

MUSLIM-JEWISH RELATIONS IN THE FOURTEENTH-CENTURY CROWN OF ARAGON

by David Nirenberg

Much is written¹ about the relations between the Christian majority of the Iberian Peninsula and its two minorities, Muslims and Jews. Yet it is also true that the two minority groups interacted along many different fronts, and (in some areas) defined themselves as much against each other as against the dominant Christians. Jews and Muslims strove to reinforce the boundaries between their communities physically, legally, ritually, and violently, and they constantly jockeyed for prestige and advantage over the other in their relations with the Christian polity. They also crossed these boundaries through commerce, conversion, shared physical space, and other types of intercourse. What emerges is a lateral process of boundary definition and redefinition at the bottom of what is in effect a constantly shifting triangle of community interaction, a process which forms the subject of this study.

The study of minority interaction is undertaken in a historiographic vacuum. Virtually no work has been done on Muslim-Jewish relations under Christian rule in the Iberian peninsula, so that we know little of the material infrastructure of these relations.² For this reason, a large part of this article is spent describing the spheres within which Muslims and Jews interacted. Without such context no meaningful discussion of relations between the two groups is possible. The approach is scattershot, more a mapping of critical areas for future study than a coherent synthesis of accumulated knowledge. Finally, the documents presented here are chosen because they cluster around issues which seem to have been of great importance to contemporaries. They are representative of the settings in which tensions arose, though not necessarily of everyday life.

It is not easy to know what Jews thought of Muslims or Muslims of Jews in the medieval Crown of Aragon. Both groups are most accessible in the documentation of

¹John Boswell and William Jordan have encouraged and supported this project for many years. I would like to thank them both for their generosity and criticism, as well as Peter Brown, Natalie Zemon Davis, María Teresa Ferrer, Elena Lourie, Jaume Riera, Teófilo Ruiz, and the Dissertation Writers Study Group. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Fordham Medieval Conference, the Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies, and the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Institución Milá y Fontanals, Barcelona.

²John Boswell, *The Royal Treasure: Muslim Communities under the Crown of Aragon in the Fourteenth Century* (New Haven 1977), and Elena Lourie, "Anatomy of Ambivalence: Muslims under the Crown of Aragon in the late Thirteenth Century," in her *Crusade and Colonisation: Muslims, Christians and Jews in Medieval Aragon* (Aldershot 1990) 72, have both dedicated valuable pages to the subject, as has, of course, Robert Ignatius Burns.

their Christian kings, a documentation concerned with taxes, privileges, and criminal and jurisdictional complaints. Not surprisingly, Christian-Muslim and Christian-Jewish relations feature most prominently in the evidence. As for Muslim records, the emigration of elites from much of the kingdom (Valencia excepted), later attempts to suppress the use of Arabic, and finally the expulsion of the Moriscos all ensured that little Arabic material survives from the period. Jewish sources, too, suffered in the expulsions of 1492, and in any case were never rich in material concerning their "Ishmaelite"—Muslim—neighbors. This lack of sources is mentioned, not by way of excuse for what follows, but as a partial explanation for the near total disinterest historians have shown for the subject of Muslim-Jewish relations in Spain.

One area of minority interaction, that of high culture, has received a limited amount of attention. In a recent article entitled "Hispano-Jewish Attitudes to the Moors in the Fifteenth Century,"³ for example, Eli Gutwirth argues that Jews felt a cultural affinity for Muslims and Islam in Spain. Some Jews, he points out, spoke Arabic and admired its qualities as a language. They respected the great Muslim thinkers and partook of a culture permeated by Muslim cuisine, music, and poetry. "All this," he claims, "is hardly compatible with a view of Spanish Jewry as antipathetic and distant to Arabic culture."⁴

Gutwirth is probably correct in saying that Arabic high culture enjoyed prestige among learned Jews, but his model leaves much unsaid. First, the respect for Arabic culture which he eulogizes was scarcely a universal or uncontested position, even among the learned. In the mid-fourteenth century, the erudite Catalan Jew Joseph ben Shalom Ashkenazi attacked the Muslims as idolaters, ridiculed their pilgrimage to Mecca in scatological terms, and then continued:

Consider attentively the stupidity of those of our coreligionists who praise and exalt the religion of the Muslims, thus transgressing the precept of the law: "you must not accord them any grace" [Deuteronomy 7.2]. Not content with this, when the Muslims profess their faith at the hour of their assembly, those poor Jews who have no part of religion associate themselves with them, reciting beside them the "Hear O Israel." Then they make the most vivid praise of the nation of that contemptible individual [Muhammad]. This attitude has the result that they attach themselves, they and their children, to the Muslims, that they vilify the blessed religion of Israel, renege the law of the Lord of hosts, and follow the nothingness and vanity of a despicable people. I am not astonished that the simple folk of our people allow themselves to go praise [Muhammad], [but by] those who pretend to be of the religion of Israel, I mean certain notables of our communities, proclaiming the praise of the Muslims and testifying to their unitary faith.⁵

Joseph ben Shalom was a Cabalist, writing against a rationalist philosophical tradition saturated by Arabic influence. His attack against an "Islamicizing" philosophical elite

³Eli Gutwirth, "Hispano-Jewish Attitudes . . .," *Sefarad* 49.2 (1989) 237–261.

⁴Ibid. 242. Compare the work of Bernard Septimus, " 'Better Under Edom than under Ishmael,' the History of a Saying," *Zion* 47 (1982) 103–111 [in Hebrew]; and his "Hispano-Jewish Views of Christendom and Islam," forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference Between Two Worlds (University of Maryland, April 1991), to be edited by B. Cooperman.

⁵I translate here from the text given by G. Vajda, "Un chapitre de l'histoire du conflit entre la kabbale et la philosophie: La polémique anti-intellectualiste de Joseph ben Shalom Ashkenazi de Catalogne," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* (1957) 135. I do not follow some of his interpretive insertions, such as "in spirit" after "poor," since the text could easily be implying some distinctions between rich and poor, vulgar and educated.

is part of a long tradition of antirationalist polemic which should not be minimized when assessing the extent of Jewish affinities for Muslim culture.⁶

Second, we really know very little about the attitudes of Muslim and Jewish cultural elites toward each other, as distinguished from their attitudes toward each other's ideas. Here we should heed the sane words of Elena Lourie. As she points out in a different context, the notables whom Shalom Ashkenazi excoriates and Gutwirth celebrates are scholars and philosophers praising famous, but long dead, Muslim intellectuals. They formed part of an interfaith "Republic of Letters" whose adherents (in all three religious groups) borrowed ideas from one another in a great variety of fields, including medicine and philosophy. But cultural borrowing does not equal tolerance: Aquinas could praise Maimonides while at the same time advocating discrimination against the Jews.⁷ For this reason I focus here on social relations, rather than elite cultural interaction. Because of the scarcity of sources, these relations cluster around familiar settings: polemics, conversion, sexuality, moneylending, civic processions, butchershops. To historians of Christian relations with Jews or Christian relations with Muslims, this is well-trodden ground. The novelty comes not from the questions, but from the focus on minority relations.

Let me begin with the words of one Muslim, admittedly of some education, about his Jewish neighbors and contemporaries. Here is how Muhammad al-Raqlī, an Aragonese Muslim from the city of Huesca, introduced the Arabic polemic against the Jews he wrote in 1360:⁸

When I saw that . . . the parties of the Jews grew strong in their homes and congregations, loosening their tongues in lies and calumnies and insulting our Prophet, Muhammad, upon him the blessing and peace of Allah, denying his revelation and prophetic role, and claiming that Allah, praised be He, did not reveal to any other people but them the religious law and scripture, and maintaining that Hagar, Ishmael's mother, peace be upon her, had not been Abraham's wife, peace be upon him, but his concubine, . . . I then studied the Torah and the Psalms and the Books of the Prophets, peace be upon them, and extracted from them proofs and testimonies to refute them [the Jews], and an account of how God rebuked and cursed them, and called them unbelievers.⁹

⁶For more on this controversy, see S. M. Stern, "Rationalists and Kabbalists in Medieval Allegory," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 6 (1955) 73–86; M. Kriegel, *Les Juifs à la fin du Moyen Age dans l'Europe méditerranéenne* (Paris 1979) 145–179.

⁷See Lourie (n. 2 above) 72.

⁸*Ta'yid al-milla*, Arabic manuscript, Colección Gayangos 31, Real Academia de Historia de Madrid. I would like to thank John Boswell and Olivia Remie Constable for providing me with copies of the manuscript. Another redaction of the same is Vienna 279.1, described by M. Steinschneider in *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache* (Leipzig 1877) 34. M. Asín Palacios published a summary of the text, and the Arabic of the introduction and epilogue, in "Un tratado morisco de polémica contra los judíos," in *Mélanges Hartwin Derenbourg* (Paris 1909), and repr. in idem, *Obras escogidas* (Madrid 1948) 2.247–273. Cf. also M. Perlmann, "The Medieval Polemics between Islam and Judaism," in *Religion in a Religious Age* (Cambridge 1974) 120f.; Andrew G. Chejne, *Islam and the West: The Moriscos* (Albany 1983) 81–82 and passim. Leon Jacob Kassir's edition and translation of the work in his "A Study of a Fourteenth-Century Polemical Treatise *Adversus Judaeos*," Ph.D. diss. (Columbia University 1969) came to my attention too late to be incorporated here. All translations are therefore my own from the Gayangos manuscript. Readers interested in the Arabic should refer to Kassir's dissertation. The date and place of composition are given by the author at the end of the document, fol. 55v: "This compilation was finished in the city of Huesca on the fifth day of Rabia I, that is, the 26th day of January in the year 762 [A.D. 1360], in which God preserve us. Amen."

⁹*Ta'yid al-milla* (n. 8 above) fol. 1v.

This is not the time to examine the arguments of this work in detail, except to note that the fifth, final, and longest section is a detailed and vituperative catalog of the prevarications, lies, and infidelities of the Jews. Muhammad does invite the Jews to repent, a repentance conditioned upon (1) their acceptance of Jesus as a messenger of God, and belief in Jesus's revelation, and (2) faith in Muhammad and his Quran.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Muhammad stresses that such repentance is impossible: the time when the Jews were allowed to repent is past. As evidence, he cites a curious eschatological *hadith* of the Prophet: at the end of days, "Isa [Jesus], upon him be peace, shall be made to descend from the skies, shall be a just judge upon the earth, shall break the cross and slay the pigs and the Jews . . . until the Jews disappear from the desert, leaving it for the believers."¹¹ Muhammad's opinions had currency: the treatise was copied, translated into Aljamiado (Spanish written in Arabic characters), summarized, and read.¹²

The Jews took such attacks seriously. The famous Catalan rabbi Solomon ben Abraham Adret (Rashba) included among his *responsa*, for the purposes of "teaching the sons of Judah to answer in honest words and rely on honest sources," a summary of a public debate he had engaged in with "an honored Ishmaelite scholar." In another work, the Rashba wrote a rebuttal to the anti-Jewish polemic of Ibn Hazm, whose text had served as the basis for many Muslim attacks on the Jews, including al-Raqili's.¹³ And we have already seen how, at roughly the same time as our Arabic polemic was written, the Catalan Jew Joseph ben Shalom Ashkenazi found it necessary to attack the Muslims as well as those Jews who admired them. Polemical interaction was clearly not the monopoly of majority-minority relations.

These texts are the production of elite cultural circles, but their oppositional and competitive tone is echoed in archival documentation. Muslim aljamas strove to maintain physical, social, and economic boundaries between themselves and Jews. In 1365, during the war with Castile, when the Crown's pressing needs increased Muslim bargaining power, the Muslims of Castro and Alfandequiella forced King Peter to promise them that no Jews (or Christians) would be allowed to live among them.¹⁴ Jews or Muslims might ask the Crown to induce an exchange of property so as to avoid prox-

¹⁰Ibid. fol. 43v.

¹¹Ibid. fol. 44.

¹²For aljamiado summaries, see, in the collection of the Miguel Asín Institute in Madrid, item VIII fols. 396v–418 and item IX fols. 205vff., both presumably dating to the early seventeenth century. The items are described in the catalog of the collection, *Manuscritos arabes y aljamiados de la Biblioteca de la Junta*, ed. J. Ribera and M. Asín (Madrid 1912) 48f., 52. The Gayangos manuscript contains interlineated aljamiado glosses by a later hand, e.g., fols. 4v, 5.

¹³Solomon b. Abraham ibn Adret, *She'elot u-teshuvot [Responsa]*, 7 vols. (Jerusalem 1965–1970) 4.53–54 no. 187 (Hebrew). See also a refutation of Ibn Hazm's anti-Jewish polemic ascribed to Adret, discussed in Joseph Perles, *R. Salomo b. Abraham b. Adereth: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Breslau 1863) 57, 77; and especially Martin Schreiner, "Die apologetische Schrift des Salomo b. Adret gegen einen Muhammedaner," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 48 (1894) 39–42. Lourie (n. 2 above) 56 n. 175 believes that Rashba's responsum was actually a camouflaged attack on the Christians and not on the Muslims, since it discusses whether or not the Messiah had already come. But as al-Raqili's preconditions for repentance testify, the Jewish refusal to recognize Jesus's (not to mention Muhammad's) revelation was part of Muslim polemical attacks against the Jews.

¹⁴Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, Reg. Canc. (hereafter ACA:C) 1204 fol. 63 (1365/4/8): "que nengu crestia ne juheu no puxa poblar ab ells"; published in Boswell (n. 2 above) 367, 494ff.

imity.¹⁵ Muslim aljamas were also willing to pay the Crown considerable sums of money in order to avoid sharing meatmarkets, ovens, baths, and other regulated resources with Jews, a topic to which I shall return below.¹⁶

Sexual intercourse between members of different religious groups was perceived as another boundary to be policed. A great deal of Christian legislative and judicial effort was spent in controlling minority sexual intercourse with Christian women. It was the possibility of such intercourse that contemporaries viewed as justification for badges of religious identity: the Jewish cape and wheel of colored cloth and the Muslim haircut and dress.¹⁷ The civil and ecclesiastical laws prohibiting sexual intercourse between Christian women and minority men are well known, but the ideological grounds for such barriers between minority groups are less obvious. Nevertheless, Muslim and Jewish communities regularly attempted to control the sexual activities of women, especially when these occurred across religious boundaries.

One way to establish sexual boundaries along religious lines was through legislation (i.e., the purchase of privileges from the Crown). The Muslim aljama of Valencia, for example, purchased King Peter's confirmation of its privilege that whenever a Muslim woman was found guilty of adultery (here defined as any sexual intercourse outside of marriage) with a non-Muslim the death penalty would be imposed without possibility of monetary remission.¹⁸ In individual cases, action was often taken by the families of the women involved, or by the local community. Amiri, a Muslim woman of Zaragoza, was twice caught sleeping with Christians and Jews. On both occasions her community intervened to prevent her sale into slavery (the standard penalty), on the condition that she never commit adultery with Christian or Jew again. When she

¹⁵Boswell 69, discussing ACA:C 721 fol. 135 (1365/1/2), an exchange which took place at the request of a Jew of Tortosa.

¹⁶For meat markets, see below at n. 43ff. For shared wax ovens in Castellón, ACA:C 478 fols. 237v–238 (1329); shared bread ovens in Tarazona, ACA:C 486 fol. 16 (1333). There are many other examples; these are chosen as representative. For what may be a contrary example of Muslims and Jews in Tortosa struggling to maintain their rights to share bathing facilities against municipal attempts to force them to use municipal baths, see ACA:C 48 fol. 190 (1280/11/30), and the discussion of related documents in David Romano, "Los judíos en los baños de Tortosa," *Sefarad* 40 (1980) 57–64.

¹⁷This is the reason given in 4 Lateran Council (1215) c. 68, *Constitutiones concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum commentariis glossatorum*, ed. António García y García, Monumenta iuris canonici, corpus glossatorum 2 (Vatican City 1981) 107: "In nonnullis prouinciis a christianis Iudeos seu Saracenos habitus distinguit diuersitas, set in quibusdam sic quedam inoleuit confusio ut nulla differentia discernantur. Vnde contigit interdum quod per errorem christiani Iudeorum seu Saracenorum et Iudei seu Sarraceni christianorum mulieribus commiscantur. Ne igitur tam dampnate commixtionis excessus, per uelamentum erroris huiusmodi, excusationis ulterius possit habere diffugium, statuimus ut tales utriusque sexus, in omni christianorum prouincia et omni tempore, qualitate habitus publice ab aliis populis distinguantur." Allan Cutler, "Innocent III and the Distinctive Clothing of Jews and Muslims," *Studies in Medieval Culture* 3 (1970) 92–116, argued that the distinction was imposed not to prevent sexual intercourse but to humiliate minorities. In Aragon, however, the documentation repeatedly stresses sexual boundaries as the motivation behind distinctive clothing. See, for example, ACA:C 384 fols. 48v–49, concerning the Jews of Apiaia. See also James Brundage, "Intermarriage between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law," *Jewish History* 3 (1988) 25–40, here 30.

¹⁸For the edict of 1347 confirming the execution of Muslim adulteresses, see ACA:C 884 fol. 167r–v, published in María Teresa Ferrer i Mallol, *Els Sarrains de la Corona Catalano Aragonesa en el segle XIV* (Barcelona 1987) 271. The edict was included in the compendium of Valencia's privileges entitled *Aureum opus regalium privilegiorum civitatis et regni Valentie* (Valencia 1515), "In extravaganti" 8, fol. 236 (p. 531 of the 1972 facsimile edition), with the incorrect date of 1348.

was again found by night in the Jewish quarter committing adultery with Jews, the two communities apparently came to blows, "wishing to kill each other over her." She was sold to a Christian for 120 sous, of which the person who informed against her (Christian? Muslim? Jew?) received 30 and the Crown the rest.¹⁹

The issue in Amiri's case was not adultery, as the promise required of her makes clear, but adultery with non-Muslims, particularly Jews. Though some have argued that Muslim society in the Crown of Aragon (and elsewhere in the Mediterranean) was organized around the concepts of *ʿaṣabiya* and family honor, and was therefore harshly intolerant of women's sexual activities outside of marriage,²⁰ the case of Amiri suggests that adultery could be forgiven. Other cases lead to the same conclusion. In 1342 a married Muslim woman from the village of María was caught in adultery. She was condemned by the *qādī* to receive 100 lashes (roughly equivalent to a sentence of death). Because she was poor she could not redeem herself in cash, yet as she stood naked in the plaza about to be whipped some Muslims from Zaragoza took pity on her and "for the love of God" paid her fine of seventy sous.²¹ Apparently Muslim communities could forgive adultery with coreligionists. Adultery with Jews was more serious.

Jewish aljamas took a similarly dim view of sexual intercourse across religious boundaries. When Oro de Par, a Jewish woman of Zaragoza, consorted with Muslim (and Christian) men, the Jewish aljama asked the king to have her disfigured and exiled. Jewish officials were afraid to act on their own, the petitioners claimed, because they feared violence from Oro's Christian lovers. Family, too, could move to protect these boundaries: it was the brothers of a Jewish woman from Zaragoza who were accused of murdering her because she was pregnant by a Christian. This is not to say that individuals could not have different attitudes. The Muslim of Zaragoza who participated in the gang-rape of a Muslim woman in the company of two Jews does not seem to have had the same feelings of "community honor" as his coreligionists involved in the incident with Amiri, nor did the Jewish butcher of Zaragoza who, together with some associates, kidnapped the daughter of another Jew and delivered her to a Christian "so that he might deflower her."²² Even these exceptions, however,

¹⁹For the case of Amiri, which occurred in 1301, see C. Orcástegui and E. Sarasa, "El libro-registro de Miguel Royo, merino de Zaragoza en 1301: una fuente para el estudio de la sociedad y economía zaragozana a comienzos del siglo XIV," *Aragón en la Edad Media* 4 (1981) 111–112.

²⁰Mark Meyerson, "Prostitution of Muslim Women in the Kingdom of Valencia: Religious and Sexual Discrimination in a Medieval Plural Society," in *The Medieval Mediterranean: Cross-Cultural Contacts*, Medieval Studies at Minnesota 3, ed. M. J. Chiat and K. L. Reyerson (St. Cloud, Minn. 1988) 87–95, esp. 90. For an example from the anthropological literature, see Ahmed Abou-Zeid, "Honour and Shame among the Bedouins of Egypt," in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. J. Peristiany (London 1966) 245–259. It is my belief, though I cannot adequately defend it here, that anthropologists have placed too much explanatory weight on the abstract concept of "honor" when studying Spanish and Muslim societies.

²¹For the record of her redemption, see the account book edited in C. Orcástegui and E. Sarasa, "Miguel Palacín, Merino de Zaragoza en el siglo XIV," *Aragón en la Edad Media* 1 (1977) 51–131, here 104.

²²For the case of the gang-rape in 1301, see Orcástegui and Sarasa (n. 19 above) 113. The Muslim involved in the gang-rape was poor. For the case of Oro de Par, which occurred in 1356, see ACA:C 691 fol. 127r–v. For the murder of the pregnant sister, see ACA:C cr. Jaime II box 30 no. 3804 (1311/1/15), a similar version of which is published in F. Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, 2 vols. (repr. London 1970) 1.201–203 no. 164, from ACA:C 239 fols. 18v–19. For the Jewish kidnapper and panderer,

reinforce the impression that contemporaries of all three religions viewed women's bodies as boundaries.

Muslim attempts to maintain sexual boundaries between Muslims and Jews and to exert control over the sexual activities of Muslim women were complicated by the prevalence of Muslim slavery and one of its byproducts, concubinage. Christian law forbade Christians from working in Jewish households, but Muslim slaves, male and female, were commonly owned by Jews. For Muslims in such a position, ironically enough, conversion to Christianity provided an escape from Jewish ownership, and many slaves exercised this option.²³ For those who remained Muslim, and particularly for women, the preservation of sexual boundaries was difficult, since Jewish men (like Muslim and Christian slave owners) often engaged in intercourse with their Muslim slaves. In Zaragoza, a Jew was accused of poisoning his son because they were both in love with one of their Muslim slaves. The son, it was said, had threatened to convert to Christianity if the father did not stop sleeping with the slave.²⁴

The offspring of such relationships created problems for both communities. Thus, for example, in 1321 Chresches de Turri and some of his kinsmen, Jews of Gerona, purchased a license from King James II permitting them to circumcise a Muslim boy who was the child of Chresches by a Muslim slave, and convert him to the Jewish religion. Some forty years earlier, Chresches's ancestor Abraham de Turri, also of Gerona, had taken an alternative course, suffocating his two children by one of his Muslim slaves.²⁵ At about the same time, in Huesca, the conversion of a female Muslim slave to Judaism created a curious legal problem. The slave had borne a child by her (former?) owner, the Jew Cetrim Abnabe. Cetrim was trying to establish ownership over the child, arguing that "according to the custom of the city" the children born from the union of a Jewish master and Muslim slave belonged to the master. Apparently the convert was alleging that her conversion enfranchised her offspring.²⁶

Outside of the institutional framework of slavery, free Muslim women might opt

see ACA:C 1065 fol. 33v (1351/1/25): "Ebrahim Araria, carnifex judeus cesarauguste uni cum quibusdam aliis suis sociis de nocte violenter et malo modo a domo Gentoni Oway, judei dicte civitate, et contra eius voluntatem extraxit quandam eius filiam et tradidit ipsam cuidam xristiano dicte civitatis ad hoc ut eam defloraret."

²³For some of the rules governing such conversions, see ACA:C 40 fols. 16v–17 (1277/8/17) published in J. Régné, *History of the Jews in the Crown of Aragon*, ed. Y. T. Assis and A. Gruzman (Jerusalem 1978) 424–425. For a typical example of the types of problems which arose over such conversions, ACA:C 91 fol. 25 (1292/2/5).

²⁴ACA:C cr. Jaime II box 30 no. 3804 (n. 22 above).

²⁵For the circumcision, see ACA:C 385 fol. 19 (1321/12/17): "concedimus de gracia sp[ecialiter] vobis . . . possitis in civitate predicta, videlicet in calle judayco ipsius civitatis, quandam filium cuiusdam sarracene serve et captive vestre facere judeum et ad ritum pervertere judeorum et ipsum facere circumscidi, iuxta legem et consuetudinem ebreorum." For the suffocation, see ACA:C 62 fols. 136v–137 (1285/3/15), published in Régné (n. 23 above) 428–430: "Item quod tu, dictus Abraham, sufocasti duos infantes natos de quadam sarracena, que a te ipsos suscepit. Item quod tenebas publice in domo tua quandam sarracenam de Palia nomine Axian in tuo contubernio, cum qua habebas rem, quociens volebas et que a te suscepit plures partus."

²⁶ACA:C 67 fol. 1 (1286/5/1?): "Cetrim Abnabe, judeus Osce, genuit genuit (*sic*) ex quadam sarracena sua quandam prole, et quod fecit ipsam sarracenam converti ad legem judaycam, et quod est consuetudo civitate Osce si aliquis judeus generat prole ex sarracena captiva sua [. . .] proles quam ex ea habeat pertenuit ad [. . .]." My thanks to Mark Meyerson for this reference. The conversion may well have enfranchised the mother.

for concubinage or prostitution with Jewish men. For example, Abulfacem, a Jew of Mula [Murcia], lived in concubinage with Axona, a Muslim, for which reason they were arrested by the king's brother and procurator in Murcia. The couple jointly appealed to the king, who ruled that they should be allowed to cohabit unmolested, since neither was a Christian.²⁷ Such arrangements need not have been rare. We know, for example, that some Jewish communities pronounced bans upon Jews who had Muslim concubines but did not marry them "with bethrothal and *ketubah*." In one *responsum*, a Jew argued that he should be allowed to continue living with a concubine he had converted from Islam to Judaism and married, even though he had not given her a *ketubah* (marriage contract). Rashba disagreed.²⁸ It was precisely this type of interaction that Muslim edicts against adultery with Jews sought to inhibit, and Axona's example suggests that the sexual boundary which Muslims so jealously guarded was permeable.

It was at this sexual boundary that conversions sometimes occurred. Of the conversions from Islam to Judaism that I have found, a disproportionate number were by women apparently in positions similar to that of Axona, the concubine of Abulfacem. Among these, the case of Maria is the best documented.²⁹ She first surfaces anonymously on 12 August 1356, when, at the request of the Jews of Lerida, King Peter ordered his bailiff there to release a Muslim woman arrested for converting to Judaism. The conversion, according to the king, was not a crime punishable by imprisonment.³⁰ Two weeks later, the king issued the following privilege to Martin Eiximin:

We hereby grant and concede to you, the said Martius, all rights which we do hold, or might or should hold over Maria, a Jewess who had been a Muslim, both for her having recently abandoned the religion of perfidious Muhammad and embraced the law of the Hebrews, and for the crime of adultery which she is alleged to have committed with Jews while still a Muslim. . . . And we accord and allot to you, the said Martius, full power and authority to settle with the said Muslim on that amount of money upon which you shall be best able to agree with her, . . . as well as [authority for] absolving and sentencing this Jewess for the aforesaid and whatever other crimes may have been committed by her, just as if such absolution were accorded her by us in writing.³¹

²⁷ACA:C 110 fol. 34v (1298/3/26): "Unde cum supradicte persone alienni [?] sint a lege nostra et non videamus causam propter quod vos de facto huiusmodi intromittere debeatis." My thanks to M. T. Ferrer i Mallol for the reference.

²⁸Ibn Adret (n. 13 above) vol. 5 no. 245. The concubine involved in this incident was probably not a free Muslim. For more general comments on Jewish attitudes toward concubinage, see Yom Tov Assis, "Sexual Behavior in Mediaeval Hispano-Jewish Society," in *Jewish History*, ed. A. Rapoport Albert and S. J. Zipperstein (London 1988) 62.

²⁹Maria's case was first noted, and partially documented, by Boswell (n. 2 above) 351f. See also D. Nirenberg, "Maria's Conversion to Judaism," *Orim: A Jewish Journal at Yale* 2 (1984) 38-44.

³⁰ACA:C 690 fol. 31v (1356/8/12): "Conquerendo expositum est nobis pro parte aljame judeorum llerde quod vos cepistis quandam sarracenam pro eo quia legem ebraycam assumpsit vel assumere intendebat, quam captam ad huc penes vos detinetis pretendendo quod dicta sarracena debet condempnari pro eo quia def[. . .] quid in dimitendo sectam suam et assumendo legem ebraycam, qua de causa supplicatum nobis fuit ut dignaremur super predictis de justitie providere. Nos itaque dicta supplicatione admissa vobis dicimus et mandamus quatenus si dictam sarracenam predictam de causa et non alia captam tenetis ipsam a dicta captione absolvatis et contra ipsam vel judeos dicte aljame vel aliquos singulares ipsius praetacta occasione minime procedatis."

³¹ACA:C 899 fol. 60 (1356/8/22), published and translated in Boswell (n. 2 above) 351-352, 442. Adultery here may refer to the practice of prostitution without royal license.

The Muslim *aljama* of Lerida was apparently infuriated by this event. For two years the *aljama* fought the lenient treatment accorded Maria, as attested by a document issued in May 1358, where the Muslims asked King Peter to intervene against any Christian who attempted to obstruct the punishment of a Muslim convert to Judaism. They argued that according to a "general constitution of Catalonia recently published and enacted at Tarragona, no Muslim man or woman should dare in any manner to convert to the law of the Jews, and that if any Muslim violates this he shall incur both corporal and financial punishment." According to the Muslims, the license accorded by the king to a recent conversion (presumably Maria's) set a bad example to others who might be thinking of conversion, and harmed the *aljama*.³²

The minority communities patrolled religious boundaries just as fiercely as they did sexual ones. Throughout the Crown of Aragon, for example, Muslim *aljamas* attempted to put Muslim conversion to Judaism on an equal footing with Christian conversion to Judaism: the penalty they demanded was death. The earliest evidence is contained in a statute passed by the *corts* in Tarragona in 1235, as part of a regulation concerning moneylending: "We declare that Saracen men and women may not become Jews, nor may Jewish men and women become Saracens. Those who do so shall lose their persons."³³ In 1337 King Peter the Ceremonious, at the request of the Muslim *aljama* of Valencia, confirmed the right of that *aljama* to condemn to death those of its members who converted to Judaism:

It has been humbly brought to our attention on behalf of the Muslim *aljamas* of the kingdom of Valencia that Muslims are permitted by their law to put to death any Muslim or Muslims converted to the Jewish faith, but when it occurs that some male or female Muslim is converted to the said Jewish faith, numerous Christians nevertheless endeavor to defend the said converted Jews and to prevent justice from being done to them according to their [the Muslim] law, to the detriment of the Muslims, and in flagrant violation of their law. We, therefore, in response to the humble request made to us on their behalf, direct and command you that whenever it should happen that a male or female Muslim is converted to the Jewish faith, you permit them to be judged and punished entirely by Muslim judges in accordance with their law, and without mercy, financial compromise, or any kind of remission or interference whatsoever.³⁴

³²ACA:C 691 fol. 232 (1358/5/18): "Q[uaprop]ter iuxta quamdam constitutionem generalem Cathalonie dudum in civitate Tarracone editam sive factam nullus sarracenus nec nulla sarracena valeat seu presumat quovismodo ad legem judaycam se transferre, et si contrarium per aliquem sarracenum vel sarracenam fit, quod incurrat illic talis pena corporalis et bonorum. . . . quapropter per eosdem adelantatos nomine dicte aljame fuit nobis humiliter suplicatum ut ad tolendum omnem perjudicium quod ipsi aljame et eius singularibus possit propterea in futurum de facili eveniret digna remedia predictam constitutionem omnino facere observari." The king ordered that in the future the constitution should be enforced. Cf. the partial transcription in Boswell (n. 2 above) 380.

³³"Item statuimus quod sarracenus vel sarracena non possit fieri judeus vel judea, nec judeus vel judea non possit fieri sarracenus vel sarracena. Et qui hoc fecerint, amittant personas suas"; *Cortes de los antiguos reinos de Aragón y de Valencia y principado de Cataluña: Cortes de Cataluña*, 7 vols. (Madrid 1896–1903) 1.126. French summary in Régné (n. 23 above) no. 9. The motivations and legal justifications for this law are unknown, and the punishment it prescribes unclear. It may either refer to enslavement or to capital punishment (probably the former: enslavement of Muslims to the Crown often substituted for capital punishment). For an example of similar legislation in Castilian territories, see the *cortes* of Seville of 1252, article 44, cited in Joseph F. O'Callaghan, "The Mudejars of Castile and Portugal in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in *Muslims under Latin Rule: 1100–1300*, ed. J. M. Powell (Princeton 1990) 50.

³⁴ACA:C 862 fol. 121 (1337/1/12), published and translated by Boswell (n. 2 above) 378–379, 436–437. I have slightly altered his translation.

In practice, it seems that these rights were unevenly enforced. Maria's case is a good example, and there are others. In 1292 James II granted permission to Perfet Gravei and his brother, Jews of Barcelona, that they might convert a Muslim slave of theirs called Hauha. Moreover any Jew who wished was permitted to catechize Hauha in the "more judayco."³⁵ In 1315 James II wrote to his bailiff in Lerida, commanding him to punish a Muslim woman who had converted to Judaism. The wording of the edict makes clear that James had forgotten the law requiring "loss of person" passed in 1235 in the reign of "his grandfather of happy memory." He had been reminded of it by the previous bailiff of Lerida, who brought it up as justification for having arrested the woman in the first place. James suggested that the law be enforced, unless the present bailiff determined that it had been repealed.³⁶ Lerida was again the scene of a Muslim's conversion in 1335, this time of a male. The Jewish aljama of Lerida complained to the king that the bailiff had imprisoned an unnamed Muslim because he had adopted or was planning to adopt "legem ebraycam," that is, Jewish religion. The king instructed his bailiff to release the Muslim if he was being held on no other charge, and not to prosecute the Jewish aljama or any of its individuals on this matter.³⁷

In 1361, King Peter blocked the prosecution of the Jewish aljama of Barcelona for its conversion of the Muslim Lopello de Serrah Mahomet, who changed his name to Abraham. The king had previously licensed the conversion, but opposition was so strong that the Jewish aljama had to obtain a remission (presumably at some expense) to avoid litigation.³⁸ Twenty years later, the bailiff of Valencia beyond the Xixona wrote in his account book that he had received a fine of 165 sous from two Muslim women of Alicante, Fotoix and Axena, who had converted to Judaism and changed

³⁵ACA:C 260 fol. 97 (1292/6/25): "Damus et concedimus vobis, Perfeto Gravei (?), iudeo . . . quod possunt vos aut . . . frater vester facere iudeam quandam sarracenam vestram nomine Hauha, concedentes vobis quod omnes illi tamen iudee quam iudei qui interesse voluerint ad faccionem ipsam iudea possunt interesse ac facere ea que in talibus more judayco sunt fieri assueti." My thanks to María Echaniz for the reference. What is meant by the latter part of the concession is not completely clear.

³⁶ACA:C 242 fol. 163r-v (1315/6/13): "Significavit etiam nobis idem Johannes quod cum quedam mulier, que fuerat sarracena, convertisset se ad ritum iudeorum, ipse Johannes cepit ipsam mulierem pre-textu cuiusdam statuti, quod asserit fore factum per illustrissimum dominum Jacobum, felicitis recordacionis avum nostrum, quod aliquis sarracenus vel sarracena non possit se convertere ad ritum iudeorum et, si contra faceret, quod amitteret personas . . . super facto autem dicte mulieris, que ad ritum iudeorum, ut predictur, se convertit, predictum statutum dicti domini regis Jacobi iuxta sui serie observetis, nisi illud forum vobis constiterit revocatum"; published by Ferrer i Mallol (n. 18 above) 230.

³⁷ACA:C 471 fol. 138v (1335/3/31): "Conquerendo exponitum est nobis pro parte aliame judeorum llerde quod vos cepistis quendam sarracenum pro eo quia legem ebraycam asumpsit [*sic*] vel assumere intendebat, quem captum ad huc penes vos det[ineritis] asserendo quod dictus sarracenus debet condempnari pro eo quia deliquit [*sic*] in dimitend[i] sectam suam et assumendo legem ebraycam, qua de causa suplicatum nobis fuit ut dignaremur super predictis de justicie providere. Nos vero dicta suplicatione admissa vobis dicimus et mandamus quatenus si dictum sarracenum predicta de causa et [n]on alia captum tenetis, ipsum a dicta capcione absolvatis, et contra ipsum vel judeos dicte aliame vel aliquos singulares ipsius praetacta occasione minime procedatis."

³⁸ACA:C 905 fol. 68 (1361/1/4). As an already circumcized Muslim, the circumcision of Abraham would have consisted in the giving of a drop of blood. See Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Sefer Kedushah* 1.14.5. See also Ben Zion Wacholder, "Attitudes towards Proselytizing in the Classical Halakah," *Historia Judaica* 20.2 (1958) 87-88, and compare Yitzhak Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (Philadelphia 1968) 2.48, referring, however, to slaves. None of the individuals whose cases are examined here were described as slaves. On Jewish circumcision of slaves and church attitudes toward it, see Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia 1933) 23-26.

their names to Jamila and Simfa. The fine was levied for "conversion without license," and no other punishment is mentioned.³⁹ Both these documents suggest that in the latter half of the century conversion from Islam to Judaism was a matter of licensing fees, not of criminal courts. If so, they may have been more numerous than would appear from the chancery documentation, which mentions only those episodes where things went wrong.

Jewish conversions to Islam also occurred, and they too were met with demands for the death penalty from Jewish communities. In 1280 a flurry of documents was issued concerning the conversion to Islam of three Jews from the hinterlands of Zaragoza. The Jews were arrested, transferred to Zaragoza, prosecuted, and punished,⁴⁰ all apparently at the insistence of an important Jewish courtier and royal official, Jucef Ravaya, the king's treasurer. What the punishment was we can only guess, but a document dated 1284 concerning a different case leads one to presume the worst: "To the justiciar of Jativa, that he deliver to death a certain Jewess named Maulet who turned Saracen, since the king in a similar case pronounced the same sentence."⁴¹ Presumably the trials at Zaragoza provided the precedent. But apart from these four relatively early cases, I have found no further hints of Jewish conversion to Islam, with the remarkable exception of Joseph ben Shalom Ashkenazi's complaint cited above.

If the Muslim argument that conversion from Islam to Judaism constituted apostasy and should be punished by death was not always successful, it was probably because the strapped royal treasury generally welcomed the income that licenses and remissions brought in. Canon lawyers, on the other hand, might side with the Muslims. Oldradus de Ponte, a fourteenth-century lawyer who spent some time teaching in Lerida, argued that Jewish conversion to Islam was not apostasy, since Islam was less evil than Judaism. The Jews "are more wicked, since the Church indicates this on Good Friday: when it prays for all, it does not bend the knee for the Jews, but it does bend the knee for the pagans." Conversion to a less evil way was not to be punished. By implication, conversion from Islam to Judaism was certainly punishable. Oldradus makes explicit the competitive nature of conversion between minority groups. The fight over such conversions was, among other things, a fight about prestige before a Christian audience.⁴²

In matters of polemics, conversion, sexual interaction, and segregation, Muslim-Jewish relations seem as competitive and conflictual as those between minority and majority. If there is a difference, it lies in the relative powerlessness of minorities to move against their competitors, except through the royal bureaucracy and occasionally through violence. This holds true for other types of interaction as well. The same

³⁹ACA:Real Patrimonio MR 1722 fol. 49, cited in Ferrer i Mallol (n. 18 above) 82-83.

⁴⁰ACA:C 48 fol. 139v, ACA:C 48 fol. 159, ACA:C 48 fol. 159 (dated 1280/9/1 and 26), published by David Romano, "Conversión de judíos al Islam," *Sefarad* 36 (1976) 336 docs. 1, 2, 3.

⁴¹ACA:C 46 fol. 221v (1284/7/6), in Romano (n. 40 above) 337 doc. 4. The document has also been (inaccurately) transcribed by Francisco A. Roca Traver, *El justicia de Valencia, 1238-1321* (Valencia 1970) 476 doc. 154, and by Robert Ignatius Burns, "Renegades, Adventurers and Sharp Businessmen: The Thirteenth-Century Spaniard in the Cause of Islam," *Catholic Historical Review* 58 (1972) 348 n. 16.

⁴²On Oldradus's position, see William C. Stalls, "Jewish Conversion to Islam: The Perspective of a *Quaestio*," *Revista española de teología* 43 (1983) 235-251, which contains a good deal of information on canonistic treatment of conversion. The quotation is from Stalls 246, translating from his edition of the *quaestio*.

institutional structures which were polarizing Christian-Jewish relations and channeling conflict along religious lines also acted in a similar fashion on relations between minorities. Here I would like to explore two concrete examples: meat markets and moneylending. Each of these subjects deserves much more extended treatment than they will receive in this paper. The important point here is that, within these structures, Muslims and Christians often stood together in an oppositional relationship to Jews. What follows should therefore be seen as two case studies in the material and institutional bases of Muslim and Christian anti-Judaism.

As is well known, meat markets were a locus of intense conflict between Christians and Jews. Some scholars have blamed such tensions on the belief that the Jews were "untouchable," a source of pollution; others on the association of meat markets with blood.⁴³ Two other, perhaps more convincing, explanations arise. The first is a question of the economics of ritual. Without some commercial outlet for meat which proved unkosher after slaughter (usually because of tubercular lesions in the lungs), Jewish meat consumption would become prohibitively expensive. The sale of such meat to Christians and Muslims, albeit at a reduced price, provided a solution to this dilemma, but it also irritated Christian butchers who saw their regulated prices being undercut. Furthermore, some Christians saw such sales as demeaning to their faith. It was not fitting, according to the divines, that a Christian should eat meat rejected by a Jew, an argument which reached its apogee in the bull issued by Benedict XIII in 1415, threatening with excommunication anyone who accepted foodstuffs from a Jew, "vel carnes per eos refutatas quas tryffa vocant."⁴⁴

Municipal councils were only too willing to borrow this religious argument for a different reason. Meat markets may well have been the most regulated aspect of medieval life. The seigneur had rights over the butcher table itself, but the price of the meat, as well as its importation, the pasturage of the flocks as they awaited slaughter, even the salaries of the guards who watched these flocks, all were regulated by municipal ordinance.⁴⁵ Taxes on meat, collected at the point of sale by the butcher, might be imposed by the Crown, the Jewish or Muslim *aljama*, or the town council.⁴⁶ The Jews, with their autonomous butcher tables, tax structures, and royal privileges, often found themselves at odds with Christian municipal officials, and it was at these jurisdictional fault lines that anti-Jewish rhetoric and violence often arose.

Both these factors affected Muslim-Jewish relations as much as Christian-Jewish ones.

⁴³On Jews as "untouchables," Maurice Kriegel, "Un trait de psychologie sociale dans les pays méditerranéens du bas moyen âge: le juif comme intouchable," *Annales: ESC* 31 (1976) 326-330. On the association of ritual murder accusations against Jews with meat markets, William C. Jordan, "Problems of the Meat-Market of Beziers," *Revue des études juives* 135 (1976) 37-39.

⁴⁴Here I am following Jaume Riera i Sans, "La conflictivitat de l'alimentació dels jueus medievals (segles XII-XV)," in *Alimentació i societat a la Catalunya medieval* (Barcelona 1988), esp. 305-310. For Benedict's bull, see J. Amador de los Ríos, *Historia social, política y religiosa de los judíos de España y Portugal* (Buenos Aires 1943) 2.551.

⁴⁵For an example of conflict between municipality and minority butchers over pricing in Borja, see ACA:C 620 fols. 177v-178 (1342/11/12). For conflicts over pasturage and guards in Luna, see ACA:C 2076 fol. 82r-v (1384/4/10) and ACA:C 2077 fol. 76v (1389/5/17), both cited in Riera (n. 44 above) 300.

⁴⁶The most detailed work on the complex problem of monopolies and taxes on foodstuffs in Aragon has focused on wine. See Asunción Blasco Martínez, "La producción y comercialización del vino entre los judíos de Zaragoza (siglo XIV)," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 19 (1989) 405-449.

Because both Muslims and Jews formed part of the "royal treasure," the Crown sometimes treated its rights over them jointly.⁴⁷ Monopolies could be assigned on bread and wax ovens, meat markets, and even jails to be used by members of both religions. Joint meat markets were almost always under Jewish control, since they usually occurred in cities where the Muslim *aljama* was not large or prosperous enough to purchase the right to have its own market. The case of Tortosa provides a good example of the conflicts that could arise from this.⁴⁸

In 1321, after a lengthy law suit, King James II granted the Muslims of Tortosa the right to build their own meat market, despite the Jews's claim that the Muslims were legally obliged to purchase the *unkosher* meat slaughtered by the Jews. The Muslims were to pay 600 sous of Barcelona per year for their privilege.⁴⁹ In order to appease the Jews, however, the king later restricted the placement of the Muslim meat market so that it would not compete with that of the Jews, and allowed all Muslims not actually from the town of Tortosa to continue purchasing meat from the Jews, or anywhere else. Later that year, when the Jews complained again, he ordered the Muslim meat market destroyed and relocated within the Muslim quarter in order to limit its clientele.⁵⁰ Of course, once the Muslims had their own meat market, they encountered the same types of conflicts with Christian municipal institutions as Jews did. By 1328, the Muslims of Tortosa were tusseling with the Christians over taxes on meat, not with the Jews over monopolies.⁵¹

Even in towns where each denomination had its own butcher, conflict arose. Because Jews often sold *unkosher* meat at prices below those charged by other butchers, any non-Jew might be tempted to purchase it. Christian authorities reacted to this with municipal and ecclesiastical prohibitions, and so did the Muslims. The Muslim *aljama* of Zaragoza passed an ordinance punishing any Muslim who bought meat from Jewish butchers with a fine of five sous or five lashes. They also argued along religious lines: they told the king that Jews sold Muslims suffocated meat and other unclean things which the Jews would not eat and which were ritually forbidden to the Muslims.⁵² In

⁴⁷For a general survey of minority, particularly Muslim, meat markets, see Boswell (n. 2 above) 95–103.

⁴⁸The case of Tortosa is partly described in Rosa Mayordomo Font, "Notas históricas sobre la carnicería de la *aljama* sarracena de Tortosa (siglo XIV)," in *Homenatge a la memòria del prof. Dr. Emilio Sáez* (Barcelona 1989) 223–231.

⁴⁹ACA:C 219 fols. 306v–307 (1321/5/1), transcribed in Mayordomo (n. 48 above) 229. Most curious is the Jews' claim that the Muslims were obliged to buy their rejected meat: "videlicet quod asserebatur per dictos judeos vos dictos sarracenos debere recipere et emere de carnibus trufatis per eosdem judeos decolatis in macello vocato de Remolins et non alibi, vobis dictis sarracenis contrarium asserentibus." Ironically, King James II had granted the Muslims the right to purchase meat at the Jewish meat market at the Muslims' request as a special concession, and one which had been bitterly contested by the Christian municipal officials, who claimed that Muslims were obliged to buy their meat at municipal stalls. See ACA:C 196 fol. 232v (1298/5/21).

⁵⁰The first restriction is in ACA:C 220 fol. 15 (1321/5/25), the Jews complaining that "dictum macellum, si infra limitationem predictam fieret, fore in eorum non modicum detrimentum." The destruction and reconstruction is ordered in ACA:C 220 fol. 40r–v (1321/6/28).

⁵¹ACA:C 430 fol. 28v (1328/10/18).

⁵²ACA:C 625 fol. 29 (1343/10/15): "aliqui sarraceni et sarracene ipsius *aljame* . . . ibant ad carniceriam judeorum dicta civitate et in ea emebant carnes contra ordinacionem dudum factam per dictam *aljama* sarracenorum eo quia in dicta carniceria judeorum vendebantur eis carnes suffocaate [*sic*] et alie inmunde quibus judei nullatenus vestebantur."

Tarazona, the Muslims explicitly allied with the Christians when the two groups issued a joint ordinance barring the Jewish meat market to patrons of either faith.⁵³

Moneylending was another area of state-regulated activity which polarized Jewish-Muslim relations as much as it did Jewish-Christian ones. The fact that Jews were legally permitted to lend at interest while Muslims and Christians were not could not help but affect relations between the groups, even though in practice some Muslims and many Christians did find ways of lending at interest.⁵⁴ The collection of interest by Jews and its subsequent taxation by the Crown was one of the primary paths of monetary flow toward the royal fisc, and negotiations over loan moratoria and litigation over loans were probably the most common contact ordinary Muslims and Christians had with the Crown and its courts.⁵⁵ It should come as no surprise, therefore, to find many examples of tension between Muslim and Jewish individuals over debts.

There were many strategies which Christians used in their legal disputes with Jews over debts, ranging from accusations of excessive usury, sodomy, or blasphemy to magical amulets against bad justice and invocations of religious law. Most of these strategies were shared by Muslims, with some exceptions. It is not clear, for example, whether Muslims were protected by the usury laws which gave Christians their most potent defense against Jewish creditors, since in some towns the Jews had long had the privilege of exemption from the twenty percent cap on interest rates in their loans to Muslims.⁵⁶ The examples below all involve Muslims, but parallel examples involving Christians exist.

Perhaps most suggestive of a generalized antagonism between Muslims and Jews in matters of moneylending is the solidarity which Muslim local officials often displayed with their coreligionists in disputes over loans from Jews. The registers of the Crown of Aragon are full of Jewish complaints about the refusal of Muslim (and Christian) officials to administer justice to them in their litigation with Muslims. Indeed, Muslims seem to have expected this type of solidarity from their officials. One witness

⁵³ACA:C 101 fol. 260r-v (1295/7/27), cited by Lourie (n. 2 above) 43 n. 138. King James overturned the ordinance as an innovation.

⁵⁴Some Muslims figure frequently as creditors of Jews. See, for example, ACA:C 462 fol. 122r-v (1333/5/25), where Samuel Albala, Jew of Alagon, complains that he is being defrauded by his Muslim creditor Abdalla Abinamir, son of the *alamin* of Pedrola. In 1334, the Jewish *aljama* of Zaragoza pleaded that it could not afford to pay Abdalla's father, the *alamin* of Pedrola, what it owed him. See ACA:C 465 fol. 271v. Later in the century, the Jewish *aljama* of Sogorbe borrowed from the Muslims of that town in order to redeem their Torah scrolls from impoundment. Conflict in the Jewish community over the repayment of the loan necessitated a *responsum* by the great rabbi Isaac ben Sheshet Perfet, no. 282. Cf. R. Magdalena Nomdedéu, "La *aljama* judía de Segorbe en un 'responsum' de Rabí Ishaq bar Séset Perfet," *Boletín de la Sociedad castellonense de cultura* 59 (1983) 385-393, and Fritz Baer, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im Königreich Aragonien während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1913) 202, who mistranslates the creditor as a Christian. For the transcript of a judgment against several Jews of Barbastro for nonpayment of debts to two Muslims, see ACA:C Processos 563.10, dated 1325/1/30.

⁵⁵Lester K. Little has made the point about monetary flow for England in his *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca 1978) 45-46: "the Jews could thus drain off a layer of money from the population at large and pass it on to the royal treasury without the king's having to get approval to levy a tax or his having to pay the costs of collecting a tax. Therefore the Jews, prior to the development of a general and regular system of taxation, had in effect, if unofficially, become royal tax collectors."

⁵⁶ACA:C 863 fols. 207-208v, reconfirming privileges granted by Peter III, James II, and Alfonso to the Jewish *aljama* of Zaragoza. Any rate which both parties agreed to would be legal: "in mutuis que sarraceni receperant a judeis faciant et solvant prout componere vel convenire possunt interse."

against Juceff Alhudali, *faqih* of Tarassona, admitted that he hated Juceff and considered him his enemy because the *faqih* had enforced the court judgments which a Jewish creditor had obtained against him.⁵⁷ In extreme cases, the king could threaten disciplinary action, as when he threatened to depose the Muslim *faqih* of Borja because of that official's bias against Jewish plaintiffs.⁵⁸ Muslim *qādīs*, too, attempted to protect their coreligionists. Thus the Jews of Borja, Zaragoza, and Tarassona complained that Muslim jurists were invoking "their Muslim *sunna* invented and newly made by the said Muslims" in order to avoid paying debts.⁵⁹

Even when religious solidarity was not explicitly invoked, disputes over loans could easily degenerate into violence between Muslims and Jews. Moneylenders might even plan on the possibility of such violence, as did the Jew of Zaragoza who took the precaution of having Prince Peter write to the Muslims of Alfamen warning them against harming him when he passed through the area collecting his debts.⁶⁰ This type of violence was often preceded by the exchange of insults. Such was the experience of the Borjan Jew Isaac Franco, who found that some Muslims of Malexant, presumably his debtors, cut down and uprooted his vineyard after "*aliqua dissensiona verba*."⁶¹ From violence against property it was but a short step to violence against persons. The murder of moneylenders as they traveled the countryside collecting their debts was not uncommon, and Muslims participated in such violence, sometimes alongside Christians. Three Jews of Lerida, for example, were murdered in 1364 by two Christians (including the bailiff) and eight Muslims of Ajabut.⁶² Such violence could be classified as "situational" in that it sprang from specific relationships between individual Muslims and Jews, and not from ascriptive "religious identity," but it was nevertheless connected to the same issues of legal and religious status that structured Christian-Jewish relations.

The beating and imprisonment of a Jewish creditor by the Muslim vassals of the abbot of Valdigna in 1377 provides a case in point.⁶³ Abraham Atarela, a Jew of Algizra, had gone to the village of Umbria to collect a debt from a Muslim called Azmet Aeqa. When he was in the Muslim's house, "the said Muslim, moved by an evil spirit, ignoring God all-powerful and royal authority, and ignoring the fact that this Jew and all other Jews are under the guard and protection of the lord king," picked up a lance and tried to kill Abraham.⁶⁴ The Jew fled to the house of a neighboring Muslim, but Azmet raised the hue and cry, rousing the Muslims to riot against Abraham, and claim-

⁵⁷ACA:C Procesos 523.11 (old numeration) fol. 44r-v (dated 1323?).

⁵⁸ACA:C 109 fols. 359v-360, cited in Lourie (n. 2 above) 48 n. 149. In 1333 some Jews of Borja claimed to be so impoverished by litigation with their Muslim debtors that they could not pay the scribes assigned to the case; ACA:C 460 fol. 99v.

⁵⁹ACA:C 103 fols. 218v-219, 299v-300 (1296), cited in Lourie (n. 2 above) 32. The Muslims were claiming that according to Muslim law debts could only last for seven years, after which they were automatically void.

⁶⁰Régné (n. 23 above) no. 2371 (1291/7/11).

⁶¹ACA:C 247 fol. 283 (1323/6/12).

⁶²ACA:C 721 fol. 88 (1364/12/3), published in Boswell (n. 2 above) 431.

⁶³For transcripts of the proceedings against the abbot by the royal fiscal procurator, see ACA:C Procesos 126.2 (1377/1/3). The final sentence is preserved in ACA:C 2101 fols. 38v-40.

⁶⁴ACA:C Procesos 126.2 fol. 6r-v. "E com lo dit juheu fon en la dita alqueria ana a casa del dit moro e demana a aquell los dits diners, e lo dit moro induhit d'esperit maligne, no guardan deus tot poderos ne la senyoria real, ne guardant com lo dit juheu e tots los altres juheus son sots proteccio e guarda del dit sen-

ing falsely that the Jew had injured him.⁶⁵ After beating Abraham, the Muslims handed him over to their lord the abbot, who threw him in jail on the pretext that he had injured Azmet, and starved him until he agreed to pay a fine of 100 florins of gold in exchange for his release. The abbot also seized, it was alleged, a sack full of silk worth more than 100 Valencian pounds which Abraham was carrying when he was attacked.⁶⁶

Thus far the incident appears merely local, but the legal arguments made in the case revealed the incident's connection to issues of Jewish legal status fundamental to the position of Jews vis-à-vis Muslims and Christians. The king insisted that jurisdiction over the case belonged to the bailiff general of Valencia, a royal official. All Jews were "of the king's chamber," "the king's treasure," and any case involving them, whether it occurred on seigneurial or royal lands, or involved Muslims or Christians, came under royal jurisdiction.⁶⁷ Not so, argued the abbot. It is true that Jews belong to the king no matter where they travel, but jurisdiction over crimes Jews commit belongs to the lord of the place in which they are committed.⁶⁸ This summarized neatly the conflict between nobles and their vassals on the one hand, the Crown and its Jews on the other. Since the majority of Muslims were seigneurial, not royal, vassals, jurisdictional conflicts such as this one tended to polarize the two communities.⁶⁹

We need not assume that this type of violence was the norm. The vast majority of Muslim-Jewish credit relations were unremarkable, like those between Jews and Christians. Nevertheless, Muslims were just as capable as Christians of generalizing from particular situational violence to broader anti-Jewish activities. In 1358, for instance, King Peter was forced to intercede on behalf of the Jews at Borja because he

learned that numerous inhabitants of the city of Borja, Christians and also Muslims, hate the Jews of the *aljama* [of the city] and try to harm them, jointly and individually, confiscating their property and committing other injustices against them without justification for their actions.⁷⁰

yor rey . . . pres .i. basto e ab aquell irui contra lo dit juheu per matar e consumir aquell," and then grabbed a lance.

⁶⁵This is, of course, the argument of the royal procurator, not of the abbot's lawyer: *ibid.* fol. 6v, "comença de cridar grans crits de viafora e avalota los moros de la dita alqueria e per ço quels dits moros matassen e consumassen lo dit juheu, dix a aquells quel dit juheu lo havia nafrat jassia no fos ver, e de aço es fama."

⁶⁶*Ibid.* fol. 7: "qui non volien donar a menyar al dit juheu pres ans aquell maltractaven per ço que per força sagues a rescatar, feu composicio forçada ab lo dit abat de Valldigna e ab sos officials per preu de cent florins d'or."

⁶⁷*Ibid.* fols. 5v-6 for the initial argument.

⁶⁸*Ibid.* fol. 16.

⁶⁹Compare ACA:C 880 fol. 133v (1345/2/28), where Peter IV grants to the Muslims of Grisen, at the request of Hugh, viscount of Cardona, "quod quotiescumque contigerit eos habere aliquos questiones cum aliama judeorum civitatis Tirasone vel aliquibus ipsius aliama . . . liceat ipsis sarracenis habere aliquem vel aliquos sarracenos vel xristianos que ipsos defendere valeant in iudicio sive extra, non obstante litera quacumque per nos concessa in contrarium aliame judeorum civitatis predictae."

⁷⁰"Perpendimus [ut] aliqui habitatores ville Burgie tam Christiani quam Sarraceni odio habentes judeos aljama ipsius ipsos et eorum singulares vilipendere conantur, pignorando et alias injusticias nulla de cause pereuntes, ut fertur, eis faciendo. . . . Idcirco nos in tuitione, presidio ac defensione vestra commendamus aljamam jamdictam et singulares de eadem"; ACA:C 691 fol. 166 (1358/1/31), published in Boswell (n. 2 above) 375.

This does not mean that Muslims and Christians were united by a common hatred of the Jews. Relations between Muslim and Christian were as difficult, albeit in their own way, as relations between Christian and Jew, or Muslim and Jew, and alliances were constantly shifting. Earlier in the same town of Borja, the Muslims had complained that Jews and Christians together had insulted and violently attacked some Muslims, severely injuring them.⁷¹ Nor do such acts of violence always reflect broader social attitudes. Famet el Crespo and Famet el Muntasio were Muslims of Daroca who, under the protection of a local knight, attacked Jews and Muslims alike. Their actions should not be overburdened with meaning.⁷²

Further, many instances of cooperation between Muslim and Jew exist, particularly at the individual level. Commercial contacts, for example, were frequent.⁷³ More intimate partnerships also existed. When the king impounded the Zaragoza Jew Samuel Golluf's "palace" and the goods contained therein, it was the Muslim Ali Alvalencia whom Samuel asked to help him steal back the goods.⁷⁴ No model which does not allow room for such cooperation will do justice to Muslim-Jewish relations in Aragon.

At the institutional level, however, Muslims, like Christians, seem frequently to have perceived their interests in opposition to those of the Jews. These interests might be pursued at the corporate level of the *aljama*, when privileges and monopolies dependent on the "state" were involved. Similarly, individuals might find themselves acting in oppositional relationships closely structured by "state" institutions, for example, when borrowing money. In all these cases, social and institutional structures favored the perception of divergent interests between the two groups. If we add problems of religious competition and conflict over the sexual crossing of boundaries to our analysis, it becomes difficult to see why historians should be more optimistic about the nature of Muslim-Jewish relations in fourteenth-century Aragon than they are about Christian-Jewish relations in the same time and place.

In at least one sense, relations between minority and majority were more closely structured than relations between Muslims and Jews. Neither minority group harbored illusions that its place in the social and religious hierarchy lay anywhere but below that of the Christians. In the case of the Jews, the annual rearticulation of that hierarchy during Holy Week could contribute to the stability of Christian-Jewish relations.⁷⁵

⁷¹ACA:C cr. Pere el Cerimonios, box 2 no. 148 (1337/1/21).

⁷²ACA:C 525 fol. 58v-59 (1331/9/7): "Famet el Crespo et Famet el Muntasio, sarraceni daroche . . . se sub proteccione et comanda quorundam militum vel potentium dicte ville posuerunt, ob quorum favorem vulnerarunt quendam judeum in carraria maiori dicte ville necnon .iii. sarracenos dicte ville letaliter vulnerarunt." The two carried out several other attacks as well. When they were arrested by the Muslim *alamin* they, together with some Christians, attacked that official and beat him.

⁷³One example must suffice: see Asunción Blasco, *La Judería de Zaragoza en el siglo XIV* (Zaragoza 1988), docs. 8-11, 13-15, 17, 20, 21, 33, for a multitude of occasions in which the Jews of Zaragoza hired Muslim builders to carry out construction on their homes.

⁷⁴ACA:C 444 fol. 162 (1332/1/25): "dictus judeus petiit in moraria Cesarauguste Ali Alvalencia qui Ali, simul cum dicto judeo, abstraxerunt de dicto palacio pannos, peccuniam et alia jocalia seu majorem partem ipsorum non obstante empara predicta."

⁷⁵On Holy Week violence against Jews, see my forthcoming article "Jews, Violence and the Sacred."

Jews and Muslims, however, lacked such a "hierarchizing discourse," and this lack manifested itself in some unique forms of inter-minority violence.

Processions are a well-known scene of conflict between Christians and Jews, and the peaceful participation of Jews in such processions has been held up by at least one historian as a barometer of Christian tolerance.⁷⁶ In fact, I have found no case of violence between the Christian majority and either minority in civic (as opposed to religious) processions during the fourteenth century. But if such a barometer is valid, then relations between Muslims and Jews were stormy. In 1291, the Jews of Daroca complained to the king that, when they heard of the death of the king Alfonso, they prepared a "representation" of his corpse and bore it on a bier (*scannum*) through the town of Daroca. When they passed through the Muslim *aljama*, the Muslims attacked the bier with swords, damaging it and injuring the Jews.⁷⁷ Later in King James's reign, in 1324, the Muslims of Huesca were fined 50,000 sous of Jacca, a staggering sum, for attacking the Jews as they processed through the Muslim *aljama* in a celebration of Prince Alfonso's victory in Sardinia. Twenty Jews were seriously injured. The Muslims maintained that the altercation, which occurred in the "Carraria de Salis," had been started by the Jews.⁷⁸

This type of conflict continued throughout the century. Again in Daroca, Muslims and Jews attacked each other as they processed "leaping, dancing, and making many other expressions of joy" in celebration of the birth of the Infant Ferdinand. The attack was described as "in the fashion of public war," and in this case seems to have been reciprocal.⁷⁹ Two years earlier, King John granted a remission to the Muslim *aljama* of Fraga for the price of one thousand florins of gold. The Muslims had assaulted the Jews of Fraga during a solemn procession mourning the death of Peter the Ceremonious, John's father. Apparently, the two groups had argued over who should have precedence in the procession, and the Muslims attacked the Jews when the Jews marched first.⁸⁰

⁷⁶Noël Coulet, "De l'intégration à l'exclusion: la place des juifs dans les cérémonies d'entrée solennelle au moyen âge," *Annales: ESC* 34 (1979) 672–683.

⁷⁷ACA:C 85 fol. 196, dated 8 July 1291. Summarized by Régéné (n. 23 above) no. 2367. For a brief discussion of Jewish participation in this type of ceremony, and for an analysis of this particular document, see Elena Lourie, "Jewish Participation in Royal Funerary Rites: An Early Use of the *Representatio* in Aragon," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 45 (1982) 192–194. Agustí Duran y Sanpere, *Referències documentals del call de Jueus de Cervera: Discursos llegits en la "Real Academia de Buenas Letras" de Barcelona* (Barcelona 1924) 28–29, discusses a Jewish funeral procession for King Alfons in 1450.

⁷⁸Discussed in M. Blanca Basáñez, *La aljama sarracena de Huesca en el siglo XIV* (Barcelona 1989) 77, citing ACA:C 248 pt. 2 fols. 133v–134, 135r–v, 154 and 160. The fine is reduced to 20,000 sous at the request of Queen Elisenda, as is detailed in ACA:C 226 fol. 26v, published by Basáñez 151–152 as doc. no. 20.

⁷⁹ACA:C 1819 fol. 141 (1389/5/7): "Pridem dum judei et sarraceni aliamarum nostrarum civitate Daroce post felicem incliti infantis Ferdinando domini regis atque nostri carissimi primogeniti nativitatem solempne festum celebrantes accederent per diversas partes ipsius civitate tripudiando, ludendo et plura alia gaudia faciendo, et quidem ex dictis judeis spiritu diabolico inducti . . . cum pluribus lapidibus, coltellis et aliis diversorum armorum generibus acriter insurgerent . . . contra dictos sarracenos, et aliqui ex sarracenis contra dictos judeos, quorum pretextu plura sunt vulnera et percussiones inter eos." See also ACA:C 1818 fols. 136–137v, which ordered the Muslims and Jews to appear and give testimony on the case, and uses the phrase "irruendo . . . ad modum belli publici expugnarunt."

⁸⁰ACA:C 1890 fols. 52–53 (1387/1/23): "contra vos, alaminum, juratos et alios sarracenos aljame sarracenorum ville predicte, delatos seu inculpato quod dudum quando fiebant sive celebrabantur ut moris est in villa ipsa per xristianos, judeos et sarracenos exequie seu funerarie domini regis Petri . . . fuit con-

The conflict over precedence was carried out in the chancery as well as on the streets. In a very informative document issued in 1392, apparently at the request of the Muslim *aljama* of Huesca, King John stated that he desired to put an end to the conflicts and scandals which occurred at all occasions of official celebration or mourning in the city of Huesca: the deaths and births of princes, the advents of kings. To this end, the king decreed that on all such occasions the Muslims should march first, since Muslims risked their lives in military service for the king while the Jews did no service, and the honor should be commensurate with the risks. The king may have reversed himself some years later, however, agreeing with the Jews that they should have precedence because of the greater antiquity of their religion.⁸¹

In all of these examples, the competition for prestige at a civic level is apparent between the two minority groups. The fact that this competition took place in processions designed to show allegiance to the royal family reinforces an obvious conclusion: the acts by which Muslims and Jews defined themselves against each other were often performed for a Christian audience. It could not be otherwise in a Christian polity. But with both groups unable to tap convincingly into the religious discourse which structured power in the Crown of Aragon, any victory could only be temporary, contingent on pragmatic political or economic allegiances of the moment.

Jews and Muslims were well aware of this dilemma. We have seen how the Jews of Huesca asserted that their priority in sacred history implied a parallel civic status. A reverse argument on behalf of the Muslims was outlined by Oldradus de Ponte (see above). But the most striking example of minority attempts to appropriate Christian religious discourse is afforded by another type of ritual violence: the stoning of Jews during the Christian Holy Week. In 1319, the Muslims of Daroca adopted the strategy as their own:

We have learned, [King James writes,] that some Muslims living in Daroca, despite a proclamation that no one, during the eight days of Easter, dare stone or throw stones at our castle of Daroca where the Jews live, scaled the walls of that castle and then attacked the Jews living in that castle with rocks and swords, seriously injuring some of them and committing many other enormities against those Jews.⁸²

tencio inter judeos predictos et vos super modo et ordine incedendi, videlicet si dicti judei in processione que tunc celebrabatur in exequiis sive funerariis predictis deberent vos precedere et vos subsequi vel acontra. Super quaquidem contencione cum judei predicti vos in ipsa solempnitate prederent, vos seu aliqui vestrum nullatenus metuentes tante solempnitate scandalum et turbacionem inferre, judeos ipsos per modum sedicionis et avaloti cum lapidibus, fustibus, et aliter immaniter [?] invastis, ipsos seu majorem partem ipsorum letaliter vulnerando."

⁸¹For the decision on behalf of the Muslims, see ACA:C 1903 fols. 52v-53, dated 12 August 1392. The document is published by Blanca Basañez (n. 78 above) 231 doc. 92. Jaume Riera, the archivist of the Chancery section of the ACA and a specialist in the Jewish history of the period, mentioned to me the later revocation on behalf of the Jews, but I have not been able to find this document.

⁸²ACA:C 245 fol. 121 (1319/4/30): "Jacobus etc. ffideli suo Egidio Garlon, vicino Daroce, salutem etc. Cum intellexerimus quod aliqui sarraceni comorantes in Darocha, dudum [sperta?] preconitacione facta nequis auderet in octavio pasche illapidare sive jacere lapides adversus castrum nostrum Daroce in quo inhabitant judei, ascenderunt muros ipsius castri et postea cum lapidibus et gladiis irruerunt in judeos comorantes in dicto castro et quosdam ex eis fortiter vulnerarunt et plura alia enormia adversus eosdem judeos comiserunt. Idcirco cum de predictis si vera existant debeant fortiter castigari volumus vobisque expresse dicimus et mandamus quatenus incontinenti visis presentibus de predictis inquiratis diligentissime veritatem." The incident was not unique. In 1285 the Muslims of Pina, together with the Christians

In this violent act the Muslims of Daroca asserted their common bond with Christians. Both accepted the prophecy of Jesus, and both were willing to avenge his murder.⁸³ Muslim-Jewish relations were brought momentarily into a Christian discourse, with the Muslims joining the majority. It seems fitting that, like so many other commentaries on religion and power in the Crown of Aragon, this one should be embedded in an act of violence.

Department of History
Rice University
Houston, Texas 77251, U.S.A.

of the town, invaded the Jewish synagogue and broke into the cabinet where the Torah scrolls were kept. This probably occurred during Holy Week. See ACA:C 56 fol. 62v (1285/4/8), summarized in Régéné (n. 23 above) no. 1335.

⁸³See above at n. 11 for the *hadith* quoted by al-Raqlī in which Jesus returns to slay the Jews at the End of Days, and for the prominence of arguments about Jesus in Muslim-Jewish polemics. For more on Muslim attitudes toward Jesus and Mary, see Mikel de Epalza, *Jésus otage: Juifs, chrétiens et musulmans en Espagne (VIe-XVIIe s.)* (Paris 1987), though Epalza stresses only the negative portrayal of Jesus by Muslims in polemics against Christians (e.g., 160) and does not mention Muslim "positive" invocations of Jesus against the Jews.