–55.

138 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, 1:57–58, 145–46, 302–5, 594–95, 624; Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium*, 33–34, 82–83, 167–69, 326–27, 342.

139 Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 67, cols. 747/748. Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, 148. On the prohibition against consuming blood or strangled animals see canon 67 of the council of Trullo, also known as the Quinisext Council, held in 692 CE. For the Greek text and English translation of the council see Nedungatt and Featherstone, eds., *Trullo Revisited*.

140 [Michael Keroularios], *Epistolae*, PG 120, cols. 799/800–801/802, paras. 7 and 8. For Tia Kolbaba's English translation of Peter of Antioch's letter see <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/1054peter-of-antioch-to-michael-keroularios1.asp>. Compare with Michael's remarks in his original letter to Peter of Antioch, PG 120, cols. 789/790–791/792, para. 12. Siecienski, *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory*, 136; Crostini, "What was Kosher in Byzantium?"; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, 35–37, 70–73, 147–48.

Other Byzantine criticisms regarding food relate to either sharing food in a time, place, or manner which might be interpreted as Judaizing, an issue to which I will turn momentarily. The salient point for consideration here is that Byzantine regulations and attitudes toward the food of non-Christians or even Christians they deemed heretical did not preclude eating or sharing such food. This position stands in contrast to what one may find in Armenian legal collections from the eleventh century and onwards. Armenian Christians were quite concerned with ritual impurity. For example, in his penitential, Dawit' Ganjekec'i prohibits eating or drinking bread, wine, cheese, meat, vegetables, grapes of infidels, except those fruits which have shells or rinds, and medicine, if it is not *theriaca*, or similarly filthy medicine. Similarly, grapes picked or trampled by a non-Christian are not fit for use in church.¹⁴¹ In such Armenian Christian regulations marking the food, physical touch or presence of those outside their own religious community are reminiscent of, though not identical to, Zoroastrian and Jewish prohibitions against consuming all or some foods and beverages handled by religious outsiders.¹⁴²

As noted in chapter four, communities with such restrictions created barriers to certain kinds of shared rituals as well as to general socializing, in contrast to other communities who developed laws which allowed for and regulated attendance of religious services or donations to or from outsiders. The Armenian Christians, therefore, stand out during this period as potentially less receptive to shared practices than Byzantine, or various Arabic- or Syriac-speaking Christian communities, even those in Asia Minor.

By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the division of animals into categories of pure and impure, edible and inedible, had become pivotal in Catholic Armenian and Western European accusations of Judaizing against Armenian Christians who had retained their affiliation with the Armenian church. The Catholicos Simēon Erewanc'i (1763–1780 CE) embraced the parallel between Armenian Orthodox and Jewish practice, arguing that if even the Pharisees obeyed the law of God, how much more so should Christians? Catholics, therefore, were the ones who neglected to observe this very basic divine regulation. Other authors from this period and later criticized Catholics for eat-

141 [Dawit' Ganjekec'i] *Penitential*, Canons 10, 11. In Canon 94, carrion and the hare are designated unclean (these are also unclean in Jewish law) and Dawit' condemns those who create strife on this subject, possibly referring to those inclined to follow the more liberal, Byzantine way of thinking. On Dawit's use of the category of clean and unclean animals see Dorfmann, "The *Admonitory Exhortations* of Dawit'." Compare with the Canons of Yovhannēs Mandukani (Catholicos 478–490 CE) in *Ordonnancement du livre des canons arméniens*, 894/895–896/897, PYM 1. Theriac was a compound drug, used in antiquity and throughout the Middle Ages and much of the early modern era, which was thought to be effective against many illnesses, most especially poison, since theriac itself was said to consist in part of poisonous substances. On theriac see various articles in Wexler, ed., *History of Toxicology and Environmental Health: Antiquity*, and Wexler, ed., *History of Toxicology and Environmental Health: Middle Ages and Renaissance*.

142 Compare Dawit's *Penitential* with the somewhat later Zoroastrian legal text: Āturfarnbag and Farnbag-Srō, *Rivāyat*, 25.3. I am indebted to Ms. Neda Darabian of Ruhr Universität Bochum for this reference. For a discussion of law and bibliography of Jewish purity laws relating to food and non-Jews, see Chapter 4 of this book. For Zoroastrian food law relating to outsiders, see Daryaei, "Food Purity and Pollution." On the connections between Zoroastrian and Jewish law and purity, see Secunda, *The Iranian Talmud*; Mokhtarian, *Rabbis, Sorcerers, Kings, and Priests*.

ing *ḥarām* (forbidden) food according to Muslim law as a retort against criticisms of food purity divisions which were customary among the Armenian Orthodox.¹⁴³ Thus, the failing of Catholics, in these instances was the *lack* of a shared practice with the other, surrounding religious communities. Seemingly the fact that these non-Christians also obeyed similar food purity regulations was proof of the truth of the Armenian Orthodox position. By contrast, Catholic Christians continued to evoke long-standing polemic which linked traditional Armenian Christian practice with that of Jews as a way of invalidating Armenian Orthodoxy. The choice to accede to commonalities between Jewish or Muslim practice and that of Armenian Orthodox Christians reflects a different attitude than those of the Middle Ages, for, as we shall see, Armenian Christians from this period refuted attempts to associate them with Jews.

More common and more systematic than polemic regarding food based on custom, ethnicity, or purity, were prohibitions relating to ritual food which either implied engaging in a ritual with another religious community, most often Jews, or condemned food habits which resembled that of another, again, usually those of Jews. Canon 11 of the 692 council of Trullo seems to have straddled both contingencies. There clergy and lay-people are forbidden from eating unleavened bread like or with the Jews (παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων).¹⁴⁴ Since the preposition παρὰ (*para*) can mean either “in the presence of”, “beside,” “with” or “parallel to” or “like” it is somewhat unclear whether lawgivers feared socialization with actual Jews or imitation of Jews. The rest of the canon prohibits becoming a family member with Jews, seeking and accepting medical assistance from them, or bathing in their company, all of which strongly suggests that preventing intimate socializing between Christians and Jews was the primary goal of this canon. In canon 99, however, an adverb ἰουδαϊκῶς (*ioudaikos*), doing something like a Jew, is used to characterize the action of bringing cooked meat into the sanctuary and reserving a portion for the priest. Priests may accept gifts of meat, but only *outside* the church building, to avoid any confusion with what Byzantines considered to be ritual offering which Jews were commanded bring to the Temple and to donate a portion to the priests.¹⁴⁵

Balsamon, in his commentary on Council of Trullo, attempts to clarify the slightly ambiguous wording of Canon 11 on the one hand, but also elaborates on the discussion of unleavened bread in a way that allows him to criticize Latin practice and link it with that of the Jews. Initially he explains that: “The holy fathers ruled that none should have communion with the Jews, we should not join with them in their festivals, nor take, nor eat the flatbread made by them, nor accept medicine from them nor bathe with them.”¹⁴⁶ His rephrasing of the canon places social activities with Jews per se, and eating the bread

143 Ohanjanyan, “Armenian–Jewish Connections”; Erewanc’i, *Girk’or*, 69 as cited in Ohanjanyan.

144 Nedungatt and Featherstone, eds., *Trullo Revisited*. The Greek text and translation may also be found at: <http://telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/relmin/extrait268341/>.

145 Lev. 7:11–18; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, 69, 135, 201; Sharf, “Animal Sacrifice in the Armenian Church,” in *Jews and Other Minorities in Byzantium*.

146 Μηδεμίαν κοινωνίαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ θέλοντες διορζονται μὴ συνεορτάζαιν τοῦτοις ἡμᾶς μηδὲ λαμβάνειν καὶ ἐσθίειν τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν τηνικαῦτα γινόμενα ἄζημα μηδὲ ἱατρεύεσθαι παρὰ τούτων ἢ σθλλουεσθαι; Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 11, cols. 551/552.

they make, at the centre. Unleavened bread is central to what follows, but there Balsamon is careful to explain that one should not eat the unleavened bread of heretics, but the canon does not prohibit eating flatbread altogether “rather from celebrating with flatbread *like the Jews*”.¹⁴⁷ For him this means misunderstanding the Pascal celebration as being a sacrifice, with bread and lamb, despite Jesus having abolished all the rituals of the Jews. Jewish use of flatbread during Passover he likens to the customs of heretics and Latins who do celebrate with unleavened bread. In this example, socialization with Jews is to be avoided, but the discussion of their ritual food practices becomes a stepping stone for condemning Christians of whom Balsamon disapproves. Other Byzantine canonists and polemicists take up the issues raised against Jews and Armenians in the council of Trullo, including the tactic of linking specific Armenian (or other Christian groups whom they condemn) and Jewish practices together. For example, the twelfth-century monk, Euthymios Zigabenos ties both the Armenian use of unleavened bread and sacrificial animals, particularly at Easter, to Jewish practice, although his description and refutation of these customs are far more detailed than those in the council of Trullo. He explores whether or not unleavened bread was consumed during the last supper and whether or not this meal occurred during Passover, when Jews were required to eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Ultimately, he decides that it was not.¹⁴⁸ His exposition on whether the wine of the eucharist should be diluted with water—a practice the Armenians rejected—devolves into an assertion that the sacrifice of animals had been abolished and had no salvific effect, yet the Armenians “sacrificed following the Jew” (θύοντες κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν).¹⁴⁹ He and Balsamon were but two of many Byzantine theologians to engage in such polemical comparisons between Jews and “wrong” Christians.¹⁵⁰

Armenians and Latin Christians were well aware of the accusations levelled at them by the Byzantines. The two twelfth-century Armenian writers, Nersēs Šnorhali (1102–1173 CE) and Pōlos Tarōnac’i (d. 1123 CE) contested accusations that the *matał*, or sacrificial meal, was comparable in meaning or practice to Jewish sacrifice. Indeed, as they and other collections of Armenian canon law indicate, the *matał* was about distributing food to the poor on saints’ days and Easter, rather than a form of sacrificial expiation. The primary concern among Armenian religious authorities was to prevent priests from taking too much of the food themselves, eating or allowing others to eat

147 ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀζύμων κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐοράζειν; Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 11, Italics mine.

148 Euthymios Zigabenos, *Panoply*, PG, 130 cols.1179/1180–1181/1182.

149 Euthymios Zigabenos, *Panoply*, PG, 130 cols. 1183/1184–1185/1186.

150 Other examples include Pseudo-Isaac, *Oratio contra Armenios*, PG 132, cols. 1175/1176–1179/1180, 1181/1182–1185/1186, 1225/1226, 1235/1236; [Michael Keroularios], *Epistolae*, PG 120, cols. 764/765–781/782; Leo of Ohrid, *Epistolae*, 180–86, 208, 212; Matthew Blastares, *Syntagma Alphabeticum*, PG 144, cols. 1345/1346–1347/1348; Ohanjanyan, “Armenian–Jewish Connections”; Siecienski, *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory*, 104–9, 117–23, 127–33, 155–56; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 57–69, 97, 115, 139, 154–76; Kolbaba, “East Roman Anti-Armenian Polemic”; Kolbaba, “Byzantines, Armenians and Latins”; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*; Sharf, “Animal Sacrifice in the Armenian Church,” in *Jews and Other Minorities in Byzantium*.

inside the church, and what kinds of animals were allowed as sacrifices, under what circumstances, and when.¹⁵¹ In truth, the Armenian practice of *mataṭ*, with its emphasis on animal sacrifice as a moment for sharing of food, and condemnation of those who do not or do not do so enough, is likely to represent an accommodation or adoption of Sasanian- and early Islamic-era Zoroastrian attitudes toward animal sacrifice and food sharing.¹⁵² Another possibility is that the attitudes toward animal sacrifice in Zoroastrian and Armenian Christian communities developed together. Early modern Armenian authors continued to insist on the differences between Jewish and Armenian sacrifice, although there is some recognition of the similarities between Armenian custom and those of Jews on Yom Kippur or Muslims on *ʿīd al-ʿaḏḩā*, which celebrates the patriarch Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son, or *ʿīd al-fiṭr*, which celebrates the end of Ramadan.¹⁵³ Thus, again, one sees a shift in attitudes among early modern Armenians toward parallels between Jewish, Muslim, and Armenian Christian practice, although in this case, authors were not willing to accept a direct equivalency between Jewish and Armenian ritual.

While not all Armenian-Byzantine-Latin accusations of Judaizing were involved with food, it is striking that so many were. As many who have studied these debates have indicated, the symbolism assigned these ritual foodstuffs and the theological implications of that symbolism, were fundamental to this polemical exchange. For example, for Byzantine authors, to give unleavened bread at the Eucharist was to deny the dual nature of Christ as dictated in the Council of Chalcedon, and, since leaven was "life," lifeless flatbread could never embody Christ.¹⁵⁴ Yet also fundamental to these exchanges, was not only theology, or the tendency to attribute all "heresy" to Judaism, but also the focus on Jewish practice, as these Christian authors imagined it, plus outrage that any group of Christians would imitate Jewish ritual, especially rituals of food. Ritual food was both especially powerful and especially threatening. Much like al-Ṭurtūshī's "Christian" doughnuts and cheese fritters, which Andalusī Muslims were using in their celebrations of *ʿīd al-ʿaḏḩā* and *ʿīd al-fiṭr*, eating the ritual food of another at one's own festivals breeched both local markers of identity and religious boundaries. Accusing the religious other of "foreign" as well as religiously "wrong" food was a way of magnifying their status as outsiders.¹⁵⁵ Barbara Crostini, referring to Byzantine food polemic, argues

151 *Ordonnancement du livre des canons arméniens*, 312/313–328/329, all canons listed there, 430/431–432/433, YMD 8; Ohanjanyan, "Armenian–Jewish Connections"; Sharf, "Animal Sacrifice in the Armenian Church" in *Jews and Other Minorities in Byzantium*.

152 Payne, *A State of Mixture*, 118. To the best of my knowledge, Armenian Christian texts do not emphasize the animals' well-being, as Payne notes for a number of Zoroastrian texts. Also, the Armenian and Syrian Churches in the region often opposed eating with outsiders, specifically "Magians," whereas Zoroastrian festivals allowed for the distribution of food to non-Zoroastrians. Payne, *A State of Mixture*, 119–24

153 Ohanjanyan, "Armenian–Jewish Connections."

154 Siecienski, *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory*, esp. 8; Crostini, "What was Kosher in Byzantium?"; Kolbaba, "East Roman Anti-Armenian Polemic"; Kolbaba, "Byzantines, Armenians and Latins"; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 25, 56, 58, 137, 165–66, 176–77.

155 al-Ṭurtūshī, *Kitāb al-ḩawādith wa-al-bidaʿ*, ed. Talbi, 140–41 and in Melville and Ubaydli, eds.,

that “[t]he Jewish presence in the Byzantine empire, therefore both territorially and in the diaspora, kept alive the issue of clean and unclean foods as a marker of both ethnic and religious identity, further strengthened by the continuation of the ‘kosher’ mentality on the part of Muslims.”¹⁵⁶ Thus, while the “Judaism” or Jewish-like behaviours which Byzantine, Latin, and Armenian Christians attributed to one another and other Christian groups, was often a product of imagination and polemical rhetoric, and, unlike many of the objections to shared practices or socializing examined in this book, was largely unrelated to fears of interaction with Jews (or Muslims), the spectre of living Jews, with their ritual foods and purity laws, fuelled these comparisons. Making such a case for Armenian polemic is more tenuous; however, Armenians were well aware of and drew from Byzantine and Syriac portrayals of Jews and Judaism, on the one hand, and had ample opportunity to encounter Jews in Anatolia, Cilicia, central Byzantine lands and the Middle East, on the other. Thus, it is possible that Crostini’s observations about the impact of Jews’ presence on Byzantine intra-Christian polemic and law may be applicable to Armenian authors as well.

No Place for Outsiders: Churches and Non-Christians

Earlier canon collections from Byzantium, like Laodicea (363 CE) or the second council of Nicea (787 CE) which were translated into Armenian, repeated prohibitions against allowing heretics or non-Christians to enter a church, or against going to the martyriums of “heretics.”¹⁵⁷ Dawit’ Ganjekeci went further, for in his penitential he indicated that physical contact with an “impure” animal, or an “*aylazgi*,” meaning “stranger,” or “foreigner” usually connoting a non-Christian, could render an object or space unclean and potentially unfit for Christian use.¹⁵⁸ Canon 13 is particularly telling, for there he creates a hierarchy. If an “*aylazgi*” enters a church without committing violence, one should sprinkle water and sweep where his hand or foot has reached, and read from the prophets, apostles, and gospel, and recite a prayer. An *aylazgi* who enters and behaves contemptuously or goes to the area where the priest would lead the services, the same ritual is required, but no service may be held in the church for a day. Those sacramental vessels touched by the outsider, if valuable must be washed and reconsecrated; less valuable ones should no longer be used for the service. Dawit’ notes that if an ani-

Christians and Moors in Spain, 3:120–21; Cuffel, “Legal but not Licit” and Chapter 5 of this book.

156 Crostini, “What was Kosher in Byzantium?,” quotation on 169.

157 Madirossian with Ananean, eds., *Ordonnancement du livre des canons arméniens*, 426/427, LAO 9,34; 488/489, LAO 6,33; 816/817, SCN 60, 63, 84, 85.

158 [Dawit’ Ganjekeci] *Penitential*, Canons 12–13, 20, 80; Dorfmann, “The *Admonitory Exhortations* of Dawit’.” My thanks to Prof. Zaroui Pogossian of the University of Florence for her input on Armenian vocabulary and texts and for alerting me to Dorfmann’s article. All errors are my own. Dowsett translates *aylazgi* as “infidel.” Dorfmann states that the term could refer to foreigner in either an ethnic or religious sense, but by the early Islamic period it was used to designate Muslims.

mal, whether clean or unclean enters the church the same rule applies.¹⁵⁹ The careful description of various possibilities and behaviours suggest that “*aylazgi*,” in this case Muslims, did enter Armenian churches. That some came without doing violence hints that local Muslims may have come either out of curiosity or reverence. Unable to expel them, Armenian Christians felt the need to purify their holy space in the aftermath of such a visitation. The reference to violence reflects the realities of living in a contested territory, often under Muslim rule.¹⁶⁰ The canon also places religious outsiders on a par with animals, which potentially implies a strong repugnance for “infidels” in addition to assigning them an impure status. Yet another interpretation of purification regulations and the establishment of a protocol for addressing the presence of a religious outsider is that it served as a strategy by which Armenian Christians could mark distinctions between self and other and having done so, still allow interactions.

This regulation and attitude stand in stark contrast to the Syriac and Arabic canon law codes discussed in chapter four, in which non-Christians seemingly entered the church and gave donations, including objects which potentially could be used in the service. In Dawit’s penitential the mere touch of an “*aylazgi*” compromised the sacrality of objects in the church.¹⁶¹ Again, the specificity and detail of these regulations suggest that outsiders did indeed seek out sacred spaces and objects of Armenian Christians, much as we know Muslims in the Middle East entered churches and, occasionally, participated in rituals therein. The reaction, at least of Dawit’, was to prohibit, rather than accommodate such intrusions.

Regulations aimed at discouraging shared festivals, rituals, or spaces between Christians and non-Christians, or “heretics” were already decreed in late antiquity, such as in the fourth-century synod of Laodicea. These earlier laws and their expansions or translations by later Byzantine and Armenian canonists, mostly address the issue of Christians going to the sacred spaces and religious services of Jews, or “false” Christians, rather than religious outsiders attempting to enter the churches or monasteries of the faithful.¹⁶² Canon 6 of Laodicea prohibits heretics from entering a church while they

159 [Dawit’ Ganjekeci] *Penitential*, Canon 13.

160 On the wars and shifting allegiances, including between Muslim Kurdish (Shaddādi) or Turkish (Seljuq) leaders during this period, see Dorfmann, “The *Admonitory Exhortations of Dawit’*”; Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History*, 5–106.

161 In addition to Canon 13, also see Canons 11 and 12. Canon 93 stipulates that if one sees a cross in the hands of an infidel, one is obliged to purchase it, regardless of the price.

162 The relevant canons of Laodicea are 9, 37–39. Later, Byzantine discussions of the this and other relevant earlier canons include Balsamon, PG 137 Canons of the Apostles, Canon 64 cols. 163/164–165/166, Canon 71 cols. 181/182, Trullo, Canon 11 col. 551/552, Canons of Laodicea, Canon 9 cols 1353/1354–1355/1356, Canons 37–39, cols. 1391/1392–1393/1394; Demetrius Khomatianos, *Responsa*, PG 119, cols. 1045/1046–1047/1048; Matthew Blastares. *Syntagma Alphabeticum*, PG 144, cols. 1049/1050–1051/1052, 1345/1346–1347/1348. For Armenian versions see Mardirossian with Ananean, eds., *Ordonnancement du livre des canons arméniens*, 426/427–428/429 LAO 9, LAO 34, SCN 85, 880/881–882/883 CAP 16, CAP 17, CCL 66, LAO 9, LAO 32, LAO 33, LAO 34, LAO 37, LAO 38, GLI 4, 892/893–894/895 SCN 63, ECB 76, 898/899–900/901 CLL60, CLL 65, CLL 66, ATC 1, LAO 37.

are still heretics but does not mention non-Christians. Additional regulations discuss what to do with those who had converted to another religion or form of Christianity or whom to admit who wished to be baptized. The latter I will discuss separately in the next section. Byzantine commentators on the Synod of Laodicea like Balsamon or John Zonaras (ca. 1070–1140 CE), the historian-theologian who lived much of his adult life in Constantinople working for Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081–1118 CE), saw this law as applying specifically and only to heretics or, in Zonaras' case, to those heretics who had "lapsed" from the true faith.¹⁶³ This category encompassed insincere Jewish converts to Christianity as well.¹⁶⁴ The Armenian rendition of Canon 6 of Laodicea adds the word for "stranger," *"aylazgi,"* designating a non-Christian, to the text, so that both heretics and non-Christians are forbidden entry.¹⁶⁵ I would suggest that this alteration plus Dawit' Ganjekec'i's extended discussion of what to do if a non-Christian were to enter a church, indicate that Armenians shaped their religious law to address the realities of a religiously pluralistic environment over which they were not always in complete control. Part of this environment included developing a strategy or policy to deal with the persistent interest of non-Christians, probably Muslims, in Christian holy spaces. While the Armenian solution, as reflected in the *Penitential*, differed from those of other Christian communities, the phenomenon of Muslim interest in churches and monasteries was a common one, as we have seen for other regions.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, extensive evidence of inter-marriage between Muslims and Christians, despite prohibitions to the contrary, may have produced a population which identified or would have been identified by others, as Muslim, and therefore "outsiders" to the Christian community, but who felt strongly drawn to churches because of their mixed heritage.¹⁶⁷ Regardless of the identity and motivations of those "strangers," Dawit' depicts such individuals as imposing their

163 Balsamon (and Zonaras) PG 137, Laodicea, Canon 6, cols. 1349/1350.

164 Balsamon, PG 137, Conc. VII Oecumen, Canon VIII, cols 915/916.

165 Mardirossian with Ananean, eds., *Ordonnancement du Livre des Canons Arméniens*, 882/883 LAO 6. Dorfmann, "Admonitory Exhortations of Dawit'" Again, my thanks to Zaroui Pogossian for checking the Armenian original for me.

166 See Chapter 4 of this book. Prior to the spread of Islam, when the canons of Laodicea and other early canon collections were being translated and circulating in Armenia, the strangers could have been members of local religious groups, or Zoroastrians. On the translation of these canons see Hubert Kaufhold, "Sources of Canon Law in the Eastern Churches," in Hartmann and Pennington, eds., *History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law*, 216–17.

167 Shukurov, "Harem Christianity"; Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 55–57. Compare with De Nicola, *Women in Mongol Iran*, 9, 44, 114; Eastmond, *Tamta's World*, although these deal with the Mongol rather than the Seljuk era. For Armenian law on inter-marriage or cross-religious sexual partnerships see: Mxit'ar Goš, *The Lawcode*, chap. 163, p. 220; [Dawit' Ganjekec'i] *Penitential*, Canons 16, 17, 18, 19; Mardirossian with Ananean, eds., *Ordonnancement du Livre des Canons Arméniens*, 814/815 LAO 31, SCN 86. Compare with Demetrius Khomatianos, *Responsa*, PG 119, cols. 1065/1066. Slavery or captivity through war and the forced or "encouraged" conversion of slaves or captives also may have produced families and children of ambiguous or mixed religious affiliations in practice, if not officially. See Mxit'ar Goš, *The Lawcode*, chaps. 54–56, pp. 157–58, chap. 110, pp. 191–92, chap. 206 pp. 249–50.

presence in Armenian churches. The purification rituals, therefore, serve as resistance to a kind of forced sharing.

While Byzantines did not have the same level of strict, direct legislation against Muslims entering churches as Armenians, anecdotal evidence indicates that many Byzantines disapproved of allowing Muslims to access to churches and monasteries or to touch objects or vestments linked to the church or saints. We have already seen that the fourteenth-century Ibn Baṭūṭa was allowed to enter some Byzantine holy places but forbidden to enter others without converting to Christianity.¹⁶⁸ Niketas Choniates, while outlining the relationship between Emperor Manuel I (1118–1180 CE) and Sultan Kilij Arslan II (r. 1156–1192 CE), described a triumphal march into Constantinople headed by both the emperor and the sultan. The planned triumph was disrupted by an earthquake. Furthermore:

The clergy of the holy church contended (and the emperor himself received their words as evil omens) that God was wroth, and that under no circumstances would he tolerate an impious man to show himself and participate in a triumph adorned by all-hallowed furnishings and embellished by the likenesses of saints and sanctified by the images of Christ.¹⁶⁹

Here, the implication seems to be that holy objects—blessed clothing and images of saints—make the procession a sacred event. As a result, the participation of the Muslim Sultan and his proximity to such objects are inappropriate and provoke God's wrath, which takes the form of an earthquake. Thus, in Byzantium, separating non-Christians from the sacred spaces, objects, and rituals of Christians was not set by law, as in Armenia, but by the whim of a given caretaker or cleric, or divine intervention. For both, the impulse is to rebuff religious others, rather than accommodate or incorporate them into Christian rituals and spaces. In the core territories of Byzantium, access to the sacred could be regulated. In Ganjak, and other regions of the Armeniate world, clergy could make laws, but at best, these only influenced their parishioners, not the various Muslim and other non-Christians around them.

The Ritual makes the Wo/man? Sharing, Imitation, and Disputed Christian Affiliation

In both Byzantine and Armenian context, engaging in rituals which were interpreted as having been taken from another religious tradition called into question a given individual or group's status as a true Christian. Framed another way, accusing a group of engaging in such rituals challenged that group's membership as part of God's people.

168 Ibn Baṭūṭa, *Voyages*, 2:433–43 and see Chapter 4 of this book.

169 “ἐφασκον δὲ οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ νεώ καὶ τοῦ βήματος (καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἀγαθὰς κληδονὰς ἐδέχετο τὰ λεγόμενα) μηνίειν τὸ θεῖον καὶ μὴδ’ ὅλως ἀνέχεσθαι προκύψεν ὅλως εἰς θρίαμβον μὴ θεοσεβείας ἄδρα μετεσχηκότα, ὃν κοσμοῦσιν ἐπιπλά παναγῇ καὶ ἁγίων ἔκτθηα διειλήφασιν καὶ χαρακτὴρ καθαγιαίνει Χριστοῦ.”; Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, 1:119; Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium*, 67.

Most of the examples discussed so far revolve around food, sacralized or otherwise. Yet foodways were not the only target of such discussions. Other types of “imitation” were imagined whereas others point to interaction and shared rituals between Armenian and Byzantine Christians and a variety of religious others.

As noted earlier, Zoroastrians and interactions with them were part of the Armenian legal tradition. Regulating interactions with Zoroastrians also included condemning the adoption of Zoroastrian practice within the church. For example, concerns about bishops and other church officials treating these offices as an inherited position, or extensive explanations of the prohibition against marrying individuals within one’s immediate family are reflections of Zoroastrian influence on local, late antique Christian practice.¹⁷⁰ The tradition of hereditary positions within the church was one of the customs Byzantines came to condemn as an example of Armenian “Judaizing, as well as being a debated issue within the Armenian church itself.”¹⁷¹ As with the custom of *matał*, Byzantine authors seem to have been unaware of or uninterested in the larger cultural-religious context from which this “imitation” sprang, and associated Armenian difference with the religious other, who, in Byzantine eyes, was the most insulting, namely Jews.

A word of caution is in order, however. So far, the numerous prohibitions against socializing with Jews in the form of bathing, marriage, or eating, going to or donating to their synagogues, etc. which are repeated in canon law texts have been analyzed in light of Armenian Byzantine polemical impulses against other Christians. Yet the instructions by Demetrius Khomatianos, noted above, on how to distribute and restrict Jewish, Armenian, and Muslim populations in Byzantine-controlled cities were not part of any polemical diatribe against an imaginary religious other. Rather, his responsum outlined recommended policy for managing religious minorities in an urban context. Presumably, his concern that if these non-Orthodox were allowed to dwell, worship and wander in cities at will, they might convert others, also reflects anxieties about the lived realities of a religiously mixed population. That people converted back and forth between Islam and Christianity, or allowed others to think that they did, as has already been alluded to. Likewise, Christians oscillated between theologies and Armenian vs. Byzantine identity.¹⁷² While, as indicated, not enough information exists to construct a detailed picture of Jewish populations in Armenia and their daily interactions with Armenian Christians,

170 Mardirossian, *Le livre des Canons arméniens*, 78–85, 141–142; Payne, *A State of Mixture*, 93–94, 106–117; Mardirossian with Ananian, eds., *Ordonnancement du Livre des Canons Arméniens*: On inheriting positions within the church: 166/167, CCL27, 168/169 SPT 13, 172/173 SPT 47, 178/179–182/183, YAP 8, THD 1, DUN 6, DUN 8; on degrees of consanguinity allowed in marriage: 708/709–710/711, SHV 13, SEW 3, SIO 16. As Payne notes, Syriac Christian legalists were also concerned with this problem in Iran, and addressed both Zoroastrian and Biblical (Jewish) law in this area.

171 Mardirossian, *Le livre des Canons arméniens*, 353–55; Nedungatt and Featherstone, eds., *Trullo Revisited*, Canon 33. The Greek text and translation may also be found at: <http://telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/relmin/extrait268341/>; Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 33, cols. 625/626.

172 See, for example, the beginning of the speech attributed by Niketas Choniates to Emperor John Komnenos II (1087–1143 CE) as he presented his youngest son Manuel. (Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, 1: 42–43, Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium*, 24–25). Therein John refers to those who

more is known about Jews in Byzantium. Relevant to the current study is that we know that Jews were an integral part of both the local economy and long-distance trade in Byzantium and that Christians in Byzantine territories *did* occasionally convert to Judaism, and Byzantine Christian captives became slaves in Jewish households abroad and were converted to Judaism as per Jewish law and sometimes re-converted to Christianity.¹⁷³ This pattern is similar to that identified for those who “switched sides” from Byzantine to Muslim or Armenian and back again. None of these pieces of information directly demonstrate that prohibitions against socializing and shared rituals between Christians and Jews in Byzantine law codes were directed at real interactions. Nevertheless, they suggest a cultural environment where shared rituals between Jews and Christians would be plausible, and show that Judaism was an attractive option for some Christians. Such attraction would have been fostered through regular (religious), and, from the perspective of Byzantine canon lawyers and members of the government, illicit interaction. The interpretation of Byzantine Christian injunctions against shared Jewish-Christian practice relative to lived Jewish-Christian interactions, must, therefore, remain open until more definitive evidence comes to light.

Evidence for certain shared practices between Muslims and Christians in Byzantine and Armenian lands is more conclusive. In 885 CE, Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to Leo, the archbishop of Calabria. Photius’ letter addressed a number of issues: the appropriate time and place and other conditions for baptism, the status of presbyters and deacons whose wives had been violated by barbarians, whether to allow requests from Muslim women to baptize their children, whether to bring the holy offering to Christians who were held captive by the Muslims, and the status of children who were the result of Muslim predations.¹⁷⁴ The issue of baptizing the children of Muslim women will be the focus of the remainder of this section, however the other topics raised in the epistle provide context. Muslim and Byzantine powers were vying for control over Calabria during the ninth-century, so that issues like the status of war-captives and slaves, or the offspring of mixed-religious sexual encounters would have been major concerns for Leo. It is not clear who these Muslim women were who sought baptism for their children, although it seems likely that they were slaves, despite Michael McCormick’s findings that most slaves were European, male and either children or teenagers. Scholars working on the region focusing on the Muslim context have found indications of Muslim slaves as well, although at various periods there was also a free Muslim population, from which these women also could have come.¹⁷⁵ Photius was

have defected to the Cilicians and to the Muslims. Also see Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 225–31; Brand, “The Turkish Element in Byzantium,” and discussions above.

173 Cuffel, “Conversion and Religious Polemic”; Perry, “Daily Life of Slaves,” 201–2, 207; Yagur, “Religious Identity”; 21–26, 28, 46, 51, 91–92, 98, 206, 220–21; Gardette, “The Judaizing Christians”; Rustow, *Heresy and the Politics of Community*, 262–64; Holo, *Byzantine Jewry*; Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, 35–39, 54–55; Gil, *A History of Palestine*, sec. 939, pp. 815–18.

174 Photius, *Responsa*, PG 102, cols. 773/774–781/782.

175 Berto, *Christians and Muslims in Early Medieval Italy*, 10–15, 36, 40, 46; McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy*, 244–65, 769–75; Metcalf, *Muslims of Medieval Italy*, 1–43.

clearly anticipating opposition to his suggestion that such children be granted baptism, for he is careful to allay fears that the one who would agree to administer such a ritual would be responsible if the child grew up to live a less than righteous life. Rather, he suggests, baptism should be a kind of gateway or down payment toward righteousness, and possibly even conversion for both child and mother.¹⁷⁶

Comparing this letter with later Byzantine texts describing the same phenomenon, Rustam Shukurov argues that there was a change in Byzantine canon law starting in the twelfth century, in which such baptisms were no longer considered valid. The change may be traced to Loukas Chrysoberges, who was patriarch of Constantinople between 1156 to 1170. Some Muslims who had been brought before the synod maintained that they should not have to be baptized because they had already been baptized in their homeland. Some also claimed to have had Orthodox Christian mothers. Nevertheless, they were required to be rebaptized, because they could produce no witnesses that they had undergone the ritual.¹⁷⁷ Theodore Balsamon discusses this issue on two occasions in his commentary on canon law: once when elaborating on canon 84 of the Council of Trullo and once on canon 8 of the seventh Ecumenical Council, otherwise known as the Second Council of Nicea (787 CE).¹⁷⁸ Canon 84 of Trullo states that children who cannot answer for themselves or understand the mystery of baptism and for whom there is no witness that they have been baptized, may be baptized again. After explaining in general why one would need to baptize a child again, he turns specifically to synod, explaining that children from both Christian and Muslim lands had been captured in war. The question arose whether these children should be rebaptized. When some Muslims at the synod claimed that they had already been baptized they were asked how that came to be. They replied that: “it is a custom, all Muslim children are baptized by an orthodox priest.”¹⁷⁹ As in the record of the synod itself, Balsamon also notes that these Muslims’ claim to Christian identity through baptism was rejected not only because there was no witness but also because Muslims sought baptism as a kind of medicine for the body, rather than the soul, an assertion he repeats in his discussion of second council of Nicea, embedded in a lengthy discussion of the problems surrounding baptizing Jews, ascertaining their sincerity, and the problem of their continuing to observe the Sabbath after baptism.¹⁸⁰ In the fourteenth century Matthew Blastares repeats this information and adds that Muslim children are baptized before circumcision.¹⁸¹

Both Charles Brand and Rustam Shukurov understood the phenomenon described in these canon law texts as indicators of how Muslims, specifically Turks, sought to

176 Photius, *Responsa*, PG 102, cols. 779/780; Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 61.

177 *Regestes des actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople*, vol. 1, fasc. II–III no.1088; Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 57–60; Shukurov, “Harem Christianity”; Brand, “The Turkish Element in Byzantium.”

178 Balsamon, PG 137, cols.793/794–797/798, 913/914–915/916.

179 συνήθειά ἐστι πάντα τὰ νήπια τῶν Ἀγαρηνῶν βαπτίζεσθαι παρὰ ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων. Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 84, cols. 795/796.

180 Balsamon, PG 137, Canon 84, cols. 795/796, 915/916.

181 Blastares, *Syntagma*, PG 144, cols. 1107/1108.

negotiate both their identity and their entry into Byzantine society. Both Brand and Shukurov maintain that to become part of an advance in Byzantine society required baptism and official Christian status. Shukurov argues that although Muslims were allowed to practice their religion within Byzantine territories, that privilege was reserved for Muslim subjects of foreign rulers, living or staying in Byzantium. Brand suggests that Seljuk identity was sufficiently fluid, and affiliation with Islam recent enough, that adopting a Christian or ambiguous status was not so distressing. Shukurov is inclined to argue that Turks consciously adopted a dual religious identity; which they claimed at any given moment depended on their locale. That many in fact came from mixed marriages aided this strategy.¹⁸² The anxiety evident in Byzantine legal texts sprang from the fear of insincere Muslim converts.¹⁸³ This hypothesis is further supported by Balsamon and Blastere's choice to embed their descriptions of Muslim baptism in discussions of Jewish baptism and crypto-Judaism.¹⁸⁴

While Brand and Shukurov's contentions are convincing and well supported by the sources, the picture which they present is partial at best. Although Shukurov mentions Photius' letter, he does not discuss its implications. Whether these Muslim women had their children baptized under duress (slavery) or freely would be important to know for understanding the context of later descriptions of similar behaviour. If the latter, then this letter provides evidence that the kind of communal bathing or "baptism" at Christian pools by both Muslims and Christians described by not only Byzantine canon lawyers, but also by Syriac canonists, such as Jōhannān of Mardē, Muslim legalists, like Ibn al-Ḥājj and western travellers, such as Felix Fabri, was a long-standing and wide-spread custom.¹⁸⁵ The fact that Photius seems to be addressing the conflict between Muslims and Christians in Calabria also indicates that this practice was not peculiar to Turkish Muslims. One might argue that the festive bathing which so upset Ibn al-Ḥājj was imported to Egypt by Mamluks, namely slaves, often Turkic, brought to Egypt to serve in the military, but nothing in the passage singles out Mamluks for special opprobrium.

182 Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 55–63, 222–23, 229–39, 297; Shukurov, "Harem Christianity"; Brand, "The Turkish Element in Byzantium." Balivet, though he does not address Muslim baptism, also argues that many Turks adopted a kind of dual Christian/Muslim identity; *Romanie Byzantine*, 21–34.

183 Shukurov, *The Byzantine Turks*, 61–62, 228–30, Shukurov suggests this anxiety was exacerbated by the scandal surrounding the purported Christian identity of Seljuk Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II (r. 1246–1262 CE) and his male children. While taking political refuge in Byzantium, the metropolitan of Pisidia, Markarios, confirmed 'Izz al-Dīn's claim that he and his family had been baptized in their homeland, and therefore already good Christians and did not need to convert. Once 'Izz al-Dīn abandoned Byzantium for the Golden Horde, his Christian status was called into question, and the Patriarch Arsenios (ca. 1200–1273 CE) was blamed for having welcomed them and having treated them as Christians with the right to attend church, eat with Christians etc. Shukurov hypothesizes that this accusation that this accusation, among others, was an effort on the part of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1223–1282 CE) to depose Arsenios.

184 Blasteres follows his discussion about baptizing Muslim infants with a chapter on the Jews. Blasteres, *Syntagma*, PG 144, cols. 1109/1110.

185 See Chapters 2, 4, and 5 of this book.

Thus, something similar to the practice described in these Byzantine legal texts seems to have been common in Egypt at least by the Mamluk era.¹⁸⁶ While desiring dual identities makes some sense in the context of frequent mixed marriages, and a need to function in both Byzantine-Christian and Seljuk (and later, other Turkic) -Muslim societies, Muslims in Egypt and the Levant would have gained no advantage from claiming Christian identity; indeed, as we have seen, doing so would have been a violation of the ruling religious hierarchy of which they were part. One possibility is that (Syrian) Christian willingness to allow, or even encourage such customs facilitated Muslim participation in baptismal and other Christian rituals throughout Anatolia and parts of the Mediterranean. Although, as we have seen, Jōhannān of Mardē made a clear separation between Muslims partaking in the baptism of St. John vs. Christians being inducted into the faith through the baptism of Christ with sacred oil and water, the Muslims bringing their children to this ceremony may have understood the ritual differently. Or, perfectly cognizant of the ritual's meaning and purpose, they consciously used this custom to claim Christian belonging when it was advantageous to do so.

In the *Penitential* of Dawit' Ganjekec'i is a passage which bears striking resemblance to the twelfth-century Byzantine and Syrian Orthodox rulings about Muslims who had been baptized by Christian priests, although it pre-dates all but the letter of Photius:

Again there is a custom among priests to accept the children of infidels for baptism: such are ignorant of the mysteries of God and do not know that we were baptized in the death of Christ and by baptism are buried with him. But they who are baptized by us in this saving mystery like us are not baptized by conviction but are baptized thinking it to be some devilish witchcraft for the protection of their persons. Therefore, it is not proper to cast the ineffable mystery of the Word before those who mock us with this redeeming sacrament; certain priests devise some imperfect [form of baptism] and merely sprinkle water on their bodies with the object of escaping from supreme and great punishment. We are, however, commanded to confess boldly before heathens; hence let no one do it for it is deception. But if anyone performs the full rite of baptism over them in our fashion, he shall be dismissed from the orders of priesthood and shall not celebrate mass...Above all, it is proper to forbid the status of godfather to the infidels, for what has a believer in common with an unbeliever, or Christ with Belial? If any should do this once in ignorance, he shall greatly repent and the priest shall have mercy on him according to his discretion. If he prove contemptuous and take no heed, he is cursed in life and death. And the priest who performs a baptism with an infidel as godfather shall be dismissed from his orders and not celebrate mass. If he does it once—repentance for one year and then scholars will examine his case.¹⁸⁷

186 On Mamluks and the Mamluk system see Freamon, "The 'Mamluk/Ghulam Phenomenon,'" Ayalon, *Islam and the Abode of War*, 1–21.

187 [Dawit' Ganjekec'i] *Penitential*, Canon 21.

Dawit', like the later Byzantine authors asserts that the Muslims seek baptism for protection rather than out of a desire to accept Christian belief. However, unlike the Byzantine (or the Muslim) texts describing this practice, onus is on the priest who performs the ritual, rather than on the Muslims requesting the ritual. Indeed, Dawit's position is much closer to the attitude of Photius, whose primary concern was to allay fears that any clergy who baptized Muslim children would be held accountable if they lived an impious life in adulthood. Yet more intriguing is Dawit's description of a kind of two-tiered baptismal ceremony, a partial one performed by priests under threat of punishment, vs. the full ceremony. It strongly resembles the two-tiered baptism of the Syrian Orthodox and Church of the East, however, his description of the motivation of clergy is quite different. While Dawit' disapproves of clergy seeking to save themselves by performing some version of baptism—enough to convince an outsider—he considers those who do the full ceremony on behalf of non-Christians on a regular basis to merit condemnation in this life and the next. That priests would be in fear of their safety lest they enact some semblance of baptism for outsiders requesting it, suggests that this ceremony was considered important and powerful enough that non-Christians, most likely Muslim overlords with the power to enforce such punishment, demanded it. Dawit' writes as if this partial baptism is a known stratagem, requiring legislation, suggesting that this dilemma arose frequently. An echo of this situation may be found in Matthew Blasteres, who writes of priests who are tributaries of Muslims performing the ritual reluctantly (ἀκοντες).¹⁸⁸ It would seem, therefore, that in Anatolia and Armenia, priests, and not just orthodox priests as the Byzantine writers asserted, were sought out to perform this blessing for Muslim children, and were compelled to do so. This element of fear and compulsion is completely absent in the Syriac sources, although the Syrian, Armenian and Byzantine Christians overlapped geographically in a number of regions. In Egypt and the Levant, while Muslims all ages went to holy pools, especially during relevant Christian holidays, some writers do specify that children were brought especially for the benefit that they might derive from it, something which Western Christian authors also confirm, although not always in complimentary terms.¹⁸⁹ In these regions, it does not seem there was any need to force Christian sacral participation, perhaps because religious hierarchies and access to holy sites were better established than in Anatolia. The repeated emphasis on children, and the explicit mention of women as instigators of the ritual in many of the texts from a variety of religious traditions, also suggest that this practice was an expression of women's piety, although linking forms of religious behaviour with women was often a form of polemic in itself.¹⁹⁰

Byzantinists and scholars of Anatolia have puzzled over the references to bad smell. Shukurov repeats Hasluck's suggestion that Christian assertions that Muslims sought baptism for their children in order to rid them of bad smell derived from Christians'

188 Blasteres, *Syntagma*, PG 144, cols. 1107/1108.

189 Ibn Taymiya, *Kitāb iqtidā'*, 227; *Ibn Taimiyya's Struggle*, 222; Felix Fabri, *Evagatorium*, 3:50–51 (fol. 92a); Felix Fabri, *Voyage en Egypte*, 2:464–65; Bertrand de la Broquière, *Voyage d'outremer*, 90, 115; Cuffel, "Environmental Disasters."

190 Cuffel, "From Practice to Polemic"; Lutfi, "Manners and Customs."

misunderstanding of Muslim purity laws.¹⁹¹ I would argue that this is simply polemic on the part of both Western and Byzantine Christian authors. Similar to Felix Fabri and other Western Christian authors who disparaged Muslim “baptism” or custom of going to Christian pools during holidays to bathe, Basamon, repeating the statement of the synod, asserts: “It is imagined by the Muslims the children would be possessed by demons and stink like dogs unless they were baptized like the Christians.”¹⁹² Matthew Blasteres is, if anything, worse, for in addition to repeating the assertion that Muslims seek baptism to rid themselves of bad smell—which is to no avail, since they do not receive real baptism—he punctuates the entire passage with comments about the pollution, diseased bodies, profound impiety, and darkness of the Muslims.¹⁹³ As shown in Chapter 1, smell was imbued with theological meaning; foul smell was indicative of wrong belief, an attitude that was shared among most of the religious communities in the Mediterranean, including Byzantines and Western Christians. Impurity and disease were no less markers of “bad” religion.¹⁹⁴ Dawit’ was far from complimentary to the unbelievers who sought, baptism, but his tone was far less vituperative than the Byzantine authors writing from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries. I would suggest that Byzantine writers felt far more threatened, as Muslim powers and a variety of those whom the Byzantines considered religious outsiders came to dwell within their borders. Balsamon and Blasteres’s discussions of insincere Jewish converts and falsely baptized Muslims, all claiming Christian identity, much as Armenians and Latins claimed to be the true and rightly practising Christians in contrast to the Byzantines, suggest a fear of hidden or changing affiliations, which, as we have seen, was well founded. Shared rituals, whether real or imagined, epitomized the ambiguity of belonging, that so often undermined political and military alliances in addition to religious allegiance. For Armenians, long accustomed to shifting borders and claims to sovereignty, they drew boundaries in other ways, namely ritualized purity and impurity, a system which potentially functioned both when they were religious/ethnic minorities, and when they possessed political power. Anecdotal indications from Armenian texts from the Safavid and Ottoman eras, however, suggest that attitudes toward shared customs or links with other religions changed, although more research would be necessary to map this process fully. The need for medieval canonists, whether Armenian or Byzantine, to repeat prohibitions again imitating or joining practices of others, and the expressions of outrage or frustration by chroniclers over what they perceived as violated boundaries, suggests that on a day to day level, neat delineations of religious affiliation or practice were ignored when it was more practicable to do so.

191 Shukurov, “Harem Christianity,” comment on 129. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam*, 1:32–33.

192 “Δέδοκται γὰρ παρὰ Ἀγαρηνοῖς τὰ τέκνα τούτων δαιμονῶν καὶ κατὰ κύνας ὄζειν εἰ μὴ βαπτίσματος τύχῳσι Χριστιανικοῦ”; Balsamon, PG 137, cols. 795/796. For a list of other Western European Christians who evoke such imagery see Shukurov, “Harem Christianity.”

193 Blasteres, *Syntagma*, PG 144, cols. 1107/1108–1109/1110.

194 Taylor, “The Syriac Baptism of St. John”; Harvey, *Scenting Salvation*, 201–220; Resnick, *Marks of Distinction*, 203, 233–44; see Cuffel, *Gendering Disgust*, 73–75, for this phenomenon in Byzantine religious polemic, and more generally, 160–97.

Conclusions

What should be apparent, whether for medieval Italian lands, Iberia, Armenianate lands, or Byzantium, is that law, anxiety, and imagination often went hand in hand. Imagined, threatening behaviour, or commonalities between those already determined as undesirable, was often an expression of insecurity on the part of those in power. In the case of both Latin and Byzantine canon law, conceptualizations about Jews, either as neighbours or as a symbolic category, sometimes shaped both language and enactments. Misunderstanding or wilful misinterpretation, such as Byzantine views discussions the Armenian *mataḥ*, were part of the imaginative process which allowed canonists, chroniclers, or polemicists to legislate or rail against opponents with neatly predetermined characteristics, rather than uncover and address more complicated pluralities of religious and cultural difference. Shared or imitated rituals, whether invented or practised epitomized messy boundaries and indefinable categories, and thus were targeted as threatening. In the case of assertions of Judaizing between Armenian, Byzantine, and Latin Christians, accusing one another of adopting the practices of a religious other served to *create* or emphasize difference between Christians by linking key rituals to an outsider. Jews and their rituals were the most effective rhetorical choice, because in all Christian traditions, Jews were characterized by their utter rejection of Jesus, and thus symbolically epitomized otherness in a way that Muslims, or even “heretics” could not.

Targeted or not, the prohibitions which the larger umbrella of the church and members of its greater hierarchy wished to impose, were often thwarted by local needs and customs. The clash between regional Iberian authorities’ impulse to include Muslims and Jews in religious festivities, and the desire of Rome to prohibit their participation, is a good example of local practice vs. official policy. Resistance to rhetoric, imposed ceremonies, or identities appears in a variety of ways, whether as counter-narratives like the *Toledot Yeshu*, hidden meanings in Jewish banners at Christian processions, ritual purifications in the wake of unwelcome visitors, or Muslim women or Christian wives of Muslim men choosing and interpreting a ritual of belonging and blessing contrary to the understandings of the men around them. Resistance, much like the rhetoric and laws it worked against, sprang from the need to set the boundaries and uphold the religious identities against perceived encroachments by the religious other, very often in the form of shared or imitated religious practices.

