An Islamic Envelope-Flap Binding in the Cloister of Tudela: Another “Muslim Connection” for Iberian Jews? 1

PAMELA A. PATTON

One of the most fruitful developments in the recent study of medieval perceptions of social outgroups in Western Christendom, be they Jews, “Saracens,” Mongols, lepers, or others, has been the recognition that identifying features and stereotypes assigned to these groups by European Christians were based less on actual experience with such peoples and their practices than on what the majority cultures expected, desired, or feared these features to be. 2 Thus Jewishness, leprosy, or paganism, among others, were by no means absolute conditions in the medieval Christian view: all lay to some extent, as R.I. Moore suggested, “with beauty in the eye of the beholder.” 3

Whether the same expectation can be applied to the Christian characterization of outgroups in high medieval Iberia depends on how readily it can be adjusted to the conditions peculiar to that setting. In Spain’s Christian kingdoms, each comprising vast swathes of land only recently captured after centuries of Muslim rule, daily proximity to and interaction with the Jews and Muslims who continued to live and work there offered a counter to the reductive

---

1 This essay could not have been written without the inspiration and collaboration of Eric Marshall White, who first raised questions about the envelope-flap binding at Tudela when we visited the cloister some years ago. It has benefited further from thoughtful comments and questions following its presentation at the Index of Christian Art at Princeton in April 2006. For these, I thank especially Elizabeth del Álamo, Adelaide Bennett, Anne-Marie Bouché, Manuel Castiñeiras, Michael Curschmann, Jerrilyn Dodds, Amanda Dotseth, Colum Hourihane, Therese Martin, and John Williams. I also would like to acknowledge the National Endowment for the Humanities for a 2006 Summer Stipend which facilitated my revision of the final text.

2 A rich tradition of such inquiry has emerged in the past twenty years, following on such fundamental efforts as that of R.I. Moore, The Formation of a Persecuting Society (Oxford, 1987). It is exemplified in the field of visual studies by such works as S. Lipton, Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible Moralisée (Berkeley, 1999); Imagining the Self, Imagining the Other: Visual Representation and Jewish-Christian Dynamics in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period, ed. E. Frojmovic (Leiden, 2002); D.H. Strickland, Saracens, Demons, and Jews (Princeton, 2003); and M.B. Merback, “Fount of Mercy, City of Blood: Cultic Anti-Judaism and the Pulkau Passion Altarpiece,” Art Bulletin 87 (2005): 589–642.

3 Moore, 67.
stereotypes of a more homogeneous northern Europe. At the same time, the Christian kings’ increasingly self-conscious efforts to repopulate and spiritually regularize newly conquered lands brought with them a desire to emulate and identify with their historically Christian European neighbors. Spain’s Christian communities seem to have struggled with the fundamental differences between their social context and experience and those of northern Europeans. Yet where religious minorities were concerned, the eventual success of northern stereotypes and topoi in the later Middle Ages reveals a gradual accommodation to the European view.

Among the most intriguing illustrations of such accommodation are those that reveal how Iberian Christians structured their perceptions of Jews and Judaism in relation to Islamic culture. Although the religious and cultural differences between Jews and Muslims in the high Middle Ages would seem to have been fairly clear to the Christians with whom they shared the Iberian peninsula, such differences were far less concrete to many of their brethren in the West. The relatively limited exposure of most European Christians to either religious culture, and a new sense of the wide range of “others” who existed beyond the bounds of an expanding Europe seem at times to have facilitated a failure to distinguish between the two, and a commensurate readiness to compare, ally, or even elide the characteristics of Jews and Muslims in opposition to a normative and implicitly Christian culture.

This tendency has been examined by a number of scholars, among them Jeremy Cohen, whose 1996 article, “The Muslim Connection, Or On the Changing Role of the Jew in High Medieval Theology,” inspired the title and, to some extent, the framework of the present essay. Whereas Cohen’s article specifically concerned the written polemics of mainstream European theology, this essay will investigate what I see as a similar blurring of Jewish and Muslim characteristics in Iberian visual culture around the turn of the thirteenth century and onward. It takes as a case study one unusually layered example of this phenomenon: the depiction of an intricately detailed Islamic bookbinding in the hands of a group of Pharisees and Temple priests conspiring in the house of Caiaphas, an image found on a capital in the Romanesque cloister of Santa María la Mayor in Tudela, Navarre (Fig. 37).

The church of Santa María la Mayor has its own “Muslim connection,” having been founded, apparently, in a mosque donated to Augustinian canons regular following the conquest of

---


5 For a concise outline of the “Reconquest” in Spain, including northern European engagement with these efforts, see J. F. O’Callaghan, Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain (Philadelphia, 2003), 1–123.


Tudela by Alfonso I in 1119. The present late Romanesque church, with its pointed vaults and spacious cloister, replaced that structure during the last quarter of the twelfth century. The cloister seems to have been under way at much the same time, since a document of 1186 records a donation of houses “for the construction of the new cloister of Santa María” in that year. The sculpted capitals of the cloister represent a tour de force of Romanesque narrative art: twenty-eight of the forty-eight surviving capitals, including all of those still standing in the north and the east galleries and one in the south gallery, present the Infancy, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ in a chronological narrative sequence that proceeds clockwise from the northwest pier in an arrangement demonstrably original to the cloister. The remaining galleries are less orderly: the south presents a series of saints’ lives, while the west contains a varied assortment of Old Testament, apocalyptic, and secular imagery.

Fig. 37: Tudela, Santa María la Mayor, cloister, general view (1186–1200) (photo: author)

---

The Tudela capitals are memorable for their lively, theatrical compositions, their crowded and expressive figures, and their painstaking quotidian detail. Eager apostles surge around Christ at the Entry into Jerusalem; the dancing Salome imperiously brandishes a pair of square castanets; and in the Resurrection of Lazarus, multiple figures hold their noses in reaction to the corpse’s stench (Fig. 38). This expressiveness is intensified by a striking variety of costumes and accessories, from the snug-fitting gown worn by Salome to the round shields and mail of Pilate’s soldiers and the twelfth-century instruments — two viols, a harp, and a zither — played by cross-legged musicians on a west gallery capital (Fig. 39).

An especially striking feature of Tudela’s narrative imagery, which I have examined at length elsewhere, is the prominence accorded to Jewish figures within the cloister’s Christological narrative. Easily distinguished from the robed, bareheaded, and unshod Apostles by their long beards, low-cut slippers, hoods or caps, and crumpled trousers, Jews play an active and obvious role as the villains of the cloister’s Passion cycle. From the scene of the conspiracy in Caiaphas’ house, on which this essay will focus, to their successive involvement in the payment of Judas (Fig. 40), the arrest of Christ, and negotiations with Pilate over a guard for the tomb, Jews are shown not just as betrayers and accusers, but as the continuous persecutors of the Christian Savior. I have argued in the past that the cloister’s emphasis on Jewish enmity toward Christ, which is unprecedented in the traditional iconography of the region, derived at least in part from the preoccupation of the Tudelan canons with the promotion of their faith within a newly conquered city that already boasted a thriving and protected Jewish community — an argument that will be tested further in the present study.

The scene of the conspiracy in Caiaphas’ house appears on a capital applied to the north face of the cloister’s northeast pier (Fig. 41). This location places the scene near the midpoint of the cloister’s Christological narrative, so that it is preceded by a pier capital depicting the washing of the Apostles’ feet and followed by two others portraying the Payment of Judas and the Last Supper. It depicts the Temple Priests and Pharisees meeting in the house of the high priest Caiaphas to plan the arrest of Jesus, as described in John 11:47–53. Seven men, five on the primary face of the capital and one on each of the two abbreviated sides, gather in earnest conversation. All wear the long beards and pointed slippers characteristic of Jews in the Tudela cloister, and three wear a close-fitting, squared-off cap. The two men at the corners sit in high-sided chairs; the man at left, presumably Caiaphas, raises his hand authoritatively as the others turn heads and hands slightly toward him. The central figure, however, faces outward as he proffers a closed book.

This tiny sculpted codex remains in excellent condition, thanks to its protected location on the inner face of the pier, facing into the cloister walk (Fig. 42). Rendered with the same
Fig. 38: Tudela, Santa María la Mayor, cloister, Resurrection of Lazarus (1186–1200) (photo: author)

Fig. 39: Tudela, Santa María la Mayor, cloister, four musicians (1186–1200) (photo: author)
assiduous attention to detail found in other cloister capitals, it presents several distinctive features. The book is held frontally, with its spine to the viewer’s right; a triangular flap, its peak decorated by a minute eight-pointed star, wraps around its fore-edge at left, overlapping the front cover and fastening at the midpoint of the spine. It is the only book of its kind in the cloister, and it is the only one shown in the hands of a Jewish figure. The few other codices depicted at Tudela are held by Christian figures and are of the conventional Western format: for example, that held by an adjacent apostle in the scene of Christ’s appearance to Thomas is straight-edged and fastened by a single metal clasp (Fig. 43).16

The observantly rendered book in the Caiaphas scene differs distinctly from this type. Its overlapping lower cover and pentagonal flap identify it with the so-called “envelope-flap” binding type that came to be used in Islamic book production beginning in the eleventh century. Opening on the left, as is consistent with the right-to-left progression of Arabic text, such bindings featured a pentagonal extension of the book’s lower cover, which folds over the fore-edge to point back toward the spine, protecting the outer edges of the leaves. In many bindings of this type, the flap seems to have been designed to tuck inside the upper cover and rest on the leaf block; however, Islamic depictions of such bindings, like the Christian-made image at Tudela,

---

16 Another codex is held by Christ on a capital giving the Mission to the Apostles; see Patton, Pictorial Narrative, 259, fig. 57. The only other books portrayed in the cloister are the scrolls held by Enoch and Elijah in a capital depicting the coming of Antichrist; these are discussed below.
often show the flap resting outside the cover instead, perhaps in an effort to render it more recognizable.\textsuperscript{17}

The earliest surviving remnants of actual Islamic envelope-flap bindings derive from eleventh-century Egypt, suggesting that the type might have originated there.\textsuperscript{18} More fully intact examples, such as the back cover and flap from a binding made in or near Damascus circa


Fig. 42: Tudela, Santa María la Mayor, cloister, detail of book held by a Temple Priest (1186–1200) (photo: author)

Fig. 43: Tudela, Santa María la Mayor, cloister, Apostle with book (1186–1200) (photo: author).
1182 and now in Berlin (Fig. 44), survive from the twelfth century, attesting that the type had gained some currency in eastern Islamic lands by this time. By the last decades of the twelfth century, envelope-flap bindings had also come to be known by the renowned bookbinders of Morocco and Islamic Iberia, as attested by a reference to the technique by the binder Bakr al-Ishbīlī in a treatise on bookbinding written during the reign of the Almohad caliph Abū Yusuf Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr (580/1184–594/1198). The earliest actual bindings to survive from the Islamic West, however, were produced significantly later, in the middle of the thirteenth century, and these originated in Marrakesh, whereas no examples of the period are traceable specifically to the Iberian peninsula. The sculpted depiction of an envelope-flap binding in the Tudela cloister thus is only barely preceded by the earliest documentary evidence of such bindings in western Islamic lands, and to date it remains the only surviving visual evidence of the use of the technique in medieval Iberia during the period in question.

This conclusion bears significant implications for the history and technology of the medieval book, the most obvious of which is not only that the envelope-flap binding was known and used in Spain in the late twelfth century, but also that its production there must have been sufficiently widespread that it could provide an exemplar to a sharp-eyed Christian sculptor working as far north as the Ebro River. The exploration of this possibility, however, must be left to historians of the medieval book, so that this essay may turn to a question more relevant to the issue with which it began. What, in this Navarrese Christian cloister, are biblical Jews doing with a medieval Islamic book?

One conceivable explanation, which remains inconclusive at this writing, might be that the type of flap binding depicted here was used not only by Muslims in Iberia, but also by Jews living there. The existence of many cases in which Iberian Jews did adopt originally Islamic artistic forms is well known from such examples as the horseshoe arches and carved stucco ornament of the late twelfth-century Mudejar synagogue, now known as "Santa María la Blanca," in Toledo, or the strong ties to Islamic book decoration observable in the earliest surviving Hispano-Jewish Bibles, which date to the thirteenth century. It is certainly conceivable that some Hebrew manuscripts might have been covered in envelope-flap bindings, although the predominant use of vellum rather than paper for such books might have made a pasteboard

---

19 On this binding, now in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek, see Arts of Islam (exh. cat. Hayward Gallery; London, 1976), no. 510; and M. Weisweiler, Der islamische Bucheinband des Mittelalters (Wiesbaden, 1962), pl. 41, fig. 60.
23 K. Kogman-Appel, Jewish Book Art Between Islam and Christianity: The Decoration of Hebrew Bibles in Medieval Spain (Leiden, 2004); for one such example from Tudela itself, dated 1301/2 and now in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale, cod. hebr. 21), see 101–2 and pls. I-III.
Fig. 44: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS or. sim. 4532, back cover and envelope flap from a bookbinding made in Syria, near Damascus (c. 1182) (photo: Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz/Art Resource, NY)
covering unsuitable. Lacking firmer physical or documentary evidence of the existence of such bindings in Iberian Jewish culture at any date — much less in the late twelfth century, when the technology was newly arrived on the peninsula — it remains impossible to attribute the Tudela image to simple ethnographic accuracy.

More important than the identification of the Tudela binding with the specific cultural practices of its time, I would argue, is the distinctiveness that this sculpted image must have possessed in the eyes of its medieval viewers. Its resemblance to actual twelfth- or thirteenth-century Islamic bookbindings is undeniable. Like such bindings, it appears to be tooled, with a radial design in the peak of the flap, much like the cluster of round punches punctuating the flap of the twelfth-century binding from Damascus; the eight-pointed star that fulfills this function at Tudela is itself a characteristically Almohad form and appears on many Moroccan bindings of the thirteenth century. Since these features were not only comparatively new to Islamic book binding at this date, but also entirely foreign to the Latin bookbinding traditions of the same period, their appearance on a cloister capital in an Augustinian monastery must have struck the canons who were their primary and most consistent viewers as incongruous, or at the very least worthy of note. Whether exclusively Islamic or sometimes also Jewish, the bookbinding depicted here, so different from the conventional codices shown elsewhere in the cloister, was recognizably other than Christian, and the absoluteness of this distance from the canons’ own cultural framework could only have helped shape their interpretation of it. Parsing their possible perceptions of this book, both in itself and as part of a larger narrative context, opens the way in turn to a much broader level of inquiry, one that is concerned not just with the religious messages of the cloister but also with the place held by twelfth-century Jews, as well as Muslims, in the world-view of the Christians for whom these messages were crafted.

The biblical episode in which the book appears, the meeting in Caiaphas’ house, is recounted in some form in all four Gospels, but most extensively in that of John. This tells how, shortly before Passover, the Temple priests and Pharisees gathered in the house of the high priest Caiaphas to complain of Jesus’ actions and plot his death. Following immediately upon a series of capitals that narrate the Infancy and Miracles of Christ, which progress from west to east along the entire north gallery of the cloister to end with the pier capital of Christ washing the Apostle’s feet on the west face of the northeast pier, the two capitals depicting this episode and its outcome, the Payment of Judas, project strongly from the two inner faces of the pier. In doing so, they form a narrative and physical pivot around which the viewer must negotiate in passing from the episodes of Christ’s early life to the extensive Passion cycle that is initiated in the east gallery by a pier capital depicting the Last Supper. In short, they are hard to miss.

24 Paper, the support more often used for Islamic books, would have been better suited to the envelope-flap binding, the foundation of which was pasteboard rather than wood: Szirmai, Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding, 52. I particularly appreciate the insights of Anne-Marie Bouché regarding this point.

25 On Jewish bookbinding, see the summary state of research and bibliography offered by L. Avrin, The Sephardi Box Binding (Jerusalem, 1989), 27–29.

26 As illustrated, e.g., in Ettinghausen, “Near Eastern Book Covers,” pls. 6 and 7.

27 John 11:47–53; variants of the story are recounted in Matthew 26:3–4; Mark 14:1; and Luke 22:2.

In spite of the visual prominence it enjoys at Tudela, the episode of the Priests in Caiaphas’ house seems to have been depicted quite rarely in Romanesque Spain, which offers no precedent for the particularized codex at Tudela. Closest geographically and chronologically is the version repeated in a pair of Navarrese picture Bibles made around 1197, probably in Pamplona, for King Sancho VII (r. 1194–1234) and now in the Bibliothèque Communale of Amiens (MS. lat. 108) and the University Library of Augsburg (MS. Cod. I.2.4˚.15). However, despite their proximity in time and space to the construction of the Tudela cloister, the Navarrese Bibles’ closely similar renderings, each featuring a crowd of dejected-looking men sitting empty-handed in a formless space, offer little meaningful comparison with the Tudela image (Fig. 45).

More informative parallels for the scene appear, if still rarely, in twelfth-century imagery made north of the Pyrenees. Especially comparable is a full-page miniature from the prefatory cycle of the Fécamp Psalter, produced around 1180 in northeastern France and now in the Royal Library in The Hague (MS. 76 F 13; Fig. 46). As in the Tudela capital, this scene is bounded symmetrically by a pair of seated priests, a standing frontal figure bisects the scene, and ancillary figures fill the interstices. Here, however, each seated priest holds the end of a long speech-scroll containing passages from John’s Gospel. The leftmost reads, “QUID FACIM(US) QUIA HIC HOMO” (“What shall we do since this man [performs many signs]?”, Jn. 11:47), while the right contains the excerpt “EXPEDIT UOBIS UT UNUS MORIATUR PRO POPULO” (“... it is expedient for you that one [man] should die for the people ...”, Jn. 11:50). Through these texts, the dark-bearded figure at right becomes recognizable as the high priest Caiaphas, whose response to the others’ query was explained by John as foretelling Christ’s sacrifice for his people.

The compositional similarities between these far-flung works may be attributable to monastic connections. Walter Cahn has suggested that the Psalter was produced not at Fécamp itself, but at the nearby monastery of Ham, a community that, like Tudela, was populated by Augustinian canons. During the second half of the twelfth century, communication between Augustinian monasteries in northeastern Spain and their sister foundations in France had intensified as the Spanish kings founded increasing numbers of these communities to help stabilize and populate recently captured Muslim lands. The influx into Iberia of both French-trained monks and the manuscripts essential to their practice may have provided a convenient conduit for visual traditions such as those shared by Tudela and the Fécamp Psalter. Yet one important element belongs to the Tudela image alone: in the Psalter, Caiaphas and his colleagues hold scrolls, rather than a bound codex.

Scrolls are in fact the most common, although not the exclusive, attribute in Western depictions of the scene in Caiaphas’ house during this period. Sometimes, as in the Fécamp Psalter,

---

30 The Amiens codex, thought to be the earlier, includes a colophon identifying the patron and completion date: the Augsburg manuscript (formerly in the Oettingen-Wallenstein Collection, Harburg) is thought to have been copied directly from it shortly thereafter: F. Bucher, _The Pamplona Bibles_, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1970), 1:9, 38–40.
Fig. 45: Amiens, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. lat. 108, Meeting of the Temple Priests and Pharisees in the House of Caiaphas, fol. 182r (c. 1197) (photo: Arxiu Mas, Institut Amatller d’Art Hispànic)

Fig. 46: The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS. 76 F 13, Meeting of the Temple Priests and Pharisees in the House of Caiaphas. fol 20r (photo: Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague)
they function as simple speech scrolls, but in other cases they provide implicit substance for the priests’ deliberations, as illustrated in a leaf from the mid-twelfth-century Eadwine Psalter, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library (MS. M. 521v), in which six men debate over three blank scrolls before conveying their payment to Judas (Fig. 47). In such scenes, the scrolls operate in a quite traditional sense as signs of the “Old Law” of the Jews—not just the Torah, which literally took the form of a scroll, but also the wider body of Jewish texts, ritual, and practices of which Jesus’ abrogation, through his unorthodox teachings and behavior, was the chief source of the Pharisees’ concern.

Scrolls functioning in a similar sense can be found in the Tudela cloister, on a rarely-discussed capital in the cloister’s west gallery, which depicts the coming of Antichrist. Here, the two Witnesses of Revelation 11:3–11, widely identified by medieval commentators as the Old Testament prophets Enoch and Elijah, proffer scrolls as they confront the monstrous crowned figure (Fig. 48). These scrolls may refer primarily to the Witnesses’ preaching against Antichrist and their conversion of unbelievers, events predicted in medieval commentaries, but they also serve more generally to identify the figures as exemplary prophets of the Old Law, whose words predicted Christ’s coming. Such a conventional use of scrolls in this particular image renders all the more noteworthy the replacement, in the Caiaphas scene, of this traditional element with a codex—and, moreover, with a codex the format of which must have struck the cloister’s customary audience as not merely foreign, but also, perhaps, unnervingly modern.

How to explain this potent change of attribute? I would argue that the codex of the Temple priests at Tudela fulfilled a different function from the scroll that appears more generically in this context. Beyond evoking the entire body of Jewish Law that now stood to be revolutionized by Christ’s teachings, the unusually specific character of this codex had the potential to raise commensurately specific associations with a particular kind of book—one that, in the current Christian world view, would have seemed every bit as foreign and modern as the envelope-flap binding itself. This book, or really collection of books, was the Talmud.

---

34 M. Gibson, T.A. Heslop, and R. Pfaff, eds., *The Eadwine Psalter* (University Park, PA, 1992), fig. 12. Most examples of this scene in which any book appears postdate the Tudela capital. For example, both Caiaphas and another priest hold scrolls in the Kristina Psalter, made in Paris c. 1230 (Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS. Gl. Kongl. 1606, fol. 18v), while a French Psalter in the Leningrad Public Library (MS. Lat.Q.v.I.78; fol. 43v) shows Caiaphas holding a speech scroll. Yet a third Parisian Psalter made c. 1220–1230 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. 1392, 1220–1230, fol.7r) likewise depicts Caiaphas with a scroll, but a small codex also appears in the hands of one his companion priests.

35 Among the numerous examples in which scrolls function as symbols of the Old Law is the Pórtico de la Gloria at Santiago de Compostela, produced c. 1168–1188; here, jamb figures of Old Testament prophets proffer scrolls, while apostles hold codices. A sample of the symbolic thinking behind this division of attributes was set out subsequently by William Durandus (c.1237–1296), who explained the codices as representing the apostles’ perfect knowledge of God, as opposed to the imperfect knowledge signified by the scrolls of the prophets and patriarchs. See *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale divinorum officiorum I-IV*, ed. A. Davril and T.M. Thibodeau, CCCM, 140 (Turnhout, 1995), 1: 3.11 (39).

36 Patton, “Cloister as Cultural Mirror,” 327, figs. 15 and 16.

Codified by the early sixth century C.E., the collection of rabbinic interpretation, tradition, and lore known as the Talmud gathered and preserved in written form the vast body of oral traditions that had emerged in rabbinic Judaism in the early centuries of the first millennium. Little Western Christian interest in the Talmud is apparent before the twelfth century, when a more active interest in Jewish texts in general brought churchmen a new awareness of the compendium and its contents. The belated recognition that Jews acknowledged a textual authority in addition to the Hebrew Bible excited a wide range of fears. The Talmud’s codification of post-biblical interpretation, although based on a Scripture shared with Christianity, could and did diverge dramatically from Christian exegesis; it included enigmatic legends and allegories that were seen as illogical at best, and heretical at worst; moreover, certain passages were held

---


to speak blasphemously of Christ and the Virgin. The most famous medieval attack on the Talmud occurred in Paris in 1240, when, following a papal investigation and formal trial, the work was condemned and multiple volumes publicly burned. These events, however, must be understood as the more organized and violent expression of a hostility that had emerged within Christian anti-Jewish polemics composed as much as a century earlier by such well-known authors as Peter the Venerable, who dedicated an extensive chapter of his *Adversus iudaeorum inveteratam duritiem* to the errors of the Talmud.

In Spain, criticism of the Talmud had emerged even before that of northern churchmen like Peter. Specific concern with the perceived errors of rabbinic texts had been expressed by Muslim authors in the tenth and eleventh centuries, perhaps most notably in the religious polemics of Ibn Hazm of Córdoba (d. 1064). Ibn Hazm’s criticism of mystical Jewish texts that alluded to the physical features and measurements of God, a clear impossibility for a limitless and

---


bodiless deity, foreshadowed the arguments of many Christian writers — the earliest of whom also hailed from the Iberian peninsula. This was Petrus Alfonsi, originally an Andalusian Jew named Moses, who had converted to Christianity in the Aragonese city of Huesca in 1106, with King Alfonso I serving as godfather.

Petrus composed his *Dialogi contra iudaeos*, probably between 1108 and 1110 and before his eventual departure from Spain for sojourns in England and France, as a rationalistic explanation of his decision to become a Christian. One of the most remarked-upon aspects of this work, which took the form of the Christian Petrus’ imaginary theological debate with his former Jewish self Moses, is its specific critique of rabbinic texts, about which the highly educated Andalusian seems to have been quite knowledgeable. Petrus’ objections to the Talmud were built to some extent upon his perception that it contradicted the theology of classical Judaism, but they also drew on previous Muslim anti-Jewish texts: like Ibn Hazm, for example, Petrus counted many talmudic passages as flawed because of their anthropomorphisms and allegory.

Petrus’ work had enormous influence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: churchmen throughout the West, including Peter the Venerable, drew upon his *Dialogi* in composing their own anti-Jewish polemics, and the text itself was so widely copied that, according to John Tolan, the unusually high total of seventy-nine manuscripts of the twelfth through fifteenth centuries still survive today. Reaction to Petrus’ work within Iberia is more difficult to quantify, given the scarcity of other Christian anti-Jewish texts there before the thirteenth century. Yet in light of the attention garnered by Petrus’ conversion in nearby Huesca — as witnessed, among other things, by the king’s personal participation in his baptism — and given the wide dissemination of his *Dialogi* in the twelfth century, one must imagine that neither his opinions on the Talmud nor their applicability in preaching and conversion remained unknown in Tudela. The seat of a small *taifa* until its conquest in 1119, late twelfth-century Tudela still preserved significant Muslim and Jewish populations, whose presence the canons of Santa María la Mayor must have confronted on several levels as they tended the needs of the town’s fledgling Christian community. Unlike Benedictine monks, whose way of life theoretically depended on separation from worldly society, Augustinian canons were charged with the *cura animarum* — the care of souls — and this led them into regular contact with the lay communities around them. Whether through direct contact with Petrus’ well-known work or through indirect experience with the Islamic polemical traditions upon which he drew, the canons of Tudela doubtless had more than a passing awareness of the increasingly controversial place held by the Talmud in Christian thought.

---

51 Some indication that the community at Tudela might have been aware of Muslim theological views is offered by the imagery of the Last Judgment on the church’s west portal, where Marisa Melero Moneo has identified several
None of this is sufficient to prove that the book held by a Temple priest in the Caiaphas scene at Tudela was either intended or understood by the canons as literally representing the Talmud. Nonetheless, the book’s unorthodox binding does read quite aptly in this context. Its modernity set it distinctly apart from the scrolls traditionally employed as signifiers of the Old Law in general, while its foreign style and structure placed it recognizably beyond the cultural boundaries of Latin Christendom. What could serve more appropriately as an attribute for the priests and Pharisees, the biblical defenders of a rabbinic law that was to be rendered obsolete by Christ’s coming, than a symbol of the physical instrument in which their oral traditions ultimately came to be expounded and preserved? Whether or not its roots in Islamic culture were consciously recognized, the sheer alienness of the book in Caiaphas’ house provided its surrounding narrative with a rich interpretive layer that could not have been lost on many of the cloister’s twelfth-century inhabitants.

For some viewers, moreover, the book might have provoked an additional layer of interpretation. Those who identified its flap binding not just as generically foreign, but specifically as Islamic — and given the richness of the city’s Islamic heritage, many viewers may have done so — might have inferred a linkage that for twelfth-century viewers would have been as powerful as it was anachronistic. This was the detail’s implicit connection between the biblical Jews who betrayed Christ and the medieval Muslims whose rise to power in the course of the early Middle Ages had made them Europe’s most concretely feared opponent.

The association of Jews with Muslims in Christian thought of the high Middle Ages was probably more prevalent beyond Iberia than it was within it. As explicated with exceptional clarity by Jeremy Cohen, over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Christian theologians increasingly had come to see the practitioners of Judaism and Islam as parallel religious “others.” In essence, Cohen has argued that the hostile confrontation of western Christendom with Muslims and Islam, chiefly in the course of the Crusades, associatively transformed Christian perceptions of Jews and Judaism, so that both groups ultimately came to be defined in relation to each other. Thus the abstraction famously labeled by Cohen as the “hermeneutical Jew” — that is, the conception of the Jew as formulated by medieval Christian theologians — was reconceptualized in tandem with an equally hermeneutical Muslim.

Perceived similarities between Jews and Muslims that emerged in medieval Christian theology and canon law ranged from the empirical to the fantastical. They included the recognition of actually shared practices, such as circumcision, or the rejection of key Christian tenets like the Trinity and the Incarnation, but they also extended to more wild-eyed accusations of blasphemy, idolatry, and alliance with the Devil. Such charges often were set out side by side in polemics that considered the two faith groups in tandem, as parallel categories of unbeliever whose character and treatment therefore reasonably must not be altogether different. Although these texts, in the hands of such authors as Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux, never relinquish a sense of the differences between the two groups’ actual relationship to Latin Christendom (Jews were a subjugated, if grudgingly protected minority, while Muslims

---


52 On Muslim Tudela, see B. Pavón Maldonado, Tudela, ciudad medieval: arte islámico y mudéjar (Madrid, 1978).

posed a concrete military threat), they nonetheless grant the two groups strikingly parallel positions in their opposition to Christian doctrine.

Although relatively few of the texts adduced by Cohen as evidence of this paradigm shift derive from Spain, Petrus Alfonsi emerges here again as both early and influential, for perhaps the only aspect of his *Dialogi* more innovative than its detailed debunking of the Talmud was Petrus’ decision to add to his critique of Judaism a full separate chapter attacking Islam, itself the first such polemic in the Latin West. To some extent this structure represents Petrus’ logical response to the fact that a disillusioned Jew in Spain had not one, but two viable religious alternatives close at hand, and one of them had to be discredited. Yet his calculated pairing of non-Christian “others” follows patterns of thought that would become increasingly common in Christian Iberia.

Although one might argue that the sheer proximity of both Jews and Muslims in the Iberian kingdoms afforded Christians sufficient personal experience with these groups to forestall the inaccurate constructs and stereotyping that came more easily to northern Europeans, clear signs exist that by the twelfth century Iberian Christians too had begun to grapple with just these kinds of overarching conceptual structures. This evidence is not extensive, and to do justice to individual cases — much less to attempt to analyze the possible motivations for them — would require more specialized scrutiny than the scope of the present essay permits. Yet even an overview of such instances of cultural elision provides a sense of the force that the “Muslim connection” had begun to exert on the minds of medieval Iberian Christians.

Petrus Alfonsi’s parallel denigration of Muslims and Jews seems to be echoed, for example, by the often cited but rarely analyzed “Letter of Toledo,” an anonymous missive written in Toledo and directed to Pope Clement III around 1185. Based on astrological signs of an apocalypse in the following year, it foretold the arrival of an Age of Peace that involved not just the conversion of the world’s Jews, as was relatively common in apocalyptic literature, but also the elimination of its Muslims. A similar habit of pairing the two faiths had already emerged in documentation surrounding the increasingly self-conscious and successful Christian movement to conquer Muslim-held cities in Al-Andalus — efforts in which, it should be noted, northern European troops and leaders often played a significant role. The capture of any Muslim city by Christian forces naturally necessitated confrontation not only with its majority

---

56 Some scholars, such as Allan and Helen Cutler, *The Jews as Ally*, 91–93, have attempted to root this development in the early Middle Ages, citing occasional charges of Jewish collusion with Muslim forces in their initial invasion of Iberia. Not all of these examples bear out (e.g., at the 694 Council of Toledo the Jews were accused of colluding not with Muslims, but with other Jews), but some, such as Prudentius of Troyes’ claim that Jews had betrayed Barcelona to Muslims in 852, do seem to articulate this concern. I believe these to be too widely scattered to relate clearly to the high medieval phenomenon.
58 On Jewish conversion at the End of Days, see Emmerson, *Antichrist*, 41.
59 An excellent account of papal and European involvement in the Reconquest is given by O’Callaghan, *Reconquest*, 1–123.
community, but also with its Jews, who in many cases were deeply acculturated to Islamic ways
and language, and such encounters occasionally met with terminological confusion, or at the
very least a surprising lack of precision. In the mid-twelfth century, for example, the author of
the Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris records how in 1118 the future Alfonso VII of León-Castilla,
on campaign in Al-Andalus, destroyed Muslim "synagogues" and burned copies of the Qur’an
("et synagogas eorum destruxerunt et libros legis Mahometi combusserunt igne"). Such comments
suggest, if not actual confusion about the differences between Jews and Muslims, then
at the very least a lack of concern about acknowledging them.

A perceived association between Jews and Muslims in this context could have benign
results, as when the conquerors’ recognition of their new Jewish subjects’ conversancy with an
existing Islamic infrastructure resulted in friendlier treatment. This occurred in Tudela itself
following its conquest in 1119: the Aragonese king Alfonso I so well understood the centrality
of Jewish involvement in the administration of the formerly Muslim municipality that when
the Jews fled upon Christian entry into the city, he offered an array of inducements and protec-
tions to entice their return. Conversely, the tendency to link Jews and Muslims as parallel
theological opponents could also inspire occasional violence against Jews as an extension of
the Iberian campaigns: in 1063, for example, French and Spanish forces sent by Pope Alexander
II to battle Muslims in Aragon eagerly extended their attack to Jewish communities, just as
would an international gathering of soldiers gathering in Toledo for the battle of Las Navas de
Tolosa in 1212. Both of these attacks may well have been instigated by the non-Iberian troops,
for whom violence against Jewish communities was a far more common side effect of the crus-
sading mentality; and indeed, there is some evidence of Spanish resistance to these actions.
Nonetheless, such episodes bear witness to the gradual infiltration of new attitudes toward
religious outgroups within the Iberian sphere.

Iberian visual culture too offers signs of a conceptual conflation between Judaism and
Islam, although these generally postdate the other forms of evidence. Again, a brief survey of
examples must suffice. One is a painted wooden beam, presumably intended for an ecclesi-
astical structure and made about 1220, which is now in the National Museum of Catalan Art
in Barcelona. In three of its five Passion scenes — the Flagellation, the Bearing of the Cross,
and the Crucifixion — Christ is attended and tortured not by the traditional Jewish figures
so common in Passion imagery of this era, but by brown-skinned men with pronounced eyes,
long bulbous noses, and white head scarves with long, tasseled ends. Strongly resembling those
used to designate north African Muslims in Iberian art from the turn of the thirteenth cen-
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60 O’Callaghan, Reconquest, 204; see also Chronica Hispana Saeculi 12, ed. E. Falque, J. Gil, and A. May (Turnhout,
1990), 212.
61 On the return of the Jews to Tudela, see B. Leroy, The Jews of Navarre in the Late Middle Ages (Jerusalem, 1985),
20–21; and F. Baer, Die Juden im christlichen Spanien, Urkunden und Regesten, I: Aragonien und Navarra (Berlin, 1929),
doc. 570 (here misdated as 1115).
62 The attacks of 1063, which provoked a letter of chastisement from Pope Alexander II, are discussed by J.
Parkes, The Jew in the Medieval Community: A Study of his Political and Economic Situation (London, 1938), 58; and by E.
Synan, The Popes and the Jews (New York, 1965), 68–69. The second incident is discussed by O’Callaghan, Reconquest,
63 On attacks against Jews in connection with the Crusades, see R. Chazan, European Jewry and the First Cru-
sade (Berkeley, 1987). The Anales Toledanos report that the knights of Toledo responded to the attacks on Jews there
by arming themselves in defense of the Jewish community; see Florez et al., España Sagrada, 23:396.
tury onward (Fig. 49). These conventions create a powerful conflation: the Jews traditionally thought of as tormenting and crucifying Christ have become almost indistinguishable from Muslims. Although this extraordinary substitution merits much fuller attention than the current essay will permit, it does attest persuasively to the interchangeability with which the two groups could be endowed by Iberian Christians.

Occasional Jewish-Muslim elisions also appear in the famous illustrated codices of the Cantigas de Santa Maria, produced for Alfonso X in the late 1270s or so and now in the Escorial.

---

64 Similar figures appear in several of the manuscripts associated with King Alfonso X of Castile (r. 1252–1284), including the Cantigas de Santa Maria, but they make an early appearance as a generally negative attribute in Navarrese sculpture toward the turn of the thirteenth century: see E. Aragonés Estella, La imagen del mal en el románico navarro (Pamplona, 1996), 33–38. See also M. Melero Moneo, “El Diablo en la Matanza de los Inocentes: una particularidad de la escultura románica hispana,” D’Art 12 (1986): 1–15, esp. 10. On the Cantigas de Santa Maria, see below.

65 I have found very little discussion of this anomaly in the literature on the Passion Beam, which tends to focus instead on stylistic and morphological questions. Rosa Alcoy i Pedros has interpreted the dark skin and “deformed” features as reflecting the executioners’ opposition to Christianity, regardless of specific religious affiliation. See R. Alcoy, “Biga de la Passió,” in Prefiguració del Museu Nacional d’Art de Catalunya (Barcelona, 1992), 170.
(MS. T.I.1) and Florence (Bib. Naz. MS. B.R. 20). As one might expect in a work engaging the collaboration of multiple artists, such details are not entirely consistent throughout the two codices, but they occur frequently enough to imply what might be called traceable habits of thought. For example, many interior scenes are embellished by hanging curtains, which often appear over a bed or seat; in Jewish and Muslim settings, these curtains sometimes bear decorative panels of illegible Arabic text, apparently in evocation of actual Islamic silks, as seen in the bedroom of a Jewish moneylender in the illustration to Cantiga 25 (Fig. 50). In curtains placed in Christian settings, such text panels either remain absent entirely or are replaced by non-scriptural ornamental forms, as if the decorative inscriptions were seen as appropriate only to the non-Christian faith groups.

The six-pointed stars that appear in the same image, just below the text panel, represent a second shared non-Christian motif: although assigned here to a Jewish setting, the same stars also decorate the pennons and shields of Muslim soldiers in a number of battle scenes (Fig. 51). The hexagram at this date had not yet acquired the exclusively Jewish association that it bears for modern viewers, and while its function as a magical symbol often led to its association with Jews (often considered adept at magic), the same form also served as a decorative element in Almohad art and architecture. In the Cantigas manuscripts, the particular function of the motif in one or another context seems to matter less than its apparently indiscriminate application to both Jews and Muslims, along with its absence from comparable depictions of Christians. Like the envelope-flap binding at Tudela, the hexagram drew its distinctiveness less from the cultures with which it was most readily associated than from the culture with which it was not.

66 On these codices see, among many others, J. Guerrero Lovillo, Las Cántigas: Estudio arqueológico de las miniatu

eres (Madrid, 1949); J. Filgueira Valverde, Alfonso X, El Sabio: Cantigas de Santa María (Madrid, 1985); and A. García Cuadra
do, Las Cantigas: El código de Florencia (Murcia, 1993); for a broader discussion of the work’s art historical aspects, see also R. Sánchez Ameijeiras, “Imaxes e teoría da imaxe nas Cantigas de Santa María,” in As Cantigas de Santa María, ed. E. Fidalgo (Vigo, 2002), 247–330. Both manuscripts have been published in facsimile, with scholarly commentary: Alfonso X El Sabio, Las Cantigas de Santa María: Edición facsímil, El Códice Rico del Escorial (Manuscrito escorialense T.j.1) (Madrid, 1979); and Alfonso X El Sabio, Cantigas de Santa María, I: Edición facsímil del código B.R. 20 de la Biblioteca Nacional Centrale de Florencia, Siglo XIII: II: El código de Florencia de las Cantigas de Alfonso X el Sabio; Volúmen complementario de la edición facsímil del ms. B.R. 20 de la Biblioteca Nacional Centrale de Florencia (Madrid, 1989). Francisco Prado-Vilar’s recent Ph.D. dissertation on the Cantigas, “In the Shadow of the Gothic Idol: The ‘Cantigas de Santa María’ and the Imagery of Love and Conversion” (Harvard University, 2002) was unavailable for consultation at this writing.

67 A similar hanging appears in a Muslim household in Cantiga 46, as illustrated in Prado-Vilar, “The Gothic Anamorphic Gaze,” fig. 1.

68 This does not necessarily reflect actual practice, since Islamic textiles were widely used by wealthy Christians too at this time: see M.J. Feliciano, “Muslim Shrouds for Christian Kings? A Reassessment of Andalusi Textiles in Thirteenth-Century Castilian Life and Ritual,” in Under the Influence, ed. Robinson and Rouhi, 101–31. The rare instances where pseudo-Arabic does appear in a Christian setting tend to be funerary or honorific: they appear twice on the deathbed of a wealthy individual and, very rarely, on the altar cloth beneath the Virgin’s statue. Such instances are much in keeping with the implications of luxury and authority attributed to the textiles by Feliciano.

69 Six-pointed stars appear on the banners of Muslim warriors in the late thirteenth-century murals depicting the conquest of Palma de Mallorca by James I, originally in the Palau d’Aguilar in Barcelona and now in the Museu Nacional d’Art de Catalunya. See J. Carbonell i Esteller, Tresors medievals del Museu Nacional d’Art de Catalunya (Barcelona, 1997), fig. 155.

Although limited in number and relatively late in date, such instances of visual overlapping between Jewish and Muslim figures in medieval Iberian art present an intriguing comparison to the parallelism and conflation found in the polemics and chronicles just discussed. They represent what I would describe as a formative phase of image-making in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, in which the invention of ways to articulate visually the otherness of Jews and Muslims — to illustrate what Christians were not — became part of a larger conceptual process of defining what Christians were. Similar efforts at what one might call "self-definition by elimination," as Moore and others have shown, were already under way in much of the Latin West, but for Iberian Christians struggling to find a place for themselves between a desirable, yet still somehow foreign European culture and the inimical, yet disturbingly proximate world of Al-Andalus, this process must have borne with it extraordinary urgency.

Seen in this light, the little book in Caiaphas' house at Tudela emerges as a site of richly layered meaning — though not all of these layers need have been fully recognized by every viewer of the image. Along with the Payment of Judas on the adjacent north face of the pier, the episode in which the detail appears sets the stage for the Passion and Resurrection in a manner that strongly emphasizes the notion of Jewish culpability in Christ's death. Positioned on a corner pier between the Nativity and Ministry narrative and that telling the story of Jesus' arrest, execution, and resurrection, the scenes form a narratological pivot that propels the viewer into the persistent visual indictment of the Jews that pervades the cloister's Passion cycle. The book
itself adds much to this. For some of its monastic viewers, its clearly contemporary appearance must have evoked the controversies over post-biblical Judaism that had engaged Christian and Muslim polemicists in Iberia for more than a century already, highlighting the obstinacy with which Christ’s biblical enemies persisted in their deviation from the Word. At the same time, its non-Latin style and structure blurred the conceptual boundaries among the biblical Jews who cradle it, the medieval Jews whose proximity represented both a necessity and a challenge to municipal authorities, and the Muslim enemy subjugated there less than a century before. Above all, it is this semiotic pliability that endows the book in the Caiaphas scene, and the narrative of which it was a part, with a complexity fully commensurate with that of the rapidly changing society around it. Its capacity to address the processes by which this society aimed to articulate what it was — and what it was not — endows this modest element with a significance beyond its scale.

Fig. 51: San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio, MS T.I.1., Muslim warriors attacking a castle (detail of Cantiga 187/Mettman 185), fol. 247r (photo: Arxiù Mas, Institut Amatller d’Art Hispànic)