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**Abstract:** This article examines Jewish Christian relations in the High Middle Ages through the prism of religious architecture and ritual, focusing on the architecture of Jewish ritual baths from the Rhineland region in Germany. I argue that the baths of Speyer, Worms, Friedberg, Offenburg and Cologne were designed to maximize the experiential power of ritual immersion and arouse symbolic associations to support the ceremony. Architectural details such as unusual depth, ornament, lighting schemes and monumentality contributed to a spectrum of immersion ceremonies described in contemporary sources. These are contextualized in concurrent developments in Christian religious architecture and ceremonial use of architectural space.
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**Introduction**

Jewish ritual immersion (*tevila*) is a religious ceremony conducted by submerging the entire naked body in water that is neither drawn, nor collected through other human effort.[[2]](#footnote-3) Full-body ritual immersion was intended to counter impurities outlined in Leviticus 11-15.[[3]](#footnote-4) Such impurity was considered broadly as an inevitable (though transitory) condition that could occur through physical contact with semen; menstrual blood, bleeding after childbirth or miscarriage; unnatural discharge; or contact with a corpse or with an impure person.[[4]](#footnote-5) Purification from such contracted impurities was necessary to participate in certain activities, mainly in and around the Jewish Temple.[[5]](#footnote-6) In the Mishna the term *mikvah* assumed the specific architectural connotation of a ritual bathing-pool for purification.[[6]](#footnote-7)Tractate Mikva’otoutlines permissible ways of gathering the water, and derivative directions regarding materials for the pool or minimum volume requirements.[[7]](#footnote-8)

Several Jewish ritual baths have been found in Germany, all underground, comprise striking architectural details. These range beyond any of the technical requirements of the Mishna and have not thus-far been explained. They are outstandingly deep, up to 25 meters underground, with pools of natural ground-water (see Plates 1-7). The all use underground springs – the highest of permissible collection forms, unnecessary for most immersion needs – a significant characteristic that has not yet been explained by scholarship. Most include underground halls and intricate lighting schemes that invite examination of multi-person and day uses, alongside the assumed major use by women for immersion at night. To suggest possible explanations for the outstanding architectural features, this discussion begins with background that outlines characteristics of Christian religious architecture in Germany from the 11th to the 13th centuries. Then, the extant deep-dug Jewish ritual baths are introduced, focusing on Speyer and Friedberg. This is followed by an examination of immersion rituals as described in medieval texts from the same region of the Rhine, juxtaposed with the architectural evidence. Based on the examination of the architectural and textual evidence, I suggest that alongside recently defined shared assumptions about rituals,[[8]](#footnote-9) Jews and Christians also shared some assumptions about what spaces were appropriate for religious rituals.

**1. Background: Romanesque architecture in Germany**

The Rhineland was particularly influenced by the architectural renewal that reached its peak in the 12th century. Political leaders were instrumental in the architectural commissions of many churches: Conrad II (990-1039) initiated grand rebuilding at Speyer, conducted in parallel with massive renovations and enlargements at Mainz, Worms and Strasbourg; Heinrich II built the Cathedral of Bamberg; Heinrich IV (1050-1106) initiated a second expansion of the Cathedral of Speyer.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Throughout the empire churches were rebuilt to be as long, wide and tall as possible, emphasizing axis and facilitating ceremonial movement in space such as processions.[[10]](#footnote-11) Along the Rhine tall stone Romanesque churches (usually with five grand towers and often large underground crypts) were built to replace smaller, humbler ones with wooden roofs.[[11]](#footnote-12) In the east, west and above the transept, high towers provided visual markers, and exhibited the city’s prosperity and abilities.[[12]](#footnote-13) Natural lighting was used to dramatically illuminate religious space and spotlight specific areas within it.[[13]](#footnote-14) The most developed examples of German Romanesque architecture are found at Worms, Mainz, Trier, Speyer and Cologne.[[14]](#footnote-15)

The most monumental Jewish ritual baths are found in cities that also boast the most developed and bold German Romanesque churches: Worms, Speyer and Cologne.[[15]](#footnote-16) Deep Jewish ritual baths may have been the permissible Jewish counterpart to the impressive tall spires of these churches. The dramatic tendencies in Christian architecture were not directly related to practical needs;[[16]](#footnote-17) and this seems to have also been the case regarding the monumental Jewish ritual baths. Versions of all of these characteristics of Romanesque churches – emphasis through size, axis, light, ornament and symbolic significance – are to be found in the Rhineland’s High Medieval mikvahs.

**2. “Romanesque” Jewish ritual baths along the Rhine**

The ritual baths found in Germany[[17]](#footnote-18) − specifically in Worms (built in 1185/6),[[18]](#footnote-19) Speyer (c.1120 or c. 1200),[[19]](#footnote-20) Cologne (c.1170),[[20]](#footnote-21) Andernach (13th c),[[21]](#footnote-22) Offenburg (12th or 14th c.)[[22]](#footnote-23) and Friedberg (1260)[[23]](#footnote-24) − follow some of the same patterns as the Romanesque and Gothic churches, being bigger, deeper, more decorated and harder to construct than those known from any other period.[[24]](#footnote-25) Some include underground halls and stairwells with massive, open shafts towering above wide pools of natural ground-water.[[25]](#footnote-26) Their depth and monumentality cannot be explained by utilitarian needs alone. Nor is it clear why they all use ground-water and not rain-water for their pools, when this is not a requirement. The use of underground springs for the immersion pools in these baths is in contrast to most Late Antique, Early Modern and contemporary mikvahsthat predominantly use rain-water for the pool. [[26]](#footnote-27) The lighting schemes of these medieval mikvahs are also unusual: most have some evidence of original openings in the wide shafts above the water pool (Worms, Speyer, Friedberg, Offenburg and Montpellier in France), a feature that required great effort to construct.

De-robing seems to have taken place in specialized niches, which are found in ante-chambers in Worms and Speyer, leading off from the stairs at Cologne, and perhaps adjoining the first landing at Friedberg. Final undressing could have occurred nearer the water, with small grooves in the wall perhaps meant for placing artificial lighting and larger niches perhaps used to store the final layer of clothing before nude submersion. In all, the descent into the ground and towards the water took quite some time. Progression through space was accompanied by moments of surprise and dis-orientation, orchestrated with dramatic lighting and monumental visual effects.

Semiological descriptions of Friedberg and Speyer − the most developed of their respective types –exemplify the unique spatial characteristics of the medieval mikvahs*.*[[27]](#footnote-28)

In Friedberg the Jewish bath was built in the same year as the local church, 1260, with comparable details (Fig. 1).[[28]](#footnote-29) Wide stairs run the width of the shaft, leading 25 meters downwards to naturally replenished ground-water. An oculus (a round vault-opening) above the water guides the full descent during the day, with a beacon of natural light shining all the way down and reflecting in the deep waters. Pierced in the tall stone vault, the light seems to be framed by darkness around it, creating a shining, eerie ambience. The sheer depth, the equivalent of a modern eight-story building, makes the descent and especially the ascent a lengthy endeavor. Eight levels of tall steps go down towards the deep water, supported by blind pointed-arch niches that move the weight of the stairs sideways onto the corner walls via buttressing. The effect is of a building that seems light and elevated, despite its actual immense weight. Foliated capitals decorate the corners of the stairwells, further enhancing the sense of an elegant, lofty space, despite being buried underground.

In Speyer (Figs. 2 and 3) axis, duration and light are likewise emphasized. The mikvah is ornamented with decorative detail: sleek masonry vaulting, elbow-capitals, elongated window columns, a diamond-shaped alternating-color decoration of the entrance portal and finely-cut stone benches. Entering the building one begins a descent down stairs in a first corridor decked on either side with built-in benches and footrests. This corridor ends in an ante-chamber with a third stone bench below a pair of large windows surmounted by two smaller ones overlooking the shaft and water pool beyond. During the day bright light emanates from the shaft into the chamber, shining towards the progressing visitor who walks uncannily into the ground and, at the same time, towards a bright light. In the eastern wall a small niche, complete with a stone bench, was presumably used for removing cloths and shoes. Opposite the niche, in the ante-chamber’s western wall, a portal leads to a semi-circular staircase cut into the ground. This dark and narrow corridor ends at the water’s edge. One’s feet almost touch the water beyond the portal as the vista opens up right before immersion. Standing here, the contrast is marked – during the day the shaft beyond is flooded with light coming 12 meters above and filling the brick-work shaft. To the right, before the final step to pool is a niche that could have been used for placing a light when immersing at night.[[29]](#footnote-30)

During the day (in both Speyer and Friedberg) the intricate lighting scheme guides the visit from entrance to immersion, manipulating movement from light to shade, between blocked views and sudden reveals. At night, a flame-lit descent would have held its own unique atmosphere, with the flickering warm glow moving with the visitor along the shadowy underground halls.[[30]](#footnote-31) In both mikvahs the progression in space is gradual and experiential − the immerser moving along steps from ground-level towards ground-water in a dramatically-lit unusual space, different to any over-ground structure.

Christian Romanesque and Gothic architecture has been theorized as bearers of meaning, using forms that evoke symbolic associations during use, calling to mind known texts.[[31]](#footnote-32) If comparable methods are sought in the design of the mikvahs,one could ask whether the descent was meant to evoke Psalm 130 (v.1: “from the depths I called thee, O God”), or whether the unusual use of ground-water could have resonated with Jeremiah, where “living waters” were a metaphor for God.[[32]](#footnote-33) Some contemporaneous rabbinical texts from Germany clearly define their own baths in this manner, stating that “ourmikvahs”are flowing streams or springs and describing them as living waters.[[33]](#footnote-34) Springs or living waters are defined by the Mishnah as the optimal water source for immersion.[[34]](#footnote-35) Choosing this option listed might signal commitment to reaching the highest possible grade of waters for immersion. Bathing in them could carry weighty associations for pious users searching for maximum stringency, or perhaps a heightened spiritual experience.[[35]](#footnote-36)

**3. Immersion practices in high medieval Germany**

Inherently connected to Temple worship, most immersions fell formally out of practice with its destruction.[[36]](#footnote-37) The category of purification that did remain mandatory was married women’s purification from any vaginal bleeding before marital relations.[[37]](#footnote-38) This has been assumed to be the main function for medieval Jewish ritual baths,[[38]](#footnote-39) although other immersions are attested.[[39]](#footnote-40) Analysis of a spectrum of immersions practiced in the Middle Ages reveals how the unique design of the medieval mikvahs greatly enhanced some emphases.

**3.1. Repentance of a crime**

R. Isaac b. Moses was asked whether a person who has accidentally killed another can lead the prayer in synagogue.[[40]](#footnote-41) He answered that it depends on whether he has repented (*shav be-teshuva*). The rabbi explained that the community had no authority to punish him according to Jewish law (to execute, beat or exile him). However, if he repents he is considered righteous, even though no legal action has been taken against him. What he needs to do is immerse, as the transgression imparts impurity. R. Isaac concludes:

All those who are repentant (*ba’alei teshuva*)[[41]](#footnote-42) need immersion. As appears in *Avot de Rabbi Natan* Chapter 3, “A case of a captured girl etc.,”: And after they ransomed her, they immersed her. For all those days that she had been among the idolaters she ate of their [food], and now they immersed her so that she will be purified, even though food cooked in a Gentile’s vessels does not impart impurity on the body, still they immersed her to purify her of the transgression.[[42]](#footnote-43)

Immersion is presented here as a viable alternative to legal punishment, when it comes with internal contrition.[[43]](#footnote-44) All repentant people, concludes R. Isaac, need to immerse to return from their sins or to conduct some form of physical asceticism to atone for their transgression.[[44]](#footnote-45) The body is treated as a vehicle both for carrying out sin and for atoning for it in lieu of legal punishment.

The spaces of the deep-dug medieval Jewish ritual baths, with the shifts from light to dark and the axis of descent and ascent, were appropriate for accentuating the monument as a threshold and for symbolically framing light. The role of religious buildings as a threshold of spiritual opportunity, and framed natural light as a metaphor for transcendental illumination is emphasized in Christian texts, such as the inscription upon the portal at St. Denis: “This work should brighten the minds so that they may travel through the true lights, to the True Light where Christ is the true door.”[[45]](#footnote-46) Comparisons between physical light and God’s light, which go back to Church fathers, continued into the 12th century.[[46]](#footnote-47) Bathing in water that wells up naturally from the ground under light from the sky could have resonated something of the essence of renewal, discarding a sinful self to be rejuvenated in the waters. The re-emergence from deep under the surface could spotlight the transformation characteristic of different immersions, which all include transition from one state to another.[[47]](#footnote-48) The physical encounter with the cleansing ground-water was a tangible way to mark the transition from past digressions to new beginning.

**3.2. Returning to the community**

Comparable content underlay an immersion which was an innovation of the High Middle Ages – immersion for a person wishing to return to Judaism after conversion, which began being prescribed by some rabbis in Germany from the 12th century.[[48]](#footnote-49) Here, too, the emphasis is on immersion as a means for cleansing and purity; it is not an absolute obligation, nor is it intended to certify the return (as it was in cases of conversion to Judaism).[[49]](#footnote-50) Eleazar of Worms outlined penance practices for Jews who had converted to Christianity but wished to return to their original faith, with immersion as the hinge-point for return:

An apostate … needs to mourn and cry and be sorry and torture himself for several years every day and lower his spirit and confess three times every day and he should not eat meat and not drink wine and not wash except on the eve of the Sabbath and the eve of a holiday … And as soon as he regrets [his actions] and immerses in a mikvah,he is considered a Jew (*Israel*) and from all the things he had sinned he returns to his creator.[[50]](#footnote-51)

In this description physical expressions of return (including immersion) complement mental or internal regret.[[51]](#footnote-52) Immersion was the pivotal moment between contrition, penance and return to Judaism. As in the case of the woman who was cleansed from eating non-kosher food, this passage describes body, soul and spirit involved together, both in committing sin and returning from it. Such rejection of clear-cut dichotomies between body and soul can be compared with the Christian debate in the High Middle Ages.[[52]](#footnote-53) They also appear in an account of “rejudaizing” by the 12th-century bishop Bernard Gui:[[53]](#footnote-54)

He who is to be rejudaized is summoned and asked by one of the Jews present whether he wishes to submit to what is called *tymla* (sic; *tevila*)in Hebrew, which … means whether he wishes to take a wash in running water, in order to become a Jew. He replies that he does. Then the Jew who presided says to him in Hebrew *Baaltussuna* (sic; *ba’al teshuva*) which means … “you are converting from the state of sin.” After this he is stripped of his garments and is sometimes bathed in warm water. The Jews then rub him energetically with sand over his entire body, but especially on his forehead, chest and arms, that is, on the places where, during baptism, he received the holy chrism … They shave his head and afterwards put him in the waters of a flowing stream, and they plunge his head in the water three times. After this immersion they recite the following prayer: “Blessed be God, the Lord eternal, who has commanded us to sanctify ourselves in this water or bath which is called *tymla* (sic) in Hebrew.” This done, he emerges from the water, dons a new shirt and breeches, and all the attending Jews kiss him and give him a name, which is usually the name he had before baptism. He who is thus rejudaized is required to confess his belief in the law of Moses … he renounces baptism and the Christian faith.[[54]](#footnote-55)

While it is unclear to what extent this text from the ‘inquisitor’s manual’ faithfully represents Jewish practice, there are details that are also found in Hebrew sources: the translated blessing follows the correct format; plunging the head three times is found in some Jewish sources,[[55]](#footnote-56) as is shaving of the head before immersion;[[56]](#footnote-57) and the use of a flowing spring or stream (living waters).[[57]](#footnote-58) Oversight by three members of the community, mentioned here, was debated by Jewish sources, some rabbis deeming it unnecessary for a returning apostate,[[58]](#footnote-59) while others mandated it.[[59]](#footnote-60) The requirement for observers could account for such architectural details of the baths, as viewing windows, galleries and landings. There could also be some theatrical capital in design: placing the returning apostate, naked and humbled below, under the representatives of the community gazing from above.[[60]](#footnote-61) Again, the physical immersion is connected with return from a state of sin.[[61]](#footnote-62) Internal cleansing and renewal are facilitated by immersion and then expressed outwardly by donning a new shirt and the change of name.[[62]](#footnote-63) It has been argued that Christian penitential practices helped shape medieval Jewish penitential culture in Ashkenaz.[[63]](#footnote-64) One can ask whether ideas of the physical setting and dramatization of penance were also shared.

**3.4. Before the Day of Atonement**

The habit of immersion for men (and for some women) in preparation for the Day of Atonement is attested in Germany and France from the end of the 11th century.[[64]](#footnote-65) By the 12th-century it was widely prescribed, despite being considered ineffective for purification (all men being irreversibly afflicted by corpse and semen contamination after the destruction of the Temple).[[65]](#footnote-66) Several rabbis note the unofficial character of the immersion, stating that in their day purification for men was impossible.[[66]](#footnote-67) A manuscript version of *Sefer Tashbetz* states that this immersion is neither mandatory nor, in these days, for purification.[[67]](#footnote-68) By the 15th-century, *Sefer Maharil* names repentance (and not impurity) as the reason for men and women to immerse before the Day of Atonement.[[68]](#footnote-69)

The architectural characteristics of the spaces may have been especially significant here because of the inability to attain actual purity.[[69]](#footnote-70) A semblance of purification could have been aided by the dramatic architecture, giving a sense that a significant event was occurring. In some cases men were directed to bath between the sixth and eighth relative praying hours,[[70]](#footnote-71) roughly at midday when the dramatic light effects in the ritual baths were most fully felt. Bathing naked in water deep below a glowing light could have been an evocative visual metaphor for renewal and reform before a day dedicated to both. The lengthy descent allowed time to slowly walk down to a very differentiated space, inviting one to slough off the everyday and aim for a different mood and thoughts. The natural isolation of the underground immersion spaces from the bustle of over-ground life could have likewise functioned as catalysts for introspection. The larger preparation halls, with a separated niche for de-robing of one person at a time (at Speyer, Worms, Cologne and Montpellier in France) could have served those who were waiting their turn as others immersed.[[71]](#footnote-72)

Before the Day of Atonement renewal was also marked by a change into clean or white clothes,[[72]](#footnote-73) symbolizing that the people were like angels on that day.[[73]](#footnote-74) Comparable notions of physical and internal cleansing, and a change into white clothes, appear in both Gui’s description of returning to Judaism and in descriptions of baptism and conversion to Christianity.[[74]](#footnote-75) The medieval mikvahsin Germany are situated right at the heart of their respective Jewish areas of residence, near the synagogue. Therefore, there would have been a bustle of passersby who could witness the symbolic visual effect: large numbers of men from the community entering the mikvahin their day-to-day garments and emerging from it in clean or white cloths.

**3.5. Married women’s purification from bleeding**

These suggested correlations between spatial design and symbolism of immersion ceremonies don’t seem, at first, directly applicable to the immersion of married women, the assumed primary function of medieval *mikvahs*. The usual directive was for women to immerse at night, when the effects of the natural lighting schemes where not as striking.[[75]](#footnote-76) However, there were societal benefits to be gained by funding grand public spaces for women’s immersion, which became a marker of Jewish society because marital sex – when conducted within the dictates of ritual purity – was hailed as the correct model for pious life.[[76]](#footnote-77) Perhaps this is the reason that guidelines regarding Jewish menstrual purity became more stringent in the 12th and 13th centuries.[[77]](#footnote-78)

By investing huge sums in monumental mikvahs, communities could express their commitment to the rite, although it is also possible that cities had more than one mikvahand that there were smaller, functional ones used by women. The deep-dug pools would present some practical difficulties with stairs being high (Friedberg, Cologne), winding (Worms, Speyer) and (after immersion) also wet and hard to navigate at night. If women did use the deep-dug examples discussed here, however, they could have enjoyed the same architectural effects of axis, perceived significance of the event, and a tangible means to feel the transition at the heart of the ceremony. At night, flame-lit descent would have held its own unique experiential qualities. There is evidence that some women, too, changed their clothing after immersion, when they again became permitted to their husbands.[[78]](#footnote-79)

**Conclusions**

Examination of the textual sources shows that the architecture of the monumental mikvahsfound in the Rhineland could have derived in parallel both from internal Jewish concerns and from external developments in the use of architectural space to enhance religious experience. Like Christian religious architecture, the Jewish ritual baths served evolving ritual practices with ceremonies that touched the heart of how Jews were defined, both inwardly and outwardly. In western Europe in the High Middle Ages, religious buildings became taller, longer, more monumental and more expensive to construct.[[79]](#footnote-80) I have suggested parallel aspirations for the monumental Jewish baths, which were dug into the ground at high cost and logistical effort, constructed partly in expensive masonry with stone vaulting meant to last. They even ultimately outlasted their communities.

Investment in the baths went hand in hand with shifts in immersion practices − renewed interest in immersions for men, as well as growing meticulousness about purification laws for women. Therefore, it is not surprising that some of the most monumental examples of deep mikvahs that have been unearthed date to the 12th and the 13th centuries and are found in Germany’s Rhineland: the region of Germany with the most developed Christian Romanesque. Use of different senses to accentuate a religious ceremony, characteristic of the Jewish baths, was common also to Christian religious architecture.[[80]](#footnote-81) The comparable attitudes to building produced end results that are visually and functionally differentiated – even opposed, with church axes being horizontal and Jewish baths vertical.[[81]](#footnote-82) However, when analyzed in detail and examined vis-à-vis the written sources, the Jewish baths display remarkable underlying similarity with the Christian Romanesque, while also disclosing difference.[[82]](#footnote-83)
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