Philological Quarterly 98.3 (2019)

Already/Never: Jewish-Porcine Conversion in the Middle English Children of the Oven Miracle

Mo Pareles

In high medieval England and its closest neighbors, Jewish avoidance of pork stood, as David B. Goldstein and Claudine Fabre-Vassas observe, for everything irreconcilable in Jewish-Christian difference.[1] In showing contempt for their Christian neighbors' tables, Jews—from the Christian point of view—ironically misunderstood their own purity laws and mistakenly represented themselves as purer than Christians. Moreover, they insulted and segregated themselves from the body of the Church, which renewed itself precisely through the fleshly communion of Christians and which had, as Christians believed, replaced Jewish laws as the source of holiness. It was, perhaps, difficult for Christians to account for the persistence of this infuriating practice, which kept Jews and Christians apart socially, materially differentiated their flesh, and provided a perennial insult to the Church.[2] The Middle English apocryphal infancy poem (henceforth the *Infancy*) that appears in the late thirteenth-century Middle English collection Oxford, Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 108 as a preface to the hagiographies of the *Early South English Legendary* (*ESEL*) provides a disturbing etiology for this Jewish taboo.[3]

In one of several exploits in the Infancy chronicles, the child Jesus attempts to find his former play companions among the Jewish children of Jericho. The parents of these children conceal them in ovens, lie to Jesus about their whereabouts, and speak maliciously about him to one another. Jesus, suspecting the truth, pursues the matter:

> Ate giwes he axede skeot
> ȝwat were in þat ouene i put.
> Þe giwes gounne to make sware
> And seiden þat alle swyn it ware.
> Jhesus to hem seide þo:
> And hit swin beon euere mo.
> And ech of heom also swiþe
> Swyn bi cam þat ilke siþe,
> And ase swyn huy eten mete.

Þus was Jhus on heom a wreke. //
. . . Þ[o] Jhu crist was i gon,
vndut was þe Ouene a non,
And þulke þat weren i pult þer in
Comen out for soþe swyn.
Alle huy heolden heom for dede
And i schende for heore mede;
And euereft sethþe for to þis
Þe Gyv for broþur heold i wis
Euerech swyn in heore manere;
Þis was a miracle clere;
Ne neuer eft fram þat to þis
Gywes ne eten of swynes flechs,
Ne neuere huy nelleth rau ne i zode,
For heore lawe it haueth for bode. (1027–50)

(He asked the Jews at once what had been put in that oven. The Jews began to vow and say that it was all swine. Jesus then said to them: "And let them be swine ever more." And each of them likewise became swine at that same time, and as swine they ate food. Thus was Jesus avenged on them.

When Jesus Christ was gone, the oven was quickly opened, and those that had been put in there came out truly swine. Everyone considered them all dead and killed for their deserts. And ever after because of this, I believe, the Jews consider every pig a brother, according to their custom. This was an excellent miracle. Nor ever after, from that [time] to this, do Jews eat of swines' flesh, nor will they ever, raw or cooked, for their law has forbidden it.) [4]

As one of the early texts (fols. 11r–22r) of MS Laud Misc. 108, dated to ca. 1280–1300, the *Infancy* introduces some of the themes that have recently drawn critical attention to the manuscript and its contents: most notably, childhood, temporality, and conversion.[5] As Daniel T. Kline notes, the manuscript attempts to resolve the noncoincidence of *temporale* and *sanctorale* cycles by doubling the time of a saintly human life with the time of the Christian nation.[6] Childhood and conversion are two of the key arenas, as Kline and Steven F. Kruger have respectively noted, in which this temporal doubling can occur. The Children of the Oven miracle, in which children undergo a permanent conversion to become pigs, foregrounds temporal incongruities. This essay takes up Kline's observations on the doubled time of life and the nation in the *ESEL* infancy episodes and Kruger's location, in the *SEL* life of St. Mary Magdalene, of a temporality of conversion he dubs the "already/not yet."[7] Intriguingly, Geraldine Heng applies Amitav Ghosh and Dipesh Chakrabarty's term "not yet forever" to thirteenth-century Jews: in this "perpetual deferment," Jews can convert but still wait indefinitely for full inclusion in the Christian community.[8] Where, in Heng's formulation, pre-Expulsion Jews thus faced a kind of sadistic optimism[9] in the form of indefinite temporal deferral, the temporal mode appropriate to the idea of Jewish personhood in the Expulsion and post-Expulsion period is, I argue, preemptive foreclosure: they could never have been Christian. Indeed, fol-

lowing a dominant contemporary logic of metamorphosis described by David I. Shyovitz, in which "[i]dentity is maintained in the midst of metamorphosis; what appears to be radical upheaval is in fact the coming to fruition of an inborn characteristic," their animal conversion indicates that they were never fully human.[10] This essay argues that the effect of the Children of the Oven tale is to express a radical temporal abjection, a permanent arrest of Jewish growth and potential, that answers the temporal, racial, and national requirements both of its text and of such a transitional—not to say genocidal—stage in national formation.[11]

Becoming Temporally Other

The English anti-Jewish cultural imagination did not need, and indeed ostentatiously thrived without, Jewish proximity, and the Infancy is in some ways only an early data point in increasingly risible writing about the Jews in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[12] Indeed, Jewish temporal difference proves a consistent theme in English medieval cultural history. As Kathleen Biddick, Miriamne A. Krummel, and Lisa Lampert-Weissig have observed, what Johannes Fabian calls "the denial of coevalness" to Judaism was foundational to the supersessionary logic of medieval Western Christianity. [13] As early as Bede, the medieval English view of sacred time, as Kathleen Davis notes, "grounded Christian political order by attaching it, by way of the *anno domini* and the biblical supersession of the New Testament over the Old Testament (which is also to say Christian history over Jewish history), to a division in sacred time."[14] In this supersessionary regime, as Krummel and Anna Wilson both suggest in their discussions of Jewish time as later medieval Christendom's "queer" time, Jewish temporal difference has sometimes stood in for temporal trouble as such.[15] This is true not only because of the marked differences between Jewish and Christian temporal regimes, which include different perceptions of memory, eschatology, and sacred and secular history as well as different generational, annual, and daily ways of marking and being in time, but also because of the internal heterogeneity of those Jewish and Christian regimes.[16]

Although Jewish temporal difference has frequently played a salient role in the friction between Christian majorities and Jewish minorities,[17] the career of the Children of the Oven miracle coincides with a particularly marked transition in the relationship of Jews to English time. Historians have demonstrated the integration of twelfth- and thirteenth-century English Jews in the spaces and routines of secular urban life and the involvement of Jews and Christians in one another's sacred observances;[18] as Elisheva Baumgarten

has shown, high medieval Jews could not live urban lives independent of the Christian sacred calendar.[19] In his influential work on thirteenth-century conversion, Robert C. Stacey describes the "quotidian" intimacy between Jews and their English Christian neighbors.[20] The anti-Jewish legislation of the thirteenth-century sundered interfaith connections in the form of a thousand cuts; local expulsions removed Jewish residents from the lives of their towns and cities; and increasingly harsh regulations and financial penalties cut Jews out of the rhythms of interfaith social and mercantile life.[21]

Meanwhile, as Lampert-Weissig demonstrates in her skillful analysis of the Wandering Jew as temporal trope, anti-Jewish cultural forms emphasized temporal otherness.[22] As Wilson observes, Thomas of Monmouth's foundational ritual murder narrative *The Life and Miracles of William of Norwich* (1174) takes the temporal disjunctions of the Easter-Passover season as catalyst and theme. Wilson argues that Passover, allegedly superseded by Easter, in fact continues to erupt into the Christian holy season as a reminder of the continued observance of a competing, noncoincident sacred calendar on which the Christian calendar nonetheless partially relies.[23] As this reading suggests, Holy Week ritual murder narratives demonstrate the obscenity of superseded Jewish practices such as Passover observance when continued into the present, and point toward the conclusion that Judaism, and thus Jews themselves, ought to belong wholly to the past.

The *Infancy* poem is a product of the Expulsion period; at earliest, it is contemporary with Edward I's Statute of the Jewry (1275), which proclaimed the end of integrated Jewish life in England, and at latest postdates the Edict of Expulsion (1290) by only a generation.[24] By no means uniquely in its century, it bears the hallmarks of genocidal cultural production: scapegoating, dehumanization, and the discovery of eternal rather than historically contingent enmity between the social body and the target group.[25] It also, as Heather Blurton observes of texts in the *ESEL*, casts a paranoid eye on the plausibility of Jewish conversion, which exempted some Jews from expulsion.[26] Such cultural work places the Jewish community outside of ordinary national, narrative time, where its destruction does no violence to the fabric of the nation—is, indeed, a national desideratum.[27] In separating unconverted Jews from the nation, the Expulsion extinguished the troubling coevalness of Jewish and Christian life, relegating Jewish time to its proper place in the Christian nation's history. MS Laud 108, a conspicuously national anthology that A. S. G. Edwards calls "perhaps the earliest harbinger of what was to become the emergent vernacular literary culture"[28] of Middle English, emerges just at this moment. One element of this literary culture, after the expulsion, was continual recourse to what medievalists

have called "spectral Jews," "virtual Jews," "hermeneutical Jews," and "paper Jews": the superseded Jews of the Christian and national imaginary.[29] The temporal conversion of the tale thus mirrors a temporal conversion in the contemporary nation, in which Jews go from inhabiting an ongoing historical present to embodying a perpetually available frozen past.

The Children of the Oven miracle elaborates a theory of Jewish difference that incorporates both general and historically specific repudiations of Jewish time. Christians divided sacred, universal time into eras based on revelations of divine law: a time before Jewish (Mosaic) law, the age of Jewish law before the coming of Christ, and the time after Christ's advent, crucifixion, and resurrection, in which the New Dispensation swept away the Old Law. In the Infancy, however, which demonstrates that Christ creates an important Jewish law, there are Jews before Christ, but there may not be any Jewish history. Jewish law then turns out not to be of typological importance but to be based on a natural and understandable Jewish revulsion toward Jews' own resemblance to animals in the age of Christ. This logic performs a doubled act of temporal sidelining, for if Jews have no authentic history, this is even truer of animals.

The Infancy reflects the growing fixation of thirteenth-century English culture with the Jewish threat to Christian children, which included the threat of becoming Jewish—or, indeed, of realizing the Jewish potential that, as Fabre-Vassas notes, "every Christian child" already has.[30] Baby boys are not born Jewish men; the knife interpellates them. Nor are children born fully Christian; they must go through baptism. This mutability makes children particularly vulnerable to spiritual predation. As Fabre-Vassas and David Biale have demonstrated, the knife that circumcised was by the fifteenth century also (to the anti-Semitic mind) the knife of ritual slaughter, and it is a short step from imagining Jews circumcising Christian boys to imagining them murdering them.[31] This is also, perhaps, a logical outgrowth of focusing on the Christ child and his sufferings to come, a devotional attitude sometimes called the Proleptic Passion:[32] from meditating on Jewish cruelty to Christ imagined, through temporal slippage, as an infant, it is easy to generalize to Jewish enmity toward innocent Christian children. Hence the Children of the Oven's gleeful pronunciation "Þus was Jhus on heom a wreke"; Christ's vengeance upon the Jewish parents seems somewhat disproportionate to the crime of hiding children at playtime, but makes sense as a proleptic punishment for their murder of Christ or other bloodthirsty crimes against innocence.

By the thirteenth century, the lethal narrative that Miri Rubin refers to as "the dangerous juxtaposition of child/vulnerability/Christ" versus "Jew/

abuse/father" had, as Heng notes, congealed "by communal consent for over a century" until it provided a cogent rationale for judicial killings, mob violence, and finally the expulsion.[33] This intensification manifests in the evolution of the tale, which is traceable to an approximately eighth- to ninth-century Arabic Infancy Gospel episode about Jesus turning non-Jewish boys temporarily into goat kids.[34] The miracle apparently accrued its anti-Semitic trappings in medieval French before attaining some popularity in England, not only in the Middle English Infancy but also in several Anglo-Norman versions. The Old French *Évangile de l'Enfance,* Anglo-Norman *Les enfaunces de Jesu Crist*, and the *ESEL* Infancy are particularly close; the extant Anglo-Norman text, which Maureen Barry McCann Boulton dates to the late thirteenth century, is such a close translation of the thirteenth-century *Évangile* that Boulton refers to it as "an Anglo-Norman redaction of the *Évangile* written in octosyllabic quatrains," and the Infancy and the *Enfaunces* are so similar in arrangement and content as to suggest a shared Anglo-Norman parent.[35] Yet only the Middle English adds the line about vengeance that takes the tale unmistakably from hateful humor to sadism.[36] Pickering's surprising remark that the Holkham Bible version's "conclusion (about pork-eating) is a mere 'wise-crack'" is now indefensible.[37]

The vertigo-inducing temporal logic of the Children of the Oven miracle thus appears within a multilingual and multimedia vernacular tradition, active on both sides of the Channel, dedicated to a far simpler historical sleight-of-hand: the conversion of deadly Christian violence against Jews into representations of Jewish violence against Christians, particularly children.

Always-Already Christ's Enemies

Although the miracle is etiological, providing a glimpse of Jews forming a crucial aspect of Jewish identity, there is no historical dimension to its approach. The Children of the Oven miracle bills itself as an origin story for the identity-defining law *kashrus*, but the Jews of this miracle are already Jews in name, association, and possession of the law. Indeed, they have already departed from the law, making way for Christians to replace them in God's favor. Moreover, they are already Christ's enemies.

In fact, Jewish law, formally established well in advance of the dirty joke that gives rise to *kashrus* in the Infancy, is the main source of conflict between the Jews and the Holy Family, apart from the Christ child's occasional homicides. Jesus is circumcised in the temple "Ase þe lawe was in þat contre" (as was the law in that land; *Infancy* 20), and breaks the Sabbath

on several occasions, for which he earns substantial Jewish ire. As the local people complain to Joseph, "Ore lawes he al to rent / And bi sabat ore folk schent" (He has completely broken our laws, and killed our people on the Sabbath; 381–82). The doubled "ore" of this indirectly reported complaint both implicitly includes the Holy Family, who are meant to be subject to the law and who are members of the Jewish people, and implicitly excludes them: since there are no non-Jewish people in this episode, there should be no need to specify that the murdered are Jewish unless this either magnifies Jesus's guilt (in which case the natural wording would be "his own people") or differentiates them in some sense from the Holy Family (our people, not yours).

Yet Jesus is, explicitly, master of the law: in an elaboration on the temple episode of Luke 2:41–47, he is meant to learn the law from Zachariah but ends up instructing the rabbis, who tell Joseph, "He hauez don us more lore / þane euere us dude ani bi fore" (He has given us more instruction than anyone ever has before; 451–52). Rather than endearing him to the Jews, this is a source of further enmity; pairing this assertion with the complaint "A giv he haueth a slawe i wis / þat was i holde of gret pris" (I believe he has slain a Jew who was considered to be of great worth; 453–54), a rabbi urges Joseph to flee with his family, "For ȝif ȝe duellez here ouȝt longer, / He wole don us muche wrong" (for if you stay here any longer, / He will do much wrong against us; 457–58). In querulously classifying Jesus's mastery of the law as a "wrong" against the Jews, in the same vein as the murder of a highly valued member of the community, the rabbi expresses the text's own rather casual valuation of Jewish lives and deaths, subordinating them to the more important question of Jesus's mischievous rebellion against Jewish authority.[38] The rabbi's prediction is accurate, in any case, since Jesus immediately goes on to claim messianic authority based on his biblical mastery, thus undermining Jewish claims to understand the message of their own scriptures, and follows these revelations by killing several Jewish children in reckless play.

By the time of the miracle, the Jews are already persecuting Jesus for the apparently trivial reason that he keeps causing the deaths of Jewish children. They are so angry about this that "swete Jesus" (sweet Jesus; 412), to the relief of Joseph, rectifies some of these killings. Although the poem narrates Jesus's culpability for these deaths with great clarity, it also continually emphasizes the Jews' irrational anger and Jesus's blessedness. The mismatch in the descriptions of acts and actors, delivered in verse, can strike the twenty-first-century reader as comically ironic—the Holy Family is unself-consciously indifferent to Jewish suffering but finds the threat of the mob

onerous, such that after the child Jesus lethally curses a Jewish man and then resurrects him: "Josep was glad in þis cas / þat þis giv a liue was, / For he was i þretned ofte / Of þat folk þat luyte of him rou3hte. / So was marie þat Maide mild / And Jhc hire swete child" (Joseph was happy under the circumstance that this Jew was alive, since he had often been threatened by that people who thought little of him. So were Mary, that gentle virgin, and Jesus, her sweet child; 473–78). Even the most prosodic translation reveals a mildly obscene gap between this sweet family's self-conscious mercifulness and the mayhem they have guilelessly wreaked in the community. However, the comedic elements, such as they are, are in fact directed at the Jews who undergo slapstick deaths that allow Jesus to grant undeserved mercy.

The Jews of the Infancy have already departed from holiness; not only do they hate and persecute Christ ("euerechone þulke giwes / Hateden muche swete Jesus" [every one of those Jews hated sweet Jesus very much; 411–12]), but they also worship idols, which the text conflates with Islamic practice.[39] On one occasion, Jesus "3eode . . . into one temple of giwes and for dude heore Maumates, and alle huy fullen bi heom sulf, and þe feondes þat with inne heom weren wenden out, 3wuche heroudes þe king honourede with þe giwes" (went . . . into one temple of Jews and destroyed their idols [Mohammeds], and felled them all by himself, and the devils that were in them, that Herod the king had honoured with the Jews, went out; rubric above line 209). These Jews are pagans and devil-worshippers; they are proleptic Muslims; and although elsewhere the narrative acknowledges the existence of the Temple, the Jews apparently have multiple houses of worship. This site of multiple heresies, the "synagogerie" (253), although in the mold of a feverishly imagined pagan temple, is a diasporic synagogue *avant la lettre*.

Never Christian, Never Human

Are Jews closer to pigs or to Christians? Peter the Venerable (d. 1156) seems to answer this question in his twelfth-century polemic *Adversus Iudeorum inveteratam duritiem* (*Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews*), observing, "Surely I do not know whether a Jew . . . is a human. I do not know, I say, whether one is human from whose flesh a heart of stone has not yet been removed, to whom a heart of flesh has not yet been granted, within whom the divine sprit has not yet been placed, without which a Jew can never be converted to Christ."[40] In this formulation, conversion is an index of full humanity. Jeremy Cohen notes that, although Peter hews to the conventional Augustinian dogma against anti-Jewish violence, he argues elsewhere

in this work for Jewish conversion, and "could not possibly have foreseen [the] ensuing historical career" of the porcine Jew he rhetorically proposes, his polemic nonetheless represents an ominous turning point in medieval anti-Jewish rhetoric.[41] Peter's creation of the inhuman, bestial Jew who refuses Christ rests upon the unstated proposals that animals cannot possess the divine spirit, that whatever likeness Jews share with animals Christians do not, and that Jews who are "not yet" (*nondum*) converted/human "can never be" (*nunquam potest*). However much this assertion contradicts other parts of Peter's thought, it also lucidly tracks the temporal and ontological logic of the *Infancy* miracle. When the tale literalizes Peter's suspicions about Jews (they are really pigs—or at least their children are), it also revises the apparent "not yet" of their Jewish unbelief in Christ—which otherwise might appear as the precondition to conversion—into the "never" of animal incapacity.

The miracle also exploits a potential loophole in Thomistic conversion theology. Mary Dzon speculates that Middle English infancy poems demonstrate Thomas Aquinas's influence, despite and partially in response to Aquinas's repudiation, following John Chrysostom, of Christ's infancy miracles.[42] The Children of the Oven miracle seems to respond to some of Aquinas's general theological concerns. In particular, Aquinas mounted an influential argument against forcible conversion of Jews, including Jewish infants. These children were, he explained, by natural law subject to the will of their parents. Therefore, for the same reason that conversion against one's will could not be valid—conversion was itself a matter of will—children could not be converted against their parents' will.[43] Recalling Barbara Newman's caution that sacred satire can be "an agent of hatred rather than light,"[44] the *Infancy* makes a dark comedy of demonstrating a potential exception, for Christ, in changing these children to pigs, is taking the Jewish parents at their words, literalizing the unwitting conversion of their infants through deceit. This is not a redemptive conversion, however; reflective of its genocidal moment, it is an erasure.

In identifying Jews with animals, the miracle partakes in the long patristic and medieval tradition of deploying Jewish ideas of uncleanness against the Jews. In the twelfth century, monastic writers including Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124/25) and Peter the Venerable accused both Jews and Muslims of the practices that they most abominate. In particular, they accused Jews of intimate association with blood, unruly/unnatural sexuality, bodily excretions, and unclean animals, including pigs and dogs. They followed in the footsteps of patristic authors such as John Chrysostom, the fourth-century saint whose question about the Jews ("Did you see how those who

were formerly children became dogs? Do you want to find out how we, who were formerly dogs, became children?") the Children of the Oven episode seems obliquely to answer.[45] The popular central European image of the *Judensau,* a pig suckled by and in some cases sexually intimate with Jews, crystallizes the connection by communicating, as Isaiah Schachar observes, that Jews "are the sow's offspring and turn to their mother for their proper nourishment."[46] As Kathryn A. Smith notes, fourteenth-century images of the Children in the Oven such as those that appeared between about 1315 and 1350 in the Anglo-Norman *Holkham Bible Picture-Book* (British Museum, MS Add. 47682), on the Tring Tiles, in the Neville of Hornby Hours (British Library, MS Egerton 2781), and in the Anglo-Norman *Enfaunces* (Oxford, Bodleian, MS Selden Supra 38), "are the English equivalent of the *Judensau*."[47] Although these comparatively rather tame images of pigs emerging from Jewish ovens lack the obscene sexual and excretory details through which the *Judensau* links Jew and pig, they make the same visceral link between Jewish and porcine bodies.

In a process chronicled in various contexts by Kenneth R. Stow, Fabre-Vassas, and others, a racial majority disclaims its proximity to or intimacy with a particular nonhuman animal while displacing that intimacy onto a racial other; in so doing, it neatly distances itself from that other human group and, according to the logic of dehumanization, by which violence against an animal is of lesser or no consequence, partially excuses, masks, or absolves itself of its racial crimes.[48] The usefulness of reducing Jews to unclean animals is twofold, in that it both provides a defense against Jewish views of Christian uncleanness, asserting instead the uncleanness of Jews, and gives Jews a place in the taxonomy of creation below Christians.[49]

Although the pig-children survive the oven and are even able to eat food in their porcine form, their Jewish parents "heolden heom for dede": consider their children dead. This is not, perhaps, very far removed from the way many Jews and Christians treated people who had converted spiritually. In the Jewish tradition, as Joshua Levinson notes, it can be argued that conversion severs kinship; the Talmud suggests that it alters the flesh so decisively that siblings conceived before and after their mother's conversion are not, in fact, siblings under the law.[50] In another context, then, it would not be a stretch to read this conversion allegorically—Jewish children converted to Christianity might as well be animals, they might as well be dead. But thirteenth-century English Jews, at least, do not seem to have viewed conversion with this level of finality, and that is not the meaning of this miracle.[51] Instead of severing a relationship through conversion, the miracle finds its purpose in saddling the Jews with perpetual kinship to pigs.

It is more likely that these parents consider their children dead because, as true pigs, they have become spiritually mortal. Effective deontic curses, as Leslie Arnovick observes, normally include either a temporal element or a means of undoing the curse. This curse is eternal; its temporal element, "euere mo," must pertain to the immortal soul or to endless generations.[52] Yet this aspect of the curse seems impossible: "And hit swin beon euere mo" invokes an eternity in which pigs can have no part, properly speaking, either in this life or the next. No pig is immortal, and sharing in eternal life, in addition to the capacity for reason, separates humans from lower creatures in medieval Christianity.[53] Similarly, according to the narrative, Jews will *never* eat pork—they will never convert, never turn Christian—although perfectly possible in the most literal sense, this is another deviation from the usual understanding of Christian time, which is said to end with the conversion of at least some of the Jews. Nonetheless, this story envisions a cursed time for Jews that extends past the end of time, an eternity that outlasts the usual definition of forever.[54] This is the dark inverse of the "yet and yet and yet" Kruger identifies in the *SEL* Magdalene, a time of continually deferred potentiality: it is the time of the never and never and never, spiritual mortality without end.[55]

Already-Never Converted

The *Infancy*'s conversion of children to pigs, which reveals Jewish law as a proleptic confession of Jewish animality and violence against children,[56] thus produces a radical temporal abjection that absorbs the anxieties about Christian childhood displaced elsewhere in the *Infancy* and in the *ESEL* and justifies the removal of all Jews to a new temporal category. This is the time of the "already/never." In the "already/never," the companion phrase I propose to Kruger's useful "already/not yet," conversion is foreclosed through temporal abjection. The metamorphosis that manifests this foreclosure—in this case the metamorphosis from human child to pig—reveals that there was already something insensible to conversion, something temporally abject, latent in the never-to-be-Christian.

This latent content is what we might call the antifuturity of Judaism—not simply its rootedness in the past, but its ability to stand within anti-Jewish discourse as complete antagonist to Christian temporal and life-cycle progress. For, as Kline observes, the *ESEL* manifests a particular interest in the dangerous lives of children.[57] Its numerous infant miracles include not only a troop of child saints, including Kenelm, martyred as a child, and a number who seem to be considerably more virtuous than Christ, such as

St. Nicholas, who "ȝwane oþur children rageden faste: to churche he wolde go; / he nolde speke non ydel word: ase swuche children doth" (when other children played rambunctiously, he would go to church; he spoke no idle word, as such children do; *ESEL* 240, lines 10–11), but also a number of children miraculously revived and transformed. Among these are the resurrected child of the Life of St. Nicholas (*ESEL* 254–55), the quickly growing child of the Life of St. Christopher (*ESEL* 273–74), the boy who survives for a year underwater due to the power of St. Clement (*ESEL* 338–39), the children of Eustace who survive abduction by beasts (*ESEL* 395–400, hereafter cited by line), and the child who appears to St. Edmund and writes his own divine name on his body (*ESEL* 433). Several of these children, such as the last mentioned, point back to the *Infancy* by revealing themselves to be the Christ child in disguise.

In *ESEL*, childhood miracles expose the intense grief of losing children, only to assuage it. St. Eustace, when his two sons "þat al myn herten were" (who were my entire heart; 103) are carried off by beasts, "wep and his hondes wrong: & tar him be þe here; / him-sulf he wolde habbe a-dreint . . . / he þolede, him þoȝte, sorue y-nou: noman ne miȝte more" (wept and wrung his hands, and tore himself by the hair. He would have drowned himself . . . he suffered, it seemed to him, great grief; no one might suffer more; 93–96). He mourns at length, noting that his sorrows exceed those of Job. Similarly, St. Clement's father, thinking his wife and three sons have died, grieves, "Worse ȝwate nadde neuere man / . . . And ich am, þare no man me ne knoweth: mid miseise ouer-come / . . . Seggez ov-sulf ȝif ȝe euere I-heorden: Ani so deolful cas!" (No man ever had worse luck . . . And I am where no one knows me, overcome with anguish . . . Ask yourselves if you have ever heard such a sad case; *ESEL* 331, lines 270–73). All of these battered children are miraculously recovered to their fathers. Yet in these outpourings of grief, realistic in emotional intensity if highly stylized and citational in their details (in each case evoking Job's lament), it is possible to realize what is missing from the Jewish parents' reactions to their children's deaths: sadness.

For in the *Infancy*, while the anger of the Jewish mobs at the Christ-child's episodic killings of his Jewish companions is also emotionally realistic (is this not, actually, the transposed anger of Christian mobs against the supposed Jewish killers of *their* children?), there is nothing that marks it out from the many other moments of Jewish anger toward the Holy Family. The Jews who "makez gret plainte of Jhu for he hadde a child a slawe" (made a loud fuss against Jesus because he had slain a child; rubric above 423), "seiden man dude hem gret schonde" (said they had been done serious injury; 426)—a characteristically legalistic response, quickly echoed in the

conditional tense by a rabbi who warns that if Jesus does not leave town, "He wole don us muche wrong" (He intends to do us much wrong; 458). It is the same anger Jesus provokes by arrogance toward his teachers and by breaking the Sabbath. For instance, when Jesus stands by while one of the Jewish children he has led into mischief kills another, the formulation "Jhus crist no word ne sede, / Ake stille he stod and saiȝh heore dede. / þis was in a satur day. / þat þe giv þis ded lay, / þar of a ros ful gret cri" (Jesus Christ said not a word, but he stood still and saw their deed. This was on a Saturday. Because the Jew lay thus dead, a very great outcry arose; 897–901), where the temporal reference intercedes between Jesus and the Jews, the Jewish outcry appears prompted as much by the day of the tragedy as by Jesus's inaction, while the Jewish clamor, seen only from Christ's perspective, contrasts with his silence. The Jews' ostentatious outrage that Jesus has killed on the Sabbath demonstrates, as it is meant to, that the Jews value their laws as highly as the lives of their brethren. It is in *Joseph* that emotional pain becomes legible in these episodes; he is "in gret mourning / For þe giwene þretning" (in great distress about the Jews' threats; 337–38).

These are law-bound Jews seeking to punish the Christ-child's offenses against the status quo, and then adjusting their law to account for their newfound kinship with pigs. They are not heartbroken parents, for Jewish children's lives are not, in the boundaries of this text, truly grievable. Neither the Christ-child nor Joseph appears able to feel empathy for them or for those who mourn them (Joseph's grief is for the fate of his own family); it is Mary who feels pity, begging, "Mi leue sone, ich bidde þe / þat þou haue of heom pite / þat ȝeonde liggethþ dede þere; / For mi loue þou heom a rere!" (My dear son, I ask that you have pity on those who lie dead there, and for my love raise them; 595–98), and while the pity motive does not interest Christ, filial love does: "Jhc louede is Moder deore / And wel i heorde his moder preiere" (Jesus Christ loved his dear mother, and listened well to his mother's prayer; 599–600). Here as elsewhere, the love bonds of the Holy Family stand out against the affectively arid background of Jewish life and death.[58] Unconverted Jewish affect, insofar as it exists, revolves around the Holy Family; the only Jew who is said to feel love is the child who loves Jesus so much that his father beats him with a rod and imprisons him in a tower without food. Here, love is an alienating and disruptive force in normal Jewish relations; the word is possible in a Jewish mouth only in abusive speech: "þou schalt for loue of Jesu / In a tour beo put" (You shall be put in a tower on account of [your] love for Jesus; 696–97). Even wild beasts are capable of tender physical care for their babies, as we know from the *ESEL* St. Edmund, where a wolf carries, licks, and kisses the saint's head "riȝt as

he wolde is owene 3welp" (just as he would with his own cub; 299). If Jewish parents other than Mary and Joseph are capable of a level of care beyond the bestial, we do not hear of it. If Jewish children's lives are worthy of care, that care can come only through a humanizing love of Christ.

In its treatment of Jewish children, the *Infancy* pursues a strategy, described most memorably by Judith Butler, of repositioning the killing of children as less than murder, their deaths as less than grievable, by portraying the victims as *not actually* human children. Butler describes the case of Palestinian children killed because they were allegedly being used as "human shields" for combatants. In this case, the children were no longer human because they "were already transformed into military instruments": "those children are not really children . . . they have already been turned to metal."[59] Thus, in the *Infancy*, the Jewish children become true animals and not properly grievable, and it is also established that the parents of these children are in any case not really capable of grieving them—that all forms of affect regarding children must be rerouted through the Holy Family. Certainly, this story, and other anti-Jewish stories that cluster around this one, such as the "Jewish boy" tale, demonstrate that Jews are already the physical and spiritual murderers of their own children;[60] not merely careless of their eternal life, these parents are motivated enough to torture and even kill Jewish children who take Communion or love Christ. It is unclear, then, that the Jewish children and their parents have ever been true human families, or that killing them is really murder.

The purpose of discovering Jewish bestiality is to locate violence against Christian children in Jews. Yet the *Infancy* provides a genealogy of religious violence against Christians that accords much more with *Jewish* experiences of religiously motivated violence in high medieval England: a perceived Jewish threat/insult to the body of Christ, or the Christian body politic, calls forth a real slaughter of Jewish adults and children, as it did in the pogroms of 1189–1190.[61] In art as in life, an asymmetrical power relationship between Christ (Christians) and Jews in the values of the text allows casual violence, even murder, against the Jewish people to appear as wholesome recreation rather than crime.[62] The "already/never" of porcine Jewishness, the permanent and preordained arrest of growth and spiritual potential that the text associates with Jewish and penitential conversion to Christianity, militates against redemptive hope for Jews. Simultaneously, the *Infancy* miracle posits a genealogy for religious violence against children not in Jewish predation towards Christian infants, but in Christ's own playful, childish violence, which converts Jewish children into something good for Christians to eat.

The conversion marked in this miracle, which will be celebrated in the sacred image-making of the following century, turns English Jews from an integrated people with a history into, as Sophia Menache notes, a pure resource for the national imaginary.[63] The anti-futurity of Judaism—its opposition to childhood, its resistance to conversion, its incommensurability with national, human, and salvation history—is also a rich potentiality, an inexhaustible national resource for the perennial reinvention of the past.

University of British Columbia

NOTES

I presented portions of this research at the New Chaucer Society conference in 2010, ICMS-Kalamazoo in 2015, and the Sewanee Medieval Colloquium in 2016, and I thank the organizers and attendees for these valuable conversations. I am especially grateful to Leslie Arnovick, Mary Dzon, Siân Echard, Allen Fulghum, *PQ* editor Eric Gidal, Steven Kruger, Haruko Momma, Robert Rouse, Vin Nardizzi, Benjamin Saltzman, the anonymous *PQ* reader, and the colleagues and students who have discussed these ideas with me and offered invaluable leads and feedback.

1 David B. Goldstein, *Eating and Ethics in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge U. Press, 2013), 70; Claudine Fabre-Vassas, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, and the Pig,* trans. Carol Volk (Columbia U. Press, 1997), esp. 7–8; see also Karl Steel, *How to Make a Human: Animals and Violence in the Middle Ages* (Ohio State U. Press, 2011), 68.

2 On *kashrus* as insult to Christianity, see David M. Freidenreich, *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law* (U. of California Press, 2011), esp. 191–94.

3 For the relationship of this manuscript (sometimes called L) to the *SEL* tradition, see Thomas R. Liszka, "MS Laud. Misc. 108 and the Early History of the *South English Legendary*," *Manuscripta* 33.2 (1989): 75–91. On the relationship of this tale and its analogues to pork consumption as a site of Christian identity, see Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast*, 89–94, esp. 92–94; Steel, *How to Make a Human,* 188–89.

4 All *Infancy* material is quoted from "Kindheit Jesu," in *Altenglische Legenden,* ed. Carl Horstmann (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1875), 3–61, and cited parenthetically by line. All translations from Middle English and Anglo-Norman are my own, unless otherwise cited.

5 Kimberly K. Bell and Julie Nelson Couch, "Introduction: Reading Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108 as a 'Whole Book,'" in *The Texts and Contexts of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108: The Shaping of English Vernacular Narrative,* ed. Bell and Couch (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–18, convincingly argue for the thematic unity of this manuscript composed entirely of Middle English texts and "exceptional in its *absence* of miscellaneity" (1). They note the role of the *Infancy* and other texts as thematically introductory materials (11), while Diane Speed argues that these *temporale* texts provide a temporal lens through which the core text, the *ESEL sanctorale*, can be profitably interpreted; Speed, "A Text for Its Time: The *Sanctorale* of the Early *South English Legendary*,"

in *Texts and Contexts,* ed. Bell and Couch, 117–36, esp. 123–29. In his description of the manuscript contents, A. S. G. Edwards includes the *Infancy* with the *(E)SEL*, which follows from its placement: although it is currently the second item in the manuscript, it was preceded by seven *SEL temporale* items that are now lost; Edwards, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108: Contents, Construction, and Circulation," in *Texts and Contexts,* ed. Bell and Couch, 21. Horstmann edited the *ESEL sanctorale* as a separate volume, *The Early South-English Legendary, or, Lives of Saints,* vol. 1. (London: EETS o.s. 87, 1887), hereafter cited as *ESEL*.

6 Daniel T. Kline, "The Audience and Function of the Apocryphal *Infancy of Jesus Christ* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108," in *Texts and Contexts,* ed. Bell and Couch, 137–55. In referring to twelfth- and thirteenth-century England as a "nation," I use Miriamne A. Krummel's definition, influenced by the Middle English "nacioun," of "a conceptual site comprising people with cultural alliances authenticated by a shared sameness," often imaginatively constructed "upon the exiled and effaced bodies of Others"; Krummel, *Crafting Jewishness in Medieval England: Legally Absent, Virtually Present* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 14–15. I have been particularly influenced in this usage by Kathleen Davis, "National Writing in the Ninth Century: A Reminder for Postcolonial Thinking about the Nation," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 28 (1998): 611–37.

7 Steven F. Kruger, "The Times of Conversion," *PQ* 92 (2013): 19–39, esp. 24, 30–35.

8 Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge U. Press, 2018), 39, 79; Amitav Ghosh and Dipesh Chakrabarty, "A Correspondence on *Provincializing Europe*," *Radical History Review* 83 (2002): 148, 152.

9 See Lauren Berlant's influential concept of "cruel optimism," which she defines as a "desire" that functions simultaneously as "an obstacle to . . . flourishing"; Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Duke U. Press, 2011), 1. See also Berlant, "Cruel Optimism," *differences* 17.3 (2006): 20–36. The desire of an oppressed minority to assimilate into a toxic racial order would constitute cruel optimism. I use "sadistic optimism" to describe the apparently beneficent desire of a powerful group for an oppressed group to reach for, or attain, a putative good that in fact harms them (without reference to whether the oppressed group shares this desire).

10 David I. Shyovitz, "Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Werewolf Renaissance," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 75 (2014): 531.

11 I use the term "abject" rather than, e.g., "marginal" or "other," to invoke the close relationship between abjection and expulsion. Sara Ahmed traces: "The abject is expelled . . . and the process of expulsion serves to establish the boundary line of the subject . . . The abject both establishes and undermines the relationship between outside and inside"; Ahmed, *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality* (London: Routledge, 2000), 51. I also use the term in the plainly political (nonpsychoanalytic) sense favored by Imogen Tyler: "the condition of one cast [out or] down" through "the violent exclusionary forces of sovereign power"; Tyler, *Revolting Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain* (London: Zed Books, 2013). In Ahmed's formulation of the politically and racially abject, which draws upon and diverges from earlier psychoanalytic feminist formulations of abjection, "one does not then live *in* abjection: abject bodies are precisely the bodies that are not inhabited, not liveable as such, or indeed, are not at home"; Ahmed, *Strange Encounters*, 52. In these terms, "temporal abjection" means the expulsion of Jews to an imaginary and unlivable temporal zone unassimilable to ordinary or sacred Christian life, so that Jews can no longer be at home in Christian England.

12 On anti-Jewish cultural production in post-Expulsion England, see, *inter alia*, Anthony Bale, *The Jew in the Medieval Book: English Antisemitisms 1350–1500* (Cambridge U. Press, 2006); Krummel, *Crafting Jewishness in Medieval England*.

13 Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (Columbia U. Press, 2002 [1983]), 31; Kathleen Biddick, *The Typological Imaginary: Circumcision, Technology, History* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), esp. 22–23; Miriamne Krummel, "Fictions of Identity: (Re)imagining the Stories We Tell," *postmedieval* 7 (2016): 235–46, esp. 235–40; and Lisa Lampert-Weissig, "The Time of the Wandering Jew in the *Chronica Majora* and the De Brailes Hours," *PQ* 96 (2017): 171–202, esp. 171–72.

14 Kathleen Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 4, 103–14.

15 Krummel, "Fictions of Identity," esp. 235–40; Anna Wilson, "*Similia similibus*: Queer Time in Thomas of Monmouth's Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich," *Exemplaria* 28 (2016): 55–56. On queer temporalities in medieval England, see Carolyn Dinshaw, *How Soon Is Now?: Medieval Texts, Amateur Readers, and the Queerness of Time* (Duke U. Press, 2012).

16 For a striking comparison of high medieval Jewish and Christian conceptions of eschatological time, see Ruth Nisse, *Jacob's Shipwreck: Diaspora, Translation, and Jewish-Christian Relations in Medieval England* (Cornell U. Press, 2017), 1–3. On Jewish life cycles, and in particular some singularities of Jewish women's lives, see *inter alia*, Elisheva Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children: Jewish Family Life in Medieval Europe* (Princeton U. Press, 2004).

17 Fabre-Vassas provides the example of Jewish observance of the lunar calendar as it relates to the myth of Jewish male menstruation; aligning the Hebrew calendar with the differentiated temporality of menstruating women, the anti-Jewish mind codes all Jews as feminine; *Singular Beast*, 107.

18 V. D. Lipman, *The Jews of Medieval Norwich* (London: Jewish Historical Society, 1967), 15–18. Kathy Lavezzo has recently contrasted dominant medieval English portrayals of secret, sinister Jewish spaces with the historical realities of integration; Lavezzo, *The Accommodated Jew: English Antisemitism from Bede to Milton* (Cornell U. Press, 2016), esp. 64–79. For examples of ritual integration, see for instance Robin R. Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262–1290* (Cambridge U. Press, 1998), 262–63.

19 Elisheva Baumgarten, "Christian Time in a Jewish Miscellany: A Hebrew Christian Calendar from Thirteenth-Century Northern France," in *Religious Cohabitation in European Towns (10th–15th Centuries),* ed. Stéphane Boissellier and John Tolan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 169–83; Baumgarten, "Shared and Contested Time: Jews and the Christian Ritual Calendar in the Late Thirteenth Century," *Viator* 46 (2015): 253–76.

20 Robert C. Stacey, "The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum* 67 (1992): 264.

21 See Mundill, "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry," in *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives,* ed. Patricia Skinner (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003): 55–70; see also Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*.

22 Lampert-Weissig, "Time of the Wandering Jew," 171–202.

23 Wilson, "*Similia similibus*," 51–55.

24 For a detailed discussion of the unresolved debate over MS Laud Misc. 108's date, see Thomas R. Liszka, "Talk in the Camps: On the Dating of the *South English Legendary*, *Havelok the Dane*, and *King Horn* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108," in *Texts and Contexts,* ed. Bell and Couch, 31–50.

25 For the purposes of this paper, I use the term "genocidal" to refer to state and non-state campaigns to render the continued survival of the English Jewish community, or of any local Jewish community, impossible. Mass local killings, deliberate devastation of economic and community life, and forced population movement (ethnic cleansing), all of which defined the experience of English Jews in the long thirteenth century, fulfill this definition. Similarly, the desire for an end to Jewish life in England is a genocidal desire. In this usage, I have been particularly influenced by David Alonzo-Maizlish, "In Whole or in Part: Group Rights, the Intent Element of Genocide, and the 'Quantitative Criterion,'" *NYU Law Review* 77 (2002): 1369–1403; Martin Shaw, *What Is Genocide?*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Polity, 2015); Shaw, "Darfur: Counter-Insurgency, Forced Displacement and Genocide," *British Journal of Sociology* 62 (2011): 56–61.

26 Heather Blurton, "'His right hond he liet of-smite': Judas/Quiriac and the Representation of Jewish Identity in the *South English Legendaries*," in *Rethinking the* South English Legendaries*,* ed. Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (Manchester U. Press, 2011). On conversion and its skeptics in thirteenth-century England, see Stacey, "Conversion of Jews," passim; Paola Tartakoff, "Testing Boundaries: Jewish Conversion and Cultural Fluidity in Medieval Europe, c. 1200–1391," *Speculum* 90 (2015): 728–62.

27 See Heng, *Invention of Race*, for a salutary reformulation of thirteenth-century English judicial murder as a "racial act committed by the state" (29). On the Expulsion as a nation-building exercise, see esp. Karen Barkey and Ira Katznelson, "States, Regimes, and Decisions: Why Jews Were Expelled from Medieval England and France," *Theory and Society* 40 (2011): 475–503; Sophia Menache, "Faith, Myth, and Politics: The Stereotype of the Jews and Their Expulsion from England and France," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 75 (1985): 351–74. For an alternative perspective, see Jonathan Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton U. Press, 2009), esp. 117–20. See also Lampert-Weissig, "The Transnational Wandering Jew and the Medieval English Nation," *Literature Compass* 13 (2016): 771–83, esp. 772–74.

28 Anthony Stockwell Garfield Edwards, "Epilogue: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108 and Other English Manuscripts," in *Texts and Contexts,* ed. Bell and Couch, 301. For an alternative perspective on the nationalism of the *SEL,* see Blurton and Wogan-Browne, "Introduction" to *Rethinking the* South English Legendaries, 9–10.

29 Kruger, *The Spectral Jew: Conversion and Embodiment in Medieval Europe* (U. of Minnesota Press, 2006), esp. xx–xxiii; Sylvia Tomasch, "Postcolonial Chaucer and the Virtual Jew," in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages,* ed. Jeffrey J. Cohen (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 243–60; Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (U. of California Press, 1999), esp. 2–3; Kathleen Biddick, "Paper Jews: Inscription/Ethnicity/Ethnography," *Art Bulletin* 78 (1996): 594–99.

30 Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast,* esp. 8; see also David Nirenberg's similar comment, which refers to the ubiquitous threat of spiritual Judaization; Nirenberg, *Neighboring Faiths: Christianity, Islam, and Judaism in the Middle Ages and Today* (U. of Chicago Press, 2014), 7.

31 Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast,* esp. 130–43; David Biale, *Blood and Belief: The Circulation of a Symbol between Jews and Christians* (U. of California Press, 2007), 99–100.

32 On the Proleptic Passion, see Mary Dzon, *The Quest for the Christ Child in the Later Middle Ages* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), esp. 191; Theresa M. Kenney, "The Christ Child on Fire: Southwell's Mighty Babe," *English Literary Renaissance* 43 (2013): 415–45; Elina Gertsman, "Signs of Death: The Sacrificial Christ Child in Late-Medieval Art," in *The Christ Child in Medieval Culture: Alpha es et O!,* ed. Theresa M. Kenney and Mary Dzon (U. of Toronto Press, 2012), 66–91.

33 Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 26. On the significance of the transformative oven in particular in these narratives, see also Rubin, 25. Geraldine Heng, "England's Dead Boys: Telling Tales of Christian-Jewish Relations Before and After the First European Expulsion of the Jews," *MLN* 127 (2012): S55; Heng, *Invention of Race,* 28, 93–96.

34 The Arabic Infancy episode is translated in J. K. Elliott, ed., *A Synopsis of the Apocryphal Nativity and Infancy Narratives: Revised and Expanded*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 214. Although recent scholarship has demonstrated the profound influence of Arabic literature on French literature in this period (see Sahar Amer, *Crossing Borders: Love between Women in Medieval French and Arabic Literatures* [U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2008]), it is unclear exactly how this tale traveled from Arabic to French; see Smith, *Art, Identity, and Devotion*, 276–77, for one theory.

35 The *Évangile de l'Enfance* survives in the fourteenth-century apocrypha collection Grenoble, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 51, and the fifteenth-century Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Van Pelt Library, MS French 662 (Fr. 41). The existing Anglo-Norman manuscripts are Oxford, Bodleian MS Selden Supra 38, which, as Boulton notes, adds an anti-Jewish epilogue; Cambridge, University Library Gg.1.1; and the fragment Cambridge, University Library 6855 (G), Maureen Barry McCann Boulton ed., *The Old French* Évangile de l'Enfance: *An Edition with Introduction and Notes* (Toronto: PIMS, 1984) 11–17; Maureen Barry McCann Boulton, *Sacred Fictions of Medieval France: Narrative Theology in the Lives of Christ and the Virgin, 1150–1500* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2015), 51–52, 303–4; *Piety and Persecution in the French Texts of England,* trans. with notes and intro. by Boulton (Tempe, AZ: ACMRS, 2013), 14–22, esp. 20–21; Boulton, ed, *Les Enfaunces de Jesu Crist* (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1985), 16–17.

36 In the French and Anglo-Norman versions, the episode's temporal logic is similar to that of the Middle English *Infancy*, but neither adds a comment about vengeance. See for instance the Anglo-Norman (Boulton, *Les enfaunces de Jesu Crist*), which concludes: "Tut dis pus ça en arere / Lé Gius tindrent come frere / Checun porc en sa manere, / Si esteit miracle fere. / Pus cel' hure ne manga / Unc nul Giu, ne les assa, / Ne jamés pur veir ne fra, / Kar la lei defendu l'a (Everyone says since then that the Jews consider every pig as a brother in a way. So was the miracle done. Since that hour no Jew ever eats or serves them, nor ever indeed will, for the law has forbidden it; 1149–56).

37 F. P. Pickering, ed., *The Anglo-Norman Text of the* Holkham Bible Picture Book (Oxford: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1971), 89. See also Michelle P. Brown's far less sympathetic

observation: "The spurious comment that this is why the Jews do not eat pork, rather than referring to Mosaic Law, is just a crude and ignorant 'witticism' by the author"; Brown, *The Holkham Bible Picture-Book: A Facsimile* (London: The British Library, 2007), 52.

38 As Dzon observes, the child Christ embarrassing and antagonizing Jewish teachers, for instance through his mastery of Scripture, was a commonplace of medieval infancy narratives reflecting a departure from the canonical gospels; Dzon, *Quest for the Christ Child,* 136–37.

39 For useful discussions of the overlapping Jewish and Muslim positions in high medieval Christian thought, see for instance Kruger, "Medieval Christian (Dis)identifications: Muslims and Jews in Guibert of Nogent," *New Literary History* 28 (1997): 185–203. As Gil Anidjar indicates, however, it is the modern construction of Jews and Muslims as enemies, not their medieval conflation, that should excite remark; Anidjar, *Semites: Race, Religion, Literature* (Stanford U. Press, 2008); Anidjar, "On Cultural Survival," *Angelaki* 9.2 (2004): 5–15.

40 "Nescio, inquam, utrum homo sit, de cuius carne nondum cor lapideum ablatum est, cui nondum datum est cor carneum, in cuius medio nondum positus est diuinus spiritus, sine quo ad Christum nunquam potest conuerti Iudeus." Yvonne Friedman, ed., *Petri Venerabilis adversus Iudeorum inveteratam duritiem* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985), 58. English translation is Peter the Venerable, *Peter the Venerable's* Against the Inveterate Obduracy of the Jews, trans. Irven M. Resnick (Catholic U. of America Press, 2013), 123. For background and exposition, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam, 1000–1150,* trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Cornell U. Press, 2002), 275–322.

41 Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 258–65.

42 See esp. Thomas Aquinas's objections in *Summa Theologiae, (*hereafter *ST),* ed. Samuel Parsons and Albert Pinheiro, vol. 53 (London: Blackfriars, 1971), that Christ did not teach until he was an adult, "lest anyone should presumptuously assume the position of ruling over or teaching others before reaching full maturity" (ne ante perfectam aetatam aliquis praesumptuose praelationis gradum et docendi officium assumat; 30–31, 3a.39.2); For a fuller picture of these objections and the relationship of the infancy texts to Aquinas, see Dzon, *Quest for the Christ Child,* esp. 110, 174; Dzon, "Wanton Boys in Middle English Texts and the Christ Child in Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, MS Z822 N81," in *Medieval Life Cycles: Continuity and Change,* ed. Isabelle Cochelin and Karen Smyth (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 123–24.

43 *ST* 3a.68.10, in Thomas Aquinas, ed. James J. Cunningham, *ST,* vol. 57 (London: Blackfriars, 1975), 110–15; *ST* 2-2a.10.12, in Thomas Aquinas, ed. Thomas Gilby, *ST,* vol. 32 (London: Blackfriars, 1975), 74–79. See Jennifer Hart Weed, "Aquinas on the Forced Conversion of Jews: Belief, Will, and Toleration," in *Jews in Medieval Christendom: Slay Them Not,* ed. Kristine T. Utterback and Merrall L. Price (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 129–46, esp. 132–33; John Y. B. Hood, *Aquinas and the Jews* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 88–92.

44 Barbara Newman, *Medieval Crossover: Reading the Secular Against the Sacred* (U. of Notre Dame Press, 2013), 201.

45 "Against the Jews Oration 1," in *John Chrysostom,* trans. Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen (New York: Routledge, 2000), 151.

46 Isaiah Shachar, *The* Judensau*: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and Its History* (London: Warburg Institute, 1974), 3. See also Heinz Schreckenberg, *The Jews in Christian Art: An Illustrated History*, trans. John Bowden (London: Continuum Press, 1996), 20, 331–37.

47 Kathryn A. Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England: Three Women and Their Books of Hours* (London: British Library Publications, and U. of Toronto Press, 2003), 278. As Smith notes, the image occurs only within England; one image is possibly dateable to the late thirteenth century (276).

48 Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast;* Kenneth R. Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and Its Interpreters* (Stanford U. Press, 2006); for the species logic of racial dehumanization, see, *inter alia*, Cary Wolfe, *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory* (U. of Chicago Press, 2003), 6–7; Mel Y. Chen, *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect* (Duke U. Press, 2012), esp. 1–55. On the co-creation of race and species hierarchies, the violence of which is far from exhausted by the dynamic described above, see in particular Bénédicte Boisseron, *Afro-Dog: Blackness and the Animal Question* (Columbia U. Press, 2018); Claire Jean Kim, *Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species, and Nature in a Multicultural Age* (Cambridge U. Press, 2015).

49 See Bale, "Fictions of Judaism in England before 1290," in *The Jews in Medieval Britain,* ed. Skinner, 129–44, esp. 141–42; Irven M. Resnick, *Marks of Distinction: Christian Perceptions of Jews in the High Middle Ages* (Catholic U. of America Press, 2012), 144–74; Mo Pareles, "Men as Meat: Exploiting Jewish Law in Ælfric's Translation of Maccabees," *Exemplaria* 27.3 (2015): 187–204.

50 Joshua Levinson, "Changing Minds—Changing Bodies: The Gendered Subject of Conversion," in *Religious Conversion: History, Experience and Meaning,* ed. Ira Katznelson and Miri Rubin (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2014), 145.

51 Stacey, "Conversion of Jews," 280–81.

52 Leslie Arnovick, personal communication, 18 January 2017.

53 Steel, *How to Make a Human,* esp. 98–108. This perspective is affirmed in the extraordinary disquisition on bodies and souls that concludes *ESEL*'s life of St. Michael (319–22). Steel finds some medieval alternatives to this view, as does Joyce E. Salisbury, "Do Animals Go to Heaven? Medieval Philosophers Contemplate Heavenly Human Exceptionalism," *Athens Journal of Humanities & Arts* 1 (2014): 79–85.

54 In this way, it resembles *eschaton* as theorized by Giorgio Agamben, *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans,* trans. Patricia Dailey (Stanford U. Press, 2005), in his account of messianic time and Jewish-Christian identity politics (esp. 63), but entirely emptied of grace.

55 Kruger, "Times of Conversion," esp. 24, 28–29.

56 See Anidjar, "Muslim Jews," *Qui Parle* 18 (2009): 1–23, for the observation that "conversion establishes a kinship and a renewed fidelity, both of which extend to infinity, between religions," such that the latter religion becomes "an active repository of the former" (4). Extending this model of conversion to the Jewish children's metamorphosis reveals the porcine as a (temporally) infinite container for the Jewish. In the context of the *Infancy*, it also makes Judaism, here marked primarily by its refusal of the Christian, a perpetual container for the porcine.

57 Kline, "Audience and Function," esp. 150–52.

58 See Rubin, *Gentile Tales,* esp. 26–27, on the Holy Family as a merciful adoptive family for the abused child of the Jewish Boy story.

59 Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* (London: Verso, 2016 [2009]), xxvi–xxvii.

60 This sense is amplified by true stories of infanticide (also known as *kiddush ha-Shem*) by desperate Jewish parents during pogroms and massacres. See, *inter alia*, Jeremy Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade* (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). See also Dzon, *Quest for the Christ Child,* 175.

61 See Bale, *Feeling Persecuted,* 187, on the dynamic in which "imagined assaults by Jews accompanied actual assaults on Jews."

62 See Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast,* 161–91, for the playful incorporation of anti-Semitic violence into the imagery of European children's songs, rituals, and games.

63 Menache, "Faith, Myth, and Politics," 360; see Jeffrey J. Cohen, "The Flow of Blood in Medieval Norwich," *Speculum* 79 (2004): 65.