

NEIGHBORS, PARTNERS, ENEMIES:
JEWS AND THE MONASTERIES OF GERMANY
IN THE HIGH MIDDLE AGES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Notre Dame
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

John D. Young

John Van Engen, Director

Graduate Program in Medieval Studies

Notre Dame, Indiana

September 2011

© Copyright by

John D. Young

2011

All rights reserved

NEIGHBORS, PARTNERS, ENEMIES:
JEWS AND THE MONASTERIES OF GERMANY
IN THE HIGH MIDDLE AGES

Abstract

by

John D. Young

German-speaking lands in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were home to the largest Jewish communities north of the Alps and Pyrenees and thus constituted key locations for Christian-Jewish interaction. This dissertation examines the monasteries of Germany—the primary centers of intellectual and cultural production in the high medieval Empire—as *loci* for that interaction. It explores both the social/economic and the cultural aspect of contact between monks and Jews. In the process, it challenges traditional interpretations of Christian-Jewish relations and helps to fill in the picture of the lives and activities of monks in this period.

The study proceeds in three parts. Part one, comprising the first three chapters, examines the political context wherein Jews and monks interacted before investigating evidence of contact between Jews and monks in the social and economic spheres. This evidence demonstrates that Jewish communities and monasteries occupied similar

political positions in this society—due to their mutual reliance on the institution of privilege—and that they engaged frequently in business dealings with each other. Part two (chapters 4-6) turns its attention to the intellectual and cultural realm, examining ideas about Jews that circulated in the monasteries. While monks obtained many of these ideas from patristic works and other earlier sources, they actively developed and modified these ideas in ways that spoke to contemporary concerns. The last part, consisting of the final chapter, examines the issue of Jewish conversion to Christianity. This issue, perhaps better than any other, forced monks to deal with both real Jews and cultural constructions of Jews.

This dissertation contends that the definitive attribute of monastic-Jewish interaction in this period was ambivalence. Real interactions were quite normal, even friendly, yet the ideas about Jews that monks developed were largely, though with some important exceptions, hostile. Such a characterization calls into question prevalent explanations of Jewish-Christian interaction, which tend to emphasize escalating hostility and uniformity ideas across regions and institutions.

For Alicia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Framing the Question	1
Historiography	6
Scope and Boundaries	23
CHAPTER 1—REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 1: PRIVILEGED NEIGHBORS	33
1.1 Privilege in High Medieval Society	33
1.2 Monastic Privilege	46
1.3 Jewish Privilege	54
1.4 Church Policy and the Jews of the Empire	89
1.5 Thirteenth-Century Papal Jewry Policy	96
1.6 Conclusion	103
CHAPTER 2—REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 2: PRIVILEGE PUT TO THE TEST	107
2.1 The Success of Jewish Privilege	107
2.2 Jewish Privilege During the Second and Third Crusades	109
2.3 Murder Accusations and Jewish Privilege	116
2.4 Privilege (or Lack Thereof) Elsewhere	126
2.5 The Breakdown of Privilege	130
2.6 Conclusion	134
CHAPTER 3—REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 3: BUSINESS PARTNERS	136
3.1 Introduction	136
3.2 Proximity	137
3.3 The Real Estate Market	142
3.4 The Realm of Finance	159
3.5 Taxes and Rents	179
3.6 Neighborly Relations	183
3.7 Conclusion	192
CHAPTER 4—THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 1: SOURCES, INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES, AND TROPES	193
4.1 Introduction	193

4.2 Jews in Choir and Scriptorium: Monastic Sources	197
4.3 Exegetical Methods and the Jews in Monastic Sources	211
4.4 Tropes in Monastic Sources	222
4.5 The Apostate Jew in the Received Tradition	225
4.6 Conclusion	240
CHAPTER 5—THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 2: ABSORPTION AND INNOVATION	244
5.1 Introduction	244
5.2 Jew as Christ-Killer and Enemy of Christianity	250
5.3 Eschatology and Prophesied Jewish Conversion	276
5.4 Conclusion	292
CHAPTER 6—THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 3: THE ADMONT SERMON CORPUS	296
6.1 Introduction	296
6.2 Stock Images of Jews in the Admont Sermons	304
6.3 Dalila the Jewish Temptress	321
6.4 The Exodus Narrative and the Salvation History of the Jews	329
6.5 Conclusion	348
CHAPTER 7—THE TWO JEWS CONVERGE	349
7.1 Jewish Converts and the Monasteries	349
7.2 The Atmosphere of Mistrust	354
7.3 Rupert of Deutz and the Struggle with Ambivalence	373
7.4 Hermann of Scheda and the Importance of Christian Example	381
7.5 The Patient Stance, or Waiting for God's Miracles	394
7.6 Caesarius of Heisterbach and Thirteenth-century Attitudes	411
7.7 Later Attitudes	424
7.8 Conclusion	428
CONCLUSION	430
BIBLIOGRAPHY	443

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My journey through higher education, and particularly the writing of this dissertation, would have been impossible without the support and generosity of a large number of individuals and institutions. The Medieval Institute at the University of Notre Dame, under its directors Thomas F.X. Noble and Olivia Remie Constable and with the invaluable administrative assistance of Margaret Cinninger and Roberta Baranowski, has furnished invaluable financial support and an unsurpassed intellectual environment in which to learn. The Neal A. Maxwell Institute also provided generous grants that aided me immensely. The dedicated library staffs at Notre Dame, Flagler College, Brigham Young University, Brigham Young University-Idaho, and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich have facilitated my research over the years. The interlibrary loan departments at these institutions must be singled out for their indefatigable efforts on my behalf. I also owe substantial debts to the liberal studies department at Flagler College and to the history departments at Brigham Young University-Idaho and Brigham Young University for offering employment and teaching experience so I could support my growing family while working on this project.

My co-advisors, John Van Engen and Michael Signer, deserve tremendous thanks, not only for advising me through the dissertation but also for fostering in me the skills and perspectives necessary to do this work. John's balance of patient encouragement and high expectations made this work far better than it would have been otherwise. John has

driven me to become the scholar I never thought I could be, and I am grateful that he cared enough to push me the way he did. Before his untimely passing, Michael was for me the very definition of a mentor. His methodology, perspective, and pedagogy, as well as his warmth and kindness, will remain with me forever. His death hushed one of this era's most important voices of toleration and interreligious dialogue. I only hope that his students, myself included, and others who benefited from his personality and commitment can keep his legacy alive. I have also benefited greatly from the patience and generosity of the other members of my dissertation committee: Remie Constable, Michael Driscoll, and Ann Astell. Remie's and Michael's classes helped to lay a base for my dissertation research, and their advice has remained essential throughout this process. Ann's willingness to step in to the breach after Michael Signer's death is especially appreciated.

I cannot thank enough my many teachers at Notre Dame, Oxford, BYU, and Ricks College. Eugene Thompson and David Peck fostered my passion for history and set me on my career path. Paul Kerry, Craig Harline, and Paul Pixton nurtured that passion and showed me what it means to be a scholar. Alison Salveson provided my initial exposure to exegesis. Thomas Prügl helped me get oriented during my research in Munich. Johannes Heil, Constantin Fasolt, Stephen Jaeger, and Rachel Fulton Brown all furnished valuable insight and friendly advice during their visits to Notre Dame. Gert Melville welcomed me graciously to the Forschungsstelle für Vergleichende Ordensgeschichte at the University of Dresden, where I completed final revisions of this work. These and other teachers and scholars have my undying gratitude.

The colleagues I have encountered at various institutions have provided not only stimulating dialogue in classroom, hallway, and office but also encouragement, understanding, and genuine friendship. I will cherish in particular the relationships I developed at Notre Dame with Miranda Wilcox, Phil Wynn, and Jonathan Juilfs. At Flagler, Timothy Johnson has been not only a model department chair but also a great supporter and dialogue partner. Kent Schull, my fellow visiting lecturer at BYU, provided vital encouragement during perhaps my most difficult period in this entire process. My students at various institutions have also aided and encouraged me in significant ways. Special recognition must go to Lydia Hayes and Sasha Snowden for helping me compile the bibliography. Both of these women have great academic careers ahead of them, and I am excited to witness their future progress.

This conversation has already blurred the lines between collegiality and friendship, but I must thank my many friends, both inside and outside of academia, for the countless discussions, dinners, celebrations, road trips, and other activities we have shared. Mike and Kennan DeGruccio, Cody and Jenny Christopherson, Patrick and Melissa Mason, Vern and Sara Stanley, Bryan and Allyson Smith, Craig and Kathleen Moore, Jordan and Heather Bailey, Chad and Rachel Mano, Kent and Kim Schull, Jordan and Andrea Fowles, John and Allison Fowles, Adam and Sara Greenwood, Jeremy John, David Peck, Miranda Wilcox, Miles Andrew, Matt Keusch, Levi Todd, Tom Marsh, Isaac Walters, Clint Elison, Ben Huff, Jordan Housemann, and Kenny Estes have expanded my intellectual and spiritual horizons in fundamental and permanent ways. Words cannot capture what these relationships have meant to me throughout this process. I have become the person I am in large part through their influence.

Without the love and inspiration provided by my family, none of this would have been possible, and my greatest expressions of gratitude go to the people to whom I am bound by the strongest bonds. My parents, Bill and Gay Young, established a loving, nurturing, learning environment and sacrificed so much to give me the opportunities they never had. My wife's parents, Jerry and Lanae Hokanson, have provided vital moral and financial support to my family over the years and have kept us in touch with our roots. My cousin, Terry Moyer, has been an inspiration and guide throughout my education, even after his stroke and untimely death. I lost four of my mentors and father figures—Dad, Terry, Michael Signer, and Gordon Hinckley—during my quest for this degree, but their examples and teachings will always remain a fundamental part of my identity. Deepest thanks go to my wife and children. Shaylee, Derek, Charity, Hyrum, and Emmaline prayed for and buoyed up their dad constantly. Their sweet words, their hugs and kisses, and their welcome pleas for attention kept me grounded and helped me always to remember my most important responsibilities. They have inspired me more than they will ever know. My wife Alicia, to whom this work is dedicated, has provided an almost unfathomable depth of support, encouragement, and healing. When I told her early in our courtship that I wanted to obtain a Ph.D and become a historian, she could not possibly have known what that path entailed. Nevertheless, she never wavered in her support, her encouragement, and her belief that I could accomplish this, even when this process stretched on much longer than either of us anticipated and especially when I doubted my abilities. Her love, sacrifice, and inspiration, more than any other factor, made this possible. She is my best friend, the love of my life, my reason for being, and this is for her.

ABBREVIATIONS

Aronius	Aronius, Julius, ed. <i>Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im Fränkischen und Deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273</i> . Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970.
ASJ	<i>The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 492-1404</i> . Ed. Shlomo Simonsohn. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988.
CC	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i> . 179 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953-
CJ	Grayzel, Solomon. <i>The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century</i> , vol.1. New York: Hermon Press, 1966.
CM	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis</i> . 239 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1971-
DM	Caesarius of Heisterbach. <i>Dialogus Miraculorum</i> . 2 vols. Ed. Joseph Strange. Cologne: J.M. Heberle, 1851.
EIP	Augustine. <i>Enarrationes in Psalmos</i> . CC 38-40.
EP	Cassiodorus. <i>Expositio Psalmorum</i> . CC 97-98.
GJ	<i>Germania Judaica</i> . 3 vols. Ed. Zvi Avneri, et al. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963-1990.
GO	<i>Glossa Ordinaria</i> . Glosses on the Psalms are taken from vol.2 of the facsimile edition of the 1480 Rusch edition. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992. Glosses on the Canticle are taken from the critical edition edited by Mary Dove. CM 170.
HD	<i>Homiliae dominicales</i> : PL 174.21-632.
HDSL	<i>Homiliae in diversos scripturae locos</i> : PL 174.1059-1134
HFTA	<i>Homiliae in festa totius anni</i> : PL 174.633-1060

MB	<i>Monumenta Boica</i> . 60 vols. Munich: Verlag der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1763-1916, 1956.
MBDS	<i>Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz</i> . 4 vols. Ed. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Munich, 1918-1989.
MBÖ	<i>Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs</i> . 5 vols. Ed. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna, 1915-1971.
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i> . Hannover, 1826-
Const.	Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum
DD	Diplomata
Ldl	Libelli de Lite
QQ zur Geistesgesch.	Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte
SS	Scriptores (in folio)
SS rer. Germ.	Scriptores rerum Germanicarum
PL	<i>Patrologia Cursus Completus</i> . 221 vols. Ed. J.P. Migne. Paris, 1841-1864.
QE, n.f.	<i>Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte</i> , neue Folge. 47 vols. Munich, 1930-
QFW	<i>Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstifts Würzburg</i> . 63 vols. Würzburg: F. Schöningh, 1948-
RB	<i>Regesta sive rerum Boicarum autographa ad annum usque MCCC</i> . 13 vols. Ed. Karl Heinrich von Lang. Munich: Impensis regiis, 1822-1854.
SBO	<i>Sancti Bernardi Opera</i> . 8 vols. Ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot, and H.M. Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957-1977.
SC	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i> . 539 vols. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968-

Biblical citations are taken from the Douay-Rheims version. English translations of Latin and German texts are my own unless otherwise indicated.

INTRODUCTION

Framing the Question

For nearly two centuries, between the horrific massacres of the First Crusade period and the widespread, deadly pogroms of the late thirteenth century, the largest Jewish communities north of the Alps and Pyrenees—those of the German lands, in other words—coexisted in relative peace and prosperity with their Christian neighbors. This coexistence was not always harmonious. Sporadic, localized incidents of persecution did occur from time to time, and the antipathy that intensified gradually during this period may have made the later persecution episodes all the more deadly. Indeed, one may say that sinister clouds began to gather ominously overhead, clouds that eventually burst into thunderclaps and torrents of murder and persecution: Oberwesel, Rintfleisch, Armleder, the Black Death, Trent, and the like. Understandably, historians and other scholars who have treated this period of Jewish-Christian relations have focused much, even the majority, of their attention on these threatening clouds in the sky, with an eye toward these eventual storms, rather than on the relatively stable life that proceeded on the ground in the interim. This dissertation, however, turns its primary attention from the sky to the ground; that is, it seeks to understand the terms and structures—the social and cultural climate—that made peaceful Jewish-Christian coexistence possible in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Germany. In the process, it acknowledges that Rintfleisch and the other episodes were on the horizon and that storms of that sort do not burst forth

spontaneously without a preliminary gathering of clouds. So, while detailing the mechanisms that enabled coexistence, this study will also document and trace some of the negative attitudes and formulations that created the conditions for later, widespread persecution.

Coexistence was underscored by ambivalence. Christian communities in the high Middle Ages, both secular and religious, had a mixed, uneven, ambivalent relationship with Jews. While Christians in general harbored a variety of negative sentiments about their Jewish neighbors, there were enough legal, social, and intellectual checks on those attitudes to suppress resentment and keep relations between the two communities stable. This ambivalence existed on several levels, three of which are of primary concern to this study. First, Christians were ambivalent about the Jews' position in the economy and society of the high Middle Ages. While many Christians, especially those in positions of political and social influence (including monasteries), saw loans and other financial services provided by Jews as necessary, even invaluable, and rewarded the Jews who furnished them accordingly, the resulting debt load, coupled with theological proscriptions on usury, produced a significant amount of frustration and simmering resentment. It seems Christian borrowers were quite content to ignore anti-usury legislation when they needed money, but they were also quick to condemn usury when their debts threatened to envelop them. Second, the theological constructions of Jews bequeathed to medieval thinkers by ancient and patristic authors were ambivalent. Jews were described, on the one hand, as treacherous, hostile, carnal, and spiritually blind, yet on the other hand they were accorded a place of respect in the history of salvation, which would culminate with their wholesale conversion to a belief in Christ. Hence, Christian

thinkers were quick to condemn Jews for killing Christ and for their persistent apostate condition, but they also viewed their position in salvation history as necessary. Third, and perhaps most important, was the ambivalence that came from trying (or, in many cases, not trying) to square real interactions with living Jews with the mostly negative theological conceptions of Jews that were a vital part of the medieval intellectual landscape, especially because those real interactions, contrary to the descriptions propounded by some scholars, were mostly peaceful, quotidian, and even friendly. While all three kinds of ambivalence will be addressed in the chapters that follow, this third type is especially relevant to the monks on whom this study focuses much of its attention.

A well-known historical example serves to highlight this third kind of ambivalence. In the year 1146, Bernard of Clairvaux departed from his home monastery in Burgundy to embark on a preaching tour that led him eventually to the western part of the German Empire. Bernard's status as one of the most renowned clerical voices in twelfth-century Christendom made this a kind of celebrity tour, and his message benefited from his stature. Pope Eugenius III, Bernard's former pupil and fellow Cistercian, had commissioned the venerable abbot to publicize the newly-called Second Crusade, which had thus far received a lukewarm response from the Christian public. Bernard was certainly up to the task of convincing people of the necessity of going on Crusade, and he managed to persuade influential figures like Eleanor of Aquitaine, queen of France, and Conrad III, emperor of Germany, as well as large groups of commoners, to take up the cross. However, upon entering the German lands, Bernard was deflected from his primary purpose of preaching the crusade to deal with another urgent matter. Another Cistercian monk, Radulf, had turned rogue, abandoned his

monastery, and taken to condemning the Jews and inciting riots against them in the communities of Franconia and the Rhineland. Acting at the behest of German ecclesiastical authorities, Bernard moved quickly to calm down the excitement engendered by Radulf, telling the audiences who gathered to hear him promote the Crusade that it was not acceptable for Christians to kill Jews or convert them forcibly to Christianity. When he caught up to Radulf, Bernard censured the renegade monk and sent him back to his white-robed superiors in France. Bernard's actions became enshrined not only in Christian but also in Jewish chronicles, the authors of which cast him as a heroic figure for his role in preserving Jewish lives.

While it may appear to be a straightforward anecdote about the effectiveness of diplomacy, upon deeper investigation this story proves puzzling on at least two vital levels. The first problem is one of historiographic perception. The Jewish experience in the Middle Ages has long been viewed as a tale of endless and escalating persecution, yet in this case we witness Christian authorities, including one of the most formidable Christian champions of the entire epoch, going out of their way at the potential expense of a project they held dear to protect Jews. In other words, this example challenges in fundamental ways the most common element of the accepted view of medieval Jewish-Christian relations. The second puzzling element of this tale is that Bernard himself composed several vehement attacks on Jews during his illustrious career.¹ In other words, the Bernard who worked so hard to undo the preaching of Radulf and protect the Jews

¹ On Bernard and the Jews: David Berger, "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 40 (1972): 89-108 and Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 221-45.

appears to contradict the Bernard who wrote fierce anti-Jewish polemic. Here we witness the ambivalence introduced above.

Bernard was not alone in his ambivalence, in the divergence of his treatment of Jews in the social and political sphere from his critique of Jews in the theological arena. In fact, as noted already and as will be detailed throughout this work, that ambivalence was perhaps the most fundamental feature of the monastic experience with Jews. After all, monks in the high Middle Ages encountered two kinds of Jew. First and probably most common, since all monks knew this kind of Jew but not all were acquainted with the second kind, was the Jew of the biblical, theological, and liturgical text. Since monks spent much of their lives interacting with texts—whether through copying books, chanting the liturgy, or writing exegetical and historical works—and since many, perhaps most, of these texts contained historical and theological information about Jews, monks had an intimate acquaintance with the ideas that collectively comprised this “textual Jew.” The second kind of Jew was the living, breathing, real Jew. Because not all monasteries lay in close proximity to the large Jewish communities of the Rhineland or to those scattered throughout other regions of the German Empire, and moreover because setting foot outside the cloister was primarily the purview of abbots, priors, and other monks in leadership positions, not all monks were acquainted with this kind of Jew. Such interactions, of course, were confined mostly to urban monasteries—important houses like St. Emmeram of Regensburg. Although contacts with real Jews were not necessarily part of the standard monastic experience, they were not necessarily infrequent either, especially for those monks who did live in close proximity to Jewish communities.

It was not easy to reconcile these two Jews and, in fact, few monks ever tried seriously to deal with both at the same time. It was only when faced with those issues that involved both kinds of Jew simultaneously that monks tried to take into account real experience and intellectual constructions at the same time. The interplay between these two kinds of Jew in the thought and experience of monks in the high Middle Ages is worthy of a close examination, and this dissertation attempts to provide just that.

Historiography

Naturally, this study both contends with and relies on the work of earlier scholars. In some cases, both “contention” and “reliance” apply to individual scholars or even single works of scholarship. In order to understand where this work rests within the now-extensive scholarly corpus on Jewish-Christian relations—the contribution it seeks to make, in other words—it is necessary to draw attention to important strands of argument pursued by other authors. This review is limited intentionally, though with one or two exceptions, to works written in English by American, British, and Israeli scholars, since this dissertation dialogues mostly with their arguments. As will become clear, however, this work tries to bring their hypotheses and methodologies into conversation with the kind of research generated mostly by German scholars.

First, in positing peaceful, if ambivalent, coexistence between Christians and Jews in the high Middle Ages, this study challenges a long scholarly tradition that either defines medieval Jewish-Christian relations as a long narrative of persecution or at least makes systematic hostility and exclusion their defining feature. This arc traces its roots back to the Hebrew poetic lamentation tradition of Antiquity and the Middle Ages but finds its modern origin in the grand narratives of Jewish history written in the nineteenth

century by adherents of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* school—particularly the work of Heinrich Graetz.² In his multi-volume *Geschichte der Juden*, Graetz rarely strays from what he views as the two major themes of pre-modern Jewish history: the unrelenting stream of persecution endured by Jews and the intellectual achievements of great Jewish thinkers. Persecution, for Graetz and his imitators, was the normal state of affairs for the Jews of medieval Europe, and, despite later calls for another scholarly direction by Salo Baron and others, Graetz's basic assumption has proven its staying power in scholarship all the way to the present. Of course, the view has over the years become far more nuanced, but the notion that hostility and persecution lay at the root of medieval Jewish-Christian relations has remained the dominant interpretation.

Two influential works from the past thirty years demonstrate the persistent strength of this idea. R.I. Moore's 1986 work *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* is largely a response to the scholarly tradition, first propounded by Charles Homer Haskins and upheld by, among others, R.W. Southern, that hailed the twelfth century (or rather the "long twelfth century") as a pivotal moment of creation, wherein the cultural and social structures that came to define western Europe were put into place.³ Moore responds to this laudatory description of the twelfth century by attempting to show its dark underbelly, attaching to high medieval Christendom the pejorative label "persecuting society." Essentially, Moore asserts that, as the society of Christian Europe

² Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeit bis auf die Gegenwart*, 11 vols. (Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1853-1876).

³ Now in its second edition: R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007). On the vital creativity of the twelfth century, see especially Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927) and R.W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

put into place both the fundamental institutions and the intellectual formulations that would define its existence for the next several centuries, it also identified those persons or groups who lay outside the pale of acceptance.⁴ The definition of the “other” was thus a by-product of the definition and organization of orthodox Christendom. More than just identifying the “other” as undesirable or “impure,” Christendom proceeded first to exclude and then to persecute these people. The main thrust of Moore’s argument in this work is that there was little difference in the way that “the persecuting society” treated the various groups it excluded; Jews, heretics, lepers, female prostitutes, and male homosexuals were each viewed as a fundamental threat to society and were thus persecuted.

While Moore has drawn criticism for such things as his imprecise definition of “society” and his failure to account much for developments before the year 1000, his argument has had a profound influence on the historiography of medieval Christian-Jewish relations. The application of his thesis to specific situations, however, remains a problematic venture. After all, if the negative classification and persecution of Jews was merely a symptom of one of the definitive, elemental values or assumptions of medieval Christian society, then one should expect to find that assumption at work in every institution and every intellectual formulation fostered by that society. It is on that level that this work tests and challenges Moore’s construction.

Other scholars have followed Moore’s line of thinking to varying degrees, using his “persecuting society” as a heuristic for investigating and explaining the interaction

⁴ Although Moore attaches particular significance to the formation of administrative structures in the development of this society—arguing that Jews were viewed as competitors for administrative positions and were thus feared—he does discuss the influence of other facets of society, including the continued development of Christian theology. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 138-43.

between Christians and Jews in the high Middle Ages. One work that adheres very closely to Moore's conception is Dominique Iogna-Prat's *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)*.⁵ This book is ostensibly a study of some of the writings of Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny. However, as his title suggests, Iogna-Prat views the writings of this important figure as representative of the attitudes of all Cluniac monks. Pressing the synecdoche even further, Iogna-Prat argues that, as one of the most important Christian institutions, Cluny shared the same assumptions as all other people in "Christendom." While he goes to great lengths to demonstrate why this synecdoche makes sense, the act of positing a single author—even one so influential as Peter the Venerable—as representative of all of high medieval Christendom remains problematic, especially since Iogna-Prat provides an insufficient amount of corroborating evidence from other authors. Moreover, Iogna-Prat's interpretive strategy is not terribly original; he simply takes Moore with him as his guide to Peter's writings. He expects to find the "persecuting society" in Peter, so his analysis becomes a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. This is more than a bit ironic, given the fact that Iogna-Prat criticizes the Cluniac abbot for approaching the Jews with an existing, pejorative picture of the Jew already in his mind.

As the example of Iogna-Prat's work shows—and other works could be substituted quite easily in its place—the overriding expectation of hostility and persecution has colored and continues to color the study of the Jewish place in medieval Christian society. Studies that deal with particular thinkers, particular episodes, or

⁵ Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)*, trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002). This was originally published as *Ordonner et exclure: Cluny et la société chrétienne face à l'hérésie, au judaïsme et à l'islam, 1000-1150* (Paris: Aubier, 1998).

particular institutions have all approached their themes with that expectation in mind.

While this study does not ignore the animosity that Christians surely held for Jews, and vice-versa, in this period, it does not approach its subject matter with this assumption. As will be shown, there is simply too much evidence of normal relations and peaceful coexistence to assume that we are dealing with a “persecuting society” when we study the high Middle Ages.

That said, this study is also cautious not to err too far in the other direction; that is, it does not try to paint too rosy a picture of Jewish-Christian relations, given the preponderance of evidence about animosity and hostility between the two communities. Such a fault may perhaps be leveled at, for instance, Jonathan Elukin’s recent work *Living Together, Living Apart*.⁶ Elukin’s main thrust in that monograph is to shift the examination of Jewish-Christian relations away once and for all from the dominant persecution narrative. To do this, he tries to show not only that Jews were integrated into medieval Christian society in a variety of ways but also that they were very good at manipulating the rules of that society to their advantage. To some extent, Elukin argues in the vein of Bernard Bachrach, whose work on early medieval Jewry highlighted the power Jews held in Visigothic, Merovingian, and Carolingian society.⁷ Elukin’s goals are certainly not without merit. His contention that “the categories of persecution and tolerance focus our attention on only one aspect of relations between Christians and Jews” and his insistence that “we should look to see how Jews and Christians of medieval Europe engaged each other across a larger spectrum of relationships and experiences” are

⁶ Jonathan Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

⁷ Bernard S. Bachrach, *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977).

both overdue. However, in its execution, Elukin's work fails to deliver, at least in a way that is beyond reproach. His attempt to write off nearly every persecution episode of the high Middle Ages—from Crusade pogroms to murder accusations to expulsions—as misinterpreted and tangential to the more important story of coexistence is particularly problematic, especially because his treatment of each episode is hopelessly brief.⁸ In other words, Elukin's main problem lies in the fact that he sacrifices close analysis of particular cases to make a larger point.

It would be a mistake, however, to write off Elukin's main contention because of his imperfect execution. In my estimation, Elukin is correct in pointing out the need to broaden our assumptions about and investigation of Jewish-Christian relations beyond marginalization and persecution. His point about Jews taking advantage of the systems and institutions into which they were integrated seems particularly valuable. However, one must also be careful in shifting the conversation to acknowledge and highlight the presence and effects of defamatory ideas, discriminatory legislation, and outright persecution—more than Elukin does in any case. Robert Chazan's very recent work *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* tries to chart a kind of middle course between Elukin and the persecution narrative.⁹ His is both a necessary approach and a difficult balancing act, and Chazan's book shows, at times, his own uncertainty about this new course. While Chazan's mastery of the primary and secondary literature on these issues is comprehensive, he seems a bit uncomfortable rethinking assumptions he previously embraced. He organizes his work into sub-themes of Jewish life—

⁸ See Elukin, 89-115.

⁹ Robert Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

demographics, economic activity, legal status, social relations, etc. For each sub-theme, he begins by propounding the accepted view—the persecution narrative that is—before providing a few examples that challenge the accepted interpretation. So, for example, in his chapter on Jewish economic activity, he spends the majority of the pages discussing the confinement of Jews to money-lending, pawn-brokering, and like professions and their increasing economic marginalization—essential elements of the accepted marginalization narrative—before acknowledging briefly that Jews were in some senses “economic pioneers” and that even their work as money-lenders can be seen as a positive development.¹⁰ The “reassessing” is never entirely convincing, and the reader still emerges with the dominant images of persecution in mind.

Despite the flaws of these two works, they should be taken seriously for their attempt to shift the scholarly discussion and reframe the fundamental questions asked of the relevant source material. As both Elukin and Chazan suggest, the question scholars ask the sources should not be “was Jewish existence defined by persecution?” but rather “how does persecution and marginalization fit into the overall story—the structures as well as the narrative—of Jewish life and Jewish-Christian relations in medieval Europe?” That the Jews were persecuted and marginalized at times is really beyond doubt, but one must also acknowledge that the Jews tried, often successfully and always in collusion with Christian partners, to establish structures intended to prevent persecution and make their lives as safe and routine as possible and that they integrated themselves to a remarkable extent into Christian society. This study adopts the revisionist perspective and some of the arguments employed by Elukin and Chazan and uses them to investigate

¹⁰ Ibid., 107-32.

the broad spectrum of Jewish-Christian coexistence, though (unlike those works) it does so in a restricted chronological, geographical, and institutional space. Instead of asking whether the situation was defined by persecution, it studies the structures that undergirded coexistence before investigating how persecution, hostility, and marginalization challenged those structures and undermined peaceful relations.

This dissertation treats not only Jewish-Christian social and economic relations, but also Christian ideas about Jews and the relationship between those cultural constructions and social interactions. In so doing, it relies on the groundbreaking work of a number of influential scholars who have worked on what one writer calls “the Christian-Jewish debate.”¹¹ At the same time, it challenges and shifts the course of this research down previously underexplored paths. Though the historiography on the intellectual construction of the Jew in the Middle Ages owes a significant debt to earlier figures like Bernhard Blumenkranz¹², Leon Poliakov¹³, and Salo Baron¹⁴, the works of three more recent scholars have been especially instrumental in shaping our understanding of Christian ideas and images about Jews. This review would not be complete without identifying some of their arguments.

Throughout his long career, Gavin Langmuir devoted much of his attention to the development of these ideas. His most fundamental contention—spelled out in a number

¹¹ Anna Sapir Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1995), ix.

¹² See especially Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430-1096* (Paris: Mouton, 1960) and his excellent catalog of Christian writings about Jews: *Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les juifs et le judaïsme* (Paris: Mouton, 1963).

¹³ Leon Poliakov, *The History of Anti-Semitism*, 4 vols. (New York: Vanguard Press, 1965-85). Volume 1 covers the European Middle Ages with the exception of Iberia, which is treated in volume 2.

¹⁴ See especially Salo Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 18 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952-83). Volumes 3-13 deal with the medieval period.

of important articles that he later collected into his *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, as well as in his more coherent but less medieval-centric *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*—is that the high Middle Ages witnessed a two-stage transformation of Christian attitudes and behavior toward Jews. First, the eleventh century saw the rise of “anti-Judaism,” a phenomenon Langmuir breaks into three components—“the doctrinal, the legal, and the popular.”¹⁵ While the popular strain of anti-Judaism led to outbreaks of violence like the First Crusade massacres, the legal strain, supported by the doctrinal strain, transformed the Jewish population of northern Europe into “an institutionalized inferior minority.” This paved the way for the second stage of this transformation, “the development of a false, irrational conception of the Jew.” The ritual murder charges, host desecration accusations, and well-poisoning allegations of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries sprang from this irrational conception, which Langmuir labels “antisemitism.”¹⁶ It was the rise of this conception, which, he contends, continued to exist side-by-side with the less sinister “anti-Judaism,” that produced the greatest hostility toward Jews in the high and late Middle Ages.

Langmuir asserts that the Christian religion itself was at the heart of this transformation. Like Moore, Langmuir notes the role that “the gradual Christianization of Europe” played in the development of hostility against the Jews.¹⁷ But he goes well beyond Moore in his exploration of the medieval Christian intellectual world. His main assertion on this score is that the relative peace of the high Middle Ages not only gave

¹⁵ Gavin I. Langmuir, “Anti-Judaism as the Necessary Preparation for Antisemitism,” in *Toward a Definition of Anti-Semitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 58.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 61.

¹⁷ Langmuir, “The Transformation of Anti-Judaism,” in *Ibid.*, 65.

Christians a chance to establish a unified ecclesiastical organization and defined doctrine but also, during the process of this establishment, afforded them time and space to question and form doubts about their religious beliefs. He remarks, “When some people became uneasily aware of doubts or disbelief that challenged beliefs central to their sense of identity, they reacted irrationally” by striking out against heretics, Jews, and others who, for them, embodied their doubts. These groups had, after all, chosen to believe something other than Christian teachings in spite of the dominant position of Christianity in their society. It was the discomfort with their doubt, in other words, that led to the irrational notions and associated behaviors that Langmuir labels “antisemitism.”¹⁸

Standing alongside the works of Langmuir in influence and containing perhaps the most comprehensive studies of medieval Christian ideas about Jews are the works of Jeremy Cohen. First in his 1982 study *The Friars and the Jews* and much more fully in his 1999 work *Living Letters of the Law*, Cohen contends that Christian opinions and writings about Jews through the end of the twelfth century followed the “Augustinian” tradition, a hermeneutic stance that emphasized the importance of the continued Jewish existence in Christian society. Augustine, notes Cohen, had determined that the Jews constituted important witnesses of both the triumph of Christianity and the truth of the Old Testament, even if their current wickedness made them loathsome to contemporary Christians. In addition to serving this vital theological function in contemporary Christendom, explained Augustine, the Jews would convert to Christianity at the end of the world. The Psalmist’s directive to “slay them not” (assumed by Augustine to mean the Jews) was thus necessary both because the Jews were useful to the Christians and

¹⁸ Langmuir, “Doubt in Christendom,” in *Ibid.*, 127. On this concept of religious doubt, see also Langmuir’s *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 232-51.

because they constituted no lasting threat to the ascendance and progress of Christianity.¹⁹ In the process of describing this influential doctrine, Cohen casts both monks and secular clerics of the fifth through twelfth centuries as adherents to the Augustinian tradition.²⁰ The real turn to greater hostility, he contends, came mostly with the rise of the Mendicants in the thirteenth century. Tasked with rooting out error and unbelief in Christian society, the friars set their sights on the Jews, who constituted the chief dissidents to the dominant Christian culture. The friars took the most virulent anti-Jewish polemical strains formulated by previous thinkers and transformed them into policy when they put on trial, confiscated, and burned Jewish texts like the Talmud, which they considered to be not merely incorrect but dangerous and even heretical. Cohen draws a line from these efforts to the expulsions of Jews from England and France around the turn of the thirteenth century. The thirteenth century thus stands out as the pivotal period for Cohen; it was then that the long-standing and relatively innocuous parameters of the Jewish-Christian debate changed irrevocably.

Also important to the general understanding of Christian ideas about and attitudes toward Jews in the high Middle Ages is the work of Anna Sapir Abulafia. In several of her articles though most fully in her *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, Abulafia joins R.I. Moore and others in arguing for the centrality of the twelfth century in the shifting relationship between Jews and Christians.²¹ It was during

¹⁹ Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982), 19-22 and *Living Letters of the Law*, 23-65.

²⁰ Cohen does investigate the trends and innovations in the works of these clergymen in *Ibid.*, 67-312, but Augustine's doctrine of Jewish witness, he contends, remained the dominant theological influence on this issue.

²¹ Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*. Among her many articles, see "Jewish Carnality in Twelfth-Century Renaissance Thought," in *Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Diana Wood,

that century, asserts Abulafia, that Christian thinkers began to rely on reason to explain the tenets of their theology, rather than merely relying on the authorities—biblical and patristic texts mostly—for their explanations. Since they were able to justify Christian dogma by the use of reason, they also concluded that anyone who refused to believe that dogma lacked the ability to reason. The fact that Jews were involved in such pursuits as money-lending—an activity, argued Christian polemicists, that was inspired by base, carnal desires—confirmed their suspicions that the Jews were governed not by mind but by flesh. They are not fully human, declared these thinkers, so they should be excluded from Christian society. While Abulafia employs both monastic and scholastic texts as evidence to back up her claims, the cathedral schools of the era come across as particularly important to this story since they were the primary locations for this turn to reason. Abulafia also contends with Cohen’s timeline of the influence of Augustine’s doctrine of Jewish witness. While Cohen indicates that this tenet held more or less firm until the rise of the Mendicants in the thirteenth century, Abulafia follows R.I. Moore in insisting that Augustine’s “*testimonium veritatis* gradually seemed to lose a great deal of its force” beginning in the second half of the eleventh century with the reforms of the church and the “Christianization” of society.²² Like Moore, Abulafia believes that the political and cultural sea-changes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries led to the denigration, and ultimately the persecution, of Jews. Unlike Moore, however, Abulafia

Studies in Church History 29 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 59-75; “Jewish-Christian Disputations and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance,” *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989): 105-25; “Christian Imagery of Jews in the Twelfth Century: A Look at Odo of Cambrai and Guibert of Nogent,” *Theoretische Geschichte* 16 (1989): 383-91; “Twelfth-Century Humanism and the Jews,” in *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy Stroumsa (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996), 161-75; “The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Iudeus,” *Jewish History* 7 (1993): 43-63.

²² Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-century Renaissance*, 66.

finds the impetus for this shift in attitudes almost entirely in the cultural and intellectual spheres.

As this discussion indicates, scholarship on the intellectual and cultural component of the Jewish-Christian relationship has focused a great deal of attention on one major issue: the point at which the ideas became so dangerous as to threaten the Jews' very existence in medieval society. This focus is at least partially due, it seems, to the overwhelming influence of the aforementioned persecution narrative. Abulafia finds the development of these uncompromisingly hostile ideas in the circles of the twelfth century thinkers, with special emphasis on the scholastic milieu. Cohen identifies the thirteenth-century friars as the key catalysts in overturning the tolerant Augustinian doctrine of "Jewish witness." Langmuir locates the seeds of irrational "antisemitism" first planted in the Norwich murder accusation in the 1140s but notes this construction developed more fully in the thirteenth century, with the Fulda blood libel of 1235 as a key moment.²³ This study interacts to some extent with this same debate, although it places greater emphasis on the structures of coexistence than on the moment at which those structures failed.

Moreover, while this study remains indebted to the work of the aforementioned scholars, as well as to studies along similar lines by Robert Chazan, Michael Signer, and others, it does question one fundamental assumption of this scholarship: that is, the notion that ideas about and attitudes toward Jews were more or less uniform across

²³ On these two episodes, see Langmuir's articles "Thomas of Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder" and "Ritual Cannibalism," in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 209-36 and 263-81.

components of society, across institutions, and across regions.²⁴ As with the notion of persistent hostility and persecution discussed above, this dissertation seeks to question and refocus the assumption of uniformity.

As noted, this assumption has manifest itself in the secondary literature in three ways. First, scholars have assumed a consistency across all components of medieval society—intellectual, cultural, political, social, and economic. They have too often taken for granted, or at least conveyed the impression, that the negative opinions of Jews held by the likes of Peter the Venerable and Guibert of Nogent in the intellectual realm were shared by kings, dukes, counts, and others with whom Jews interacted in the political arena, and by peasants, townsmen, and others with whom Jews did business in the economic sphere. Most scholars on this topic—or at least those writing in English—have taken much of their evidence of Christian attitudes toward Jews from the works of intellectuals and assumed that they were reflections of more general attitudes. As Abulafia declares, “There must have been a constant interaction between these popular beliefs and the doctrinal views on Jews of the friars and other theologians of the Church too.”²⁵ Whichever direction these ideas traveled—whether from common to elite or vice-versa—they were shared across all spheres of medieval society: so claims the scholarly consensus. However, as the example of Bernard of Clairvaux demonstrates, even one individual could be conflicted, or at least produce contradictory information, on this question. If that could be the case for one person, then one should expect to find a great

²⁴ Not all of these scholars make this contention overtly (Moore and Iogna-Prat being exceptions). However, the identification of a particular moment when Jewish existence became intolerable for Christians and the distinguishing of a particular catalyst (like Cohen’s friars) for that moment relies inherently on the assumption that such ideas became standard for the majority of Christians. This is, in my estimation, the chief problem with making arguments of this sort.

²⁵ Abulafia, “The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism,” *Theoretische Geschichte* 11 (1984): 81.

deal of variation in attitude and behavior across the broad spectrum of medieval civilization.

Scholars have also assumed homogeneity across the various institutions within medieval society, or, at least, they have done little to point out the disparities in opinion and behavior among the institutions that interacted with or thought about Jews. True, Cohen does analyze the strategies and motivations of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century friars closely, as well as the effect their preaching and other activities had on the state of Christian-Jewish relations, but his analysis of the eleventh and twelfth century material, while admirable in so many ways, does not ask, for instance, how Anselm's, Guibert's, Bernard's, or Peter the Venerable's monastic situations might have influenced their opinions about Jews and produced different ideas from the cathedral school environment of, say, Alan of Lille. Even though Abulafia relies heavily on cathedral school texts in her analysis, she does not do enough to point out the effect of the cathedral school environment and, for the most part, simply lumps that evidence together with monastic and other writings. The same holds true for Moore, Langmuir, and others. Iogna-Prat does try to describe the importance of Cluny, but he subsequently abandons his singular focus on the monastic milieu in an effort to show how Cluny represented all of Christendom. As excellent studies of specific institutions and milieux have argued, medieval institutions—whether political, religious, or economic—had their own goals, prerogatives, and reasons for existence.²⁶ It stands to reason that the unique goals of

²⁶ Good examples of studies that focus on the goals and prerogatives of specific institutions include Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 3rd ed., trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982); Steven A. Epstein, *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); Maureen C. Miller, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000).

specific institutions influenced their views of and interactions with Jews in ways that distinguished them from the opinions and relations of other institutions and from Christendom at large.

Third, due to the assumption of uniformity, scholars have not done enough to account for local and regional differences in the Christian-Jewish relationship.²⁷ Of course, my historiographic summation has thus far excluded a sizable number of regional and local works by German historians on the Jewish communities of the Empire and the relationship of those communities with the majority Christian population.²⁸ It has also left out, for instance, the studies of French Jewry undertaken by, among others, William Jordan²⁹ and Robert Chazan³⁰ and the explorations of English Jewry by Robin Mundill³¹, Robert Stacey³², and R.B. Dobson³³, to say nothing of the compelling explorations of

²⁷ Robert Stacey points out the need for “a series of parallel histories of Jewish experience in a variety of political communities scattered unevenly across the landscape of twelfth-century northern Europe.” Robert C. Stacey, “Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England: Some Dynamics of a Changing Relationship,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael A. Signer and John H. Van Engen (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 351.

²⁸ See especially several book-length studies on specific communities or regions, including Matthias Schmandt, *Judei, cives et incole: Studien zur jüdischen Geschichte Kölns im Mittelalter* (Hannover: Hahn, 2002); Christoph Cluse, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in den mittelalterlichen Niederlanden* (Hannover: Hahn, 2000); Karlheinz Müller, *Die Würzburger Judengemeinde im Mittelalter: von den Anfängen um 1100 bis zum Tod Julius Eichters (1617)* (Würzburg: Freunde Mainfränkischer Kunst und Geschichte, 2004); Sabine Mütschele, *Juden in Augsburg: 1212-1440* (Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Stuttgart, 1996).

²⁹ William Chester Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989).

³⁰ Robert Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

³¹ Robin R. Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

³² Stacey, “Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 340-54 and “The English Jews Under Henry III,” in *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary, and Archaeological Perspectives*, ed. Patricia Skinner (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), 41-54.

Iberian Jewry by Yitzhak Baer³⁴, David Nirenberg³⁵, and others. Still, while these studies—especially those of German scholars like Alfred Haverkamp, Matthias Schmandt, and Christoph Cluse—have investigated the Jewish-Christian relationship on the regional and local levels, they have, with a few exceptions³⁶, focused the majority of their attention on the political, social, and economic aspects of that relationship. To date there has been little overlap between these regional and local studies and the more general, theoretical studies discussed above, which works are based largely on intellectual and cultural source material. Scholars must do more in studies of particular regions or particular institutions to address the interaction of the intellectual/cultural sphere with the social/political/economic aspects of the Jewish-Christian relationship. Put another way, scholars must attempt to combine the major focus of the German scholars with that of the American, British, and Israeli scholars on this topic. This combination would not only help create a more nuanced view of the interplay between ideas and actual relations but would also move scholarship beyond the overwhelming focus on marginalization and persecution, since German scholars have marshaled so much evidence of coexistence, both in their local and regional studies and in their valuable primary source collections.³⁷

³³ R.B. Dobson, *The Jews of Medieval York and the Massacre of March 1190* (York: St. Anthony's Press, 1974).

³⁴ Yitzhak Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961-66).

³⁵ David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

³⁶ Nirenberg's *Communities of Violence* is such an exception; his ability to combine analysis of intellectual and cultural sources with social, political, and economic information is very effective, though it also benefits from a greater wealth of source materials than is available for studying the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, or for studying areas outside Iberia. German scholars like Haverkamp and Cluse have also worked in multiple realms.

³⁷ The *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden* compiled in the late nineteenth century by Julius Aronius is still perhaps the indispensable source for locating primary source texts about medieval German Jews, and

The combining of theoretical revisions with valuable regional and episodic studies has helped to refocus in productive ways the scholarship on other areas of medieval civilization. In a now-classic article, for instance, Elizabeth Brown called for scholars to look at medieval social structures (i.e., “feudal” relationships) regionally, rather than continue to adhere to the “tyranny” of the construct of feudalism as propounded by Bloch, Ganshof, and others.³⁸ Over the next generation, scholars like Susan Reynolds heeded Brown’s call, carrying out studies that identified important regional differences and that took into account both the intellectual facets and the social and political aspects of those structures.³⁹ Like the issue of feudalism two generations ago, the issue of the Jewish-Christian relationship of the high Middle Ages is in need of more thorough regional and institutional studies that take all parts of that relationship into account.

Scope and Boundaries

This dissertation tries to adopt a fresh approach to the study of the Jewish-Christian relationship in the Middle Ages by first setting aside, at least temporarily, the assumptions of uniformity and negativity. To do this, it narrows its focus in some ways while broadening it in others. Put another way, it functions within defined boundaries

this work makes extensive use of the evidence found therein. The most recent edition is Julius Aronius, ed., *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im fränkischen und deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1970). Aronius’s work appears to have served as a model for a similar recent volume on the Austrian Jews of the Middle Ages: Eveline Brugger and Birgit Wiedl, eds., *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich im Mittelalter* (Innsbruck: Studien, 2005). A second volume of this work, stretching the documentary record to 1365, was published in 2010.

³⁸ Elizabeth A.R. Brown, “The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe,” *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 1063-88.

³⁹ Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

that both test the notion of uniformity and enable a search for routine, non-hostile aspects of the Christian-Jewish relationship. Four such boundaries frame this study.

First, this work focuses on the role of monasteries in the Christian-Jewish relationship. This is, in other words, an institutional boundary. Surprisingly, the role of monasteries in this story has been neglected in the historiography. Scholars have employed the works of individual monks—particularly influential ones like Peter the Venerable, Bernard of Clairvaux, Rupert of Deutz, and Peter Abelard (who was, people forget, a monk for most of his career)—to write about Christian opinions toward Jews, but they have rarely studied these figures *as monks*. Put another way, scholars have not asked how the monastic experience of these authors influenced their reactions to or writings about Jews. Instead, as explained above, scholars have mostly placed these monks into the larger contexts and trends they have identified as integral, even if that has meant ignoring their monastic context.

This neglect of the monastic context in scholarship on Christian-Jewish relations is at least partially the result of historiographic biases. The narrative of the twelfth-century “Renaissance” is bound up very closely with the development of cathedral schools, which have been studied partly on their own merit and partly as forerunners of universities.⁴⁰ Hence, as scholars have looked for evidence of high medieval intellectual developments, including ideas about Jews, they have tended to look first at the cathedral school context. When these scholars have examined monastic writings on this subject, they have, on most occasions, treated them mostly as supporting evidence for the developments generated primarily in the cathedral schools. By this approach, monks like

⁴⁰ This scholarly trend originated with Haskins’s famous *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, 32-69.

Anselm become mere “forerunners” of the intellectual turn to *ratio* that achieved its fullest development in the cathedral schools and universities of France. Moreover, monks like Rupert, Bernard, and Peter the Venerable have been either portrayed as basking in the spirit that flourished in the schools or described as conservative critics of the new intellectual trends. Such characterizations may be accurate from a certain viewpoint, but they also neglect something fundamental: the fact that these figures were, above all things, representatives of and advocates for the cloistered environment. This common source bias also arises from the common assumption that monasteries, especially those of the traditional Benedictine Order, were on the wane in this period, while cathedral schools were on the rise.⁴¹ Scholars have described the monasteries as intellectually stagnant, while lauding the innovation and creativity of the cathedral schools. Cathedral school authors, they remark, were simply more original, more cutting edge, more inclined to rely on reason than authority. To cite only one of many examples of this scholarly assumption, Heinrich Fichtenau, after commenting on the conservative nature of the high medieval monastic intellectual environment, notes that “the monastic schools were deteriorating; in France above all, they were superseded by cathedral schools and independent circles of masters and students.”⁴² This assumption of decline is problematic in a number of ways, as John Van Engen has shown⁴³, and this study further substantiates the persistent importance of the cloister in high medieval civilization. As will be demonstrated, monks were not only writing about Jews on a regular basis

⁴¹ This idea is discussed and refuted at length by John Van Engen, “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150,” *Speculum* 61 (1986): 269-304.

⁴² Heinrich Fichtenau, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 6.

⁴³ In his article “‘The Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered.”

throughout the high medieval period but they were doing so in creative and original ways. Moreover, individual monks and monastic communities were interacting with Jews on both the individual and communal levels. When encountering this evidence, one must account for the unique monastic context—that is, for the specific audience to which monastic authors wrote and the didactic and other reasons why monks composed various kinds of texts, from chronicles, cartularies, and necrologies to sermons and exegetical works.

One question that needs to be dealt with, however briefly, is the use of the term “monk” in this dissertation. Put simply, I employ this term in a very wide, inclusive sense. The evidence I bring to bear in this work comes from the cloistered environment; I make little distinction between orders, since such identifications do not seem to have had much influence on cloistered attitudes toward or relationships with Jews. This is not to ignore the important distinctions that existed between Benedictines and Cistercians, between monks who adhered to the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and cloistered canons who adopted the Augustinian or some other *Regula*, or, perhaps more obviously, between monks and nuns. It is obvious that the differences between these various groups of cloistered individuals did influence and effect important religious developments in the high Middle Ages. On the issue of monastic-Jewish relations, however, the influence of particular orders was less pronounced. It is thus important to keep in mind Giles Constable’s declaration that “there was at all times within the monastic world a higher degree of continuity and similarity than of change and difference.”⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 312. See also Caroline Walker Bynum’s discussion of the similarities between monks and regular canons in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 22-58.

While distinctions between various monastic orders are not important for the task at hand, it is important to distinguish the monastic experience with Jews from that of other clergymen, especially the secular clergy associated with cathedral schools in the twelfth century and the Mendicants who rose quickly to occupy a prominent place in the Christian-Jewish relations of the thirteenth century. The cloister, whatever the order or gender of its inhabitants, was very different from the cathedral or the parish church, in terms of both practice and outlook. Although monastic texts have often been employed to make general observations about the medieval intellectual world, it must be remembered that most of these texts—and certainly the exegetical, homiletic, liturgical, and even hagiographic works that comprise most of the monastic corpus of this era—were written for the instruction or edification of other monks. Monastic authors usually did not think beyond the walls of their own monasteries and the needs of their brothers, unlike cathedral school or university scholars who often wrote for wider audiences. Since this was the case, monastic writings, including those that treat Jews, must be studied with the goals and setting of the cloister in mind, taking into account their unique audience and didactic purpose, before they can be fitted into a larger context.

The second major boundary imposed on this study is a geographic one. With a few exceptions—utilized mostly for purposes of comparison—all of the evidence explored in this work comes from German lands (labeled here as either “the Empire” or simply “Germany”). While some of my observations may apply to the general context of medieval Christendom—and I will say so when I think they do—a strict focus on the high medieval Empire seems a good strategy for two main reasons. First, Germany

contained the largest Jewish communities in northern Europe in the high Middle Ages.⁴⁵ Jewish settlements in the Rhineland cities of Cologne, Mainz, and Speyer and in other cities like Regensburg and Magdeburg were rivaled in numbers only by the longstanding Jewish communities in Italy and Iberia. Moreover, Jews of German lands thrived economically and culturally, producing such figures as the German Pietists and composing such influential texts as Jewish chronicles of the First Crusade and the *Sefer Hasidim*.⁴⁶ Since this work seeks to investigate Christian interactions with Jews in both the social and economic sphere and the intellectual realm, it requires a variety of sources. Such sources are found in much greater abundance in Germany than in, say, France or England. Moreover, this study benefits from a significant number of local and regional studies of Jewish communities performed by German scholars. Such studies are lacking for other areas of medieval Europe, at least those places north of the Mediterranean, at least partly because the Jewish communities in those places were small and insignificant by comparison and thus produced fewer records.

The second reason for the geographic focus on Germany is the fact that monasteries were the dominant cultural institutions of the high medieval Empire. The geographic boundary thus coincides well with the institutional boundary. While Germany did have cathedral schools in the high Middle Ages, these schools were far more conservative in nature than, say, the schools of northern France or Italy, which regions witnessed the initial formation of the larger intellectual institution of the

⁴⁵ The most accessible study of the German Jews of this era is Michael Toch, *Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1998).

⁴⁶ The most thorough study of the Pietists remains Ivan G. Marcus, *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

university in the twelfth century.⁴⁷ The German educational system appears to have been influenced in profound ways by the Investiture Controversy; church reform touched the Empire more than other places in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries and contributed to the conservative outlook of the German schools. Whatever the source of this approach, many of the prominent German secular clerics of the twelfth century, Adalbert of Saarbrücken and Otto of Freising among them, went to Paris or other schools outside of Germany for their advanced intellectual training, since studies of this magnitude were not offered in the cathedral schools of Germany. Other prominent figures in the German schools ultimately left Germany for the less restrictive, more exciting educational climes of Paris, and scholars from the French schools who went to Germany often found the atmosphere of the German schools unacceptable. Paul Pixton attributes this German educational environment to a “misfiring of German cultural leadership.”⁴⁸ German bishops and others responsible for setting educational trends in Germany, Pixton argues, allowed their education system to lag behind that of other regions, to such an extent that Germany did not produce a university until the very end of the fourteenth century, long after universities had become entrenched and renowned in Italy, France, and England.

While the cathedral schools of Germany remained stagnant, at least compared to their counterparts in France and Italy, the monasteries of Germany were flourishing.

While some secular clerics stood out prominently in the Empire of this period, most of

⁴⁷ On German cathedral schools, see especially the study of Bamberg, favored city of the Salian emperors, by Johannes Fried, “Die Bamberger Domschule und die Rezeption von Frühscholastik und Rechtswissenschaft in ihrem Umkreis bis zum Ende der Stauferzeit,” *Vorträge und Forschungen* (1986): 163-200. While Bamberg was certainly one of the educational leaders in Germany, it still adopted the conservative approach that characterized other German schools. The curriculum at Bamberg remained focused on basics like grammar and rhetoric, even after the schools of France had begun to study the more advanced works of Aristotle.

⁴⁸ Paul B. Pixton, “The Misfiring of German Cultural Leadership in the Twelfth Century: The Evidence from the Cathedral Schools,” *Paedagogica Historica* 34 (1998): 347-63.

the leading lights in the German intellectual world of the high Middle Ages were monks. The prominent German cloisters, and the monks who inhabited them, functioned as the conscience of the Empire in the High Middle Ages. As such, they commented upon and sought to influence the policies enacted by emperors, dukes, bishops, and others who wielded secular authority in the realm. They also wrote some of the most influential works about events and circumstances that affected Christendom generally. German monks were among the most important chroniclers of the crusades, for instance.

The third boundary applied to this work—an expansion rather than a limitation—is one of scope. Because interactions between Jews and monks took place both real life and in the minds of the Jews and monks—in both the social and political world and the intellectual and cultural realm, in other words—this dissertation examines a variety of evidence from all of these contexts. It looks not only at theological and polemical texts like Cohen’s and Abulafia’s works, or at economic and political texts like, for example, Moore’s work, but rather at both in roughly equal amounts. Put another way, this work does not employ economic evidence as mere supporting data for observations that come primarily from intellectual sources, or vice-versa. Instead, it embraces the comparison between the two kinds of evidence. Indeed, its most fruitful analysis comes through the juxtaposition of the real with the imaginative, or rather through contrasting the two Jews that appeared respectively in these two realms. This comparison places the ambivalence discussed above—the key feature of monastic opinion on Jews—on full display.

This choice to broaden the scope of the inquiry beyond the cultural and intellectual also sheds some light on an underexplored facet of the history of the monasteries: that is, their involvement in the trade and commerce of the high Middle

Ages. Indeed, this area is still mostly untapped despite long acknowledgement of the need for such study. On this score, John Van Engen writes, “Benedictine houses also had an ancient association with fairs and markets, a point in need of further study. When economic growth accelerated in the course of the eleventh century, this association put abbeys in a prime position to take advantage of it.”⁴⁹ Monasteries were not merely spiritual institutions; they were also powerful lords who engaged in social and economic activities with the wider world.⁵⁰ Studying the texts monks produced in isolation from the other parts of society in which they participated tells only part of their story. This study tries to fill such historiographic gaps by taking a more holistic approach to the monastic context.

Finally, this study functions within what might be called a boundary of perspective; like the previous boundary, this is expansive rather than limiting. As already noted, this work tries to get away from approaching evidence of Christian-Jewish interaction with the assumption that the relations and attitudes it details were defined by animosity. This is not to say that resentment or enmity were absent from the relationship between the two groups or even that such feelings were not a vital aspect of their shared existence. It is to suggest, however, that such animosity was never the only, and not always the most important, component either of that relationship or of the impressions the two communities had of each other. Even during some of their most tense moments, Jewish-Christian relations in the high medieval Empire were complex and tended toward

⁴⁹ Van Engen, “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered,” 279.

⁵⁰ On this aspect of monastic existence, see also Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-century Burgundy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

mutual ambivalence. Getting away from a singular focus on animosity and persecution is a necessary prerequisite to a fresh, original interpretation of this topic.

CHAPTER 1

REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 1: PRIVILEGED NEIGHBORS

1.1 Privilege in High Medieval Society

Between the massacres of the First Crusade and the series of persecutions that began in the 1280s and eventually erupted into larger conflagrations like the Rintfleisch, Armleder, and Black Death Massacres, Jews and Christians in the German empire were able to coexist peacefully, with only a few minor, local conflicts marring the otherwise harmonious record. That the Jewish-Christian relations in Germany during this period were relatively peaceful is a feature of that history to which scholars have paid very little attention.¹ It seems the First Crusade massacres that began this period and the large conflagrations that concluded it—to say nothing of the influence of the Holocaust on historical analysis—have overshadowed the calmer period in the middle and led scholars to believe that persecution simply continued throughout the era. Reasons for this calm situation have received even less treatment. One goal of this chapter is to begin to

¹ The most notable exception is Jonathan Elukin's recent study *Living Together, Living Apart*, though the stance and tone of that work are a bit too bold and somewhat controversial. Robert Chazan's recent *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* also moves in this direction, although his approach is much more careful—a probably much more prudent—than Elukin's. Of course, the groundwork for seeing medieval Jewish-Christian relations in terms other than persecuted and persecutor was laid by Salo Baron, who argued against the “lachrymose” interpretation of Jewish history. He offered his version of Jewish history most fully in his mammoth *Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times* (New York: Behrman House, 1961) is also highly influential in moving the historiography toward actual relations between Jews and Christians, although Katz's work deals mostly with the perceptions of Jews and Christians, rather than their real social and political interactions. Baron's and Katz's view is in large part a reaction against the version of Jewish history written in grand narrative format in the late nineteenth century, most notably in Heinrich Graetz's *Geschichte der Juden*.

explain why this situation was able to exist for nearly two centuries after some of the most destructive persecution episodes of the medieval period. In the process, it will seek to lay out the political, legal, and social context wherein monastic interactions with Jews and monastic reactions to Jews—the subjects of subsequent chapters—took place; this is, for purposes of this work, an even more important task than the first, but it will be seen that the two inquiries go hand in hand. Such an exercise is also a necessary prerequisite to an investigation of monastic ideas about Jews, since this dissertation seeks to compare social *realia* with internal dialogue, the outward perspective of the monastery with the inward. To understand how real interactions with Jews influenced or challenged intellectual conceptions of Jews, one must first understand the environment in which those interactions took place.

As this dissertation is concerned with the relationship between two communities that carved out places for themselves in the social and political landscape of Europe in the High Middle Ages, it is absolutely vital to investigate the institutional underpinning of those positions. The key institution for both Jews and monasteries, one that has been all too commonly neglected or misinterpreted by scholars who study Jewish-Christian relations, was privilege. More than any other factor, privileges granted and backed up by secular and ecclesiastical authorities produced the relatively calm, peaceful living circumstances of the Jews in this period, as well as the conditions wherein Jews and monasteries interacted with one another.

Privilege was an institution—one might also call it a custom or a practice—of massive importance in the Middle Ages, and indeed in the entire pre-modern period of European history; it largely defined the legal, social, and political status of some of the

most recognizable groups and communities in the Middle Ages, including monasteries and Jewish communities. One scholar defines it thus: “The tradition of *privilege* concerns special rights or ‘liberties’ belonging to people by virtue of their occupation, pedigree, legal status, or place of residence.”² Privileges were oral traditions in earlier eras, but, with the rise of literacy and the increasing use of written records in the high Middle Ages, they were ensconced in documents called charters. Both secular and ecclesiastical authorities issued privileges to a wide variety of individuals and communities (or other collective bodies) in pre-modern Europe. Towns, guilds, churches, monasteries, noble individuals and families, and many other groups or persons received privileges. Some recipients of privileges were also granters of privilege; they received them from some authorities and granted them, as authorities themselves, to other groups. Although the practice of issuing privileges extends back to earlier eras (and indeed descends from the patron-client relations so vital to the Roman world), the actual use of the term “privilege” increased until it became nearly ubiquitous in the High Middle Ages “both in canon law and in secular writing-offices,”³ as written documents became the basis for legal claims.⁴ Alain Boureau notes, for instance, that the *Liber Extra*, the

² John Bell Hennemann, “Nobility, Privilege and Fiscal Politics in Late Medieval France,” *French Historical Studies* 13 (1983): 2.

³ Alain Boureau, “Privilege in Medieval Societies from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries, or: How the Exception Proves the Rule,” in *The Medieval World*, ed. Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (London: Routledge, 2001), 622.

⁴ In the most thorough study of this development, M.T. Clanchy notes that charters had become standard in many villages in England by the thirteenth century. He notes, “In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as far as titles to property among laymen were concerned in particular, the balance in England had shifted from memory to written record.” He also suggests that this transition occurred a bit earlier on the continent. M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 53.

authoritative 1234 canon law collection, expounds at length on the nature of privilege.⁵ Moreover, the volume of privileges issued by both ecclesiastical and secular authorities increased dramatically in this era when the “two swords” were trying to gain the political upper hand in and define the legal norms for medieval Christian society. Both sides in the conflict between church and state, and in other quarrels, used privilege to secure important allies in their struggle against their enemies. Hence, the character and content of privilege varied among different authorities, yet the goal of establishing networks of loyal, lawful subjects was the same in all cases.⁶

To confer a privilege, one simply needed to have legitimate authority in the eyes of the persons requesting and/or receiving the issued privilege. Lords and prelates of even relatively low status could feasibly issue privileges, and their subjects would seek those privileges if they felt that obtaining such would protect or advance their interests. Of course, the higher or more prestigious the authority, the more effective and sought after were their privileges. Concerning papal privilege, John Moore explains that people traveled to Rome, often at the very beginning of a papal reign, because “they believed the pope to be the highest ecclesiastical authority and also the closest thing there was to a universal Christian authority, so his stamp of approval on the rights, privileges, or properties they claimed was the best form of authentication available to them.”⁷ Kings and emperors in this period entertained similar audiences from the people of their realms,

⁵ Boreau, 622. He notes that “the whole of Book V, title 33 is devoted to it.”

⁶ Ibid., 622-623. Boreau points out that the volume of privileges issued by the papacy increased five-fold between the tenth and eleventh centuries and doubled from the first half to the second half of the eleventh century.

⁷ John C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/61-1216): To Root Up and to Plant* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 39.

so much so that they appear to have developed shortcuts to the established system of privilege affirmation. By the twelfth century, it became common practice for the German emperors to issue blanket charters affirming or reaffirming the privileges granted to various constituencies in the Empire, including monasteries and Jewish communities. The pope and other authorities adopted similar practices.

The privilege relationship—between the granter and the recipient—was reciprocal. As Boureau explains, “Privilege was essentially a collective thing, involving the exchange of service for remuneration that could be fiscal, material (especially consisting of landed property), or symbolic.”⁸ The basic political and social relationships between propertied individuals and collectives were thus privilege relationships, but privilege extended far beyond the various degrees of royalty and nobility to include other individuals and communities, including Jews and monasteries. The agency and initiative of the recipients, even more than the prerogative of the granters, was the key element in the granting of privileges. Authorities did not make such grants arbitrarily. Rather, individuals and collectives, including monasteries and Jewish communities, sought out and incentivized—and probably in many cases cajoled, pestered, bribed, or perhaps even blackmailed—their superiors into conferring privileges on them. In turn, the recipients became subject to the terms and jurisdiction of the privilege-granter, but they were willing to pay that price in exchange for the guarantees they obtained.

One may discern the motives and incentives involved in the establishment of these privilege relationships by looking at the sorts of guarantees made in the privileges themselves. Susan Reynolds writes the following about collective action in towns,

⁸ Boureau, 622.

although I believe these trends extended to other communities, including Jews and monasteries:

“Once townspeople had the common interests, the confidence, and the influence to negotiate with their rulers or with anyone else, then they could do so on whatever subject they wanted, asking for confirmation of their customs, restriction of their dues, or even, if they were ambitious enough, for entirely new privileges. What would limit the success of any town community, whether it worked through a guild or through its normal assembly, would not be its lack of formal constitutional machinery or legal standing but its lack of political and economic muscle.”⁹

Reynolds here suggests that independence—whether legal, economic, or political—was among the most common guarantees sought after and spelled out in privileges. As another scholar explains, “The content of these privileges signaled major social and political changes, for it was through grants of privileges to communes or to monasteries that local ‘liberties’ were constructed.”¹⁰

Alongside independence or exemption, the most common guarantee found in high medieval privileges was the lord’s promise to protect his privileged subjects. This was especially important for monasteries and Jewish communities, since neither had arms, organized militias, or any other means of defending themselves. Indeed, the need for protection both from armed assault and from levies, bribes, forced services and the like almost certainly constituted one of the most common reasons for seeking out privileges from secular lords, particularly those who commanded armies. In his magisterial yet controversial classic *Land und Herrschaft*, Otto Brunner describes this protective relationship. While Brunner writes specifically about the relationship between local lords and their peasants, his comments also seem to capture the kind of relationship that existed

⁹ Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 168.

¹⁰ Boureau, 622.

between emperors or other nobles and their privileged Jewish and monastic subjects. He explains:

“The power of a lord appears variously as lordship, protection, advocacy, stewardship, guardianship—all of which can be thought of as the armed protective hand of a man who was not only legally competent but also in fact capable of protecting the people of his household. As their protector he was their lord; they were subject to his power of command and stood under his grace or favor.”¹¹

The very reputation of a lord depended on his ability to follow through on his obligations to his privileged subjects. By granting a privilege, the lord committed himself to do whatever was necessary to protect. Brunner continues:

Should ever the lord fail to provide this protection, his lordship itself was called into question. The lord was to render protection by fighting feuds when necessary and be standing up for his own and his subjects’ rights in lawcourts, diets, or territorial assemblies. It was up to him to defend his subjects from unrightful judgments and distrains, which meant defending his rights of immunity and the rights of his subjects dwelling in his ‘liberty’ from all intervention by territorial magistrates.¹²

Such protection even required the lord, if necessary, to subject himself to considerable distress. I refer to Brunner one last time:

The seigneur was obliged to protect a peasant prosecuted in enmity by receiving him into the peace of his own house or castle whose peace the enemy was not entitled to break, by guaranteeing his safety should he seek instead the sanctuary of a church or a roadside shrine, or to help him flee if reconciliation failed. Here we see just how important ‘belonging to’ the lord’s household could be to a subject peasant.¹³

While one does not customarily think of Jews and monasteries as being part of such relationships, privileges were, nevertheless, the governing institutions that defined the

¹¹ I have cited here the English translation of the earlier German work. Otto Brunner, *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*, 4th ed., trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 213-14.

¹² *Ibid.*, 219-220.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 221-22.

place of these communities in the broader community of the realm. It was through privilege—or rather through the independence and protection that privilege offered—that both monasteries and Jewish communities were able to achieve protected status and to pursue their own projects and prerogatives in this era.

Despite the obvious importance of this institution in medieval society—for monastic and Jewish communities in particular—it is an element of the Christian-Jewish relationship to which only a few scholars have paid attention. Even those who have drawn reference to Jewish privilege have only hinted at its existence without identifying the vital role it played in medieval Jewish existence and in medieval society in general. In his bold and controversial work, for instance, Jonathan Elukin refers repeatedly to advantageous arrangements worked out between Christian authorities and Jews, but he does not carry out any kind of systematic study of these agreements. Guido Kisch's study of Jewry law in Germany likewise hints at the existence of Jewish privilege but never labels it properly. This chapter thus seeks to flesh out a vital aspect of Christian-Jewish interaction to which other scholars—the few who have referred to these at all—have drawn only oblique reference. Moreover, it does not limit its focus solely on privileges granted to Jews; the comparison of Jewish privilege to monastic privilege provides valuable insight into the necessity and ubiquity of these agreements and places both within the broader political context.

Before launching into an in-depth discussion of monastic and Jewish privilege in the high medieval Empire, it seems necessary to spell out the main arguments of this chapter, implicit though they may be in the conversation thus far. First and most importantly, because Jewish communities and monasteries relied for their very existence

on the institution of privilege in the high Middle Ages, they were peers in multiple senses of the word—social, political, legal, and economic. This argument has been hinted at recently by Elukin, who notes, “In many ways the provisions about Jews remind one of protections afforded monks and clergy. They had a specific and recognized place in these local societies.”¹⁴ Both communities needed and sought after protection from both secular and ecclesiastical authorities, and both communities also sought various kinds of independence or exemption, whether that included the ability to pursue their own economic interests without molestation or merely to pay lower taxes than they had been accustomed to pay in earlier generations. Being privileged peers did not necessarily make them competitors for privilege. After all, authorities did not necessarily have a limited number of privileges to hand out; they granted privileges to whatever individuals or communities provided services that were beneficial to them. Lords considered each case individually. Nevertheless, in my estimation, it is still significant that Jews and monks occupied similar political and social positions in high medieval society. Both communities knew intimately the paths that needed to be trod to survive in this world, and they may have come into contact with, or at least been aware of, each other as they journeyed on said paths.

Although both Jewish communities and monasteries relied on privileges, authorities granted them to monks for reasons that were different from their reasons for conferring them on Jewish communities. This does not negate the idea that Jews and monks were peers, since similar protections and guarantees were made to both groups. Yet it is still important to explain the divergent reasons why these grants were extended.

¹⁴ Elukin, 63.

Privileges were reciprocal in both cases, but the services the monks offered to privilege-granting authorities differed substantially from those the Jews were expected to provide. Authorities considered both services vital; the relative worth of the two probably varied according to the circumstances and needs of the authorities granting the privileges.

Monks were key players in the economy of salvation; as worthy participants in what many considered the ultimate Christian life, they prayed for the well-being and salvation of their patrons. This was the service they performed most often in exchange for privilege. Their prayers were considered by most to be far more efficacious than the prayers of laymen who sullied their lives with worldly activities. Indeed, this had been the monks' key role in Christian society since late antiquity, and monastic privilege—the antecedent of the well-developed, high medieval institution—dates from that era. The development of the doctrine of purgatory in the high Middle Ages added further urgency to the desire for monastic prayers, at least until the middle of the thirteenth century when new religious institutions like the Mendicant and lay religious orders began to gain prestige and fulfill some of the same functions.¹⁵

Jews, on the other hand, fulfilled their reciprocal obligations not in the economy of salvation but in a different economy: the realm of finance and commerce. Authorities granted privileges to Jews because they provided loans, trading contacts, taxes, and other essential financial services. The growth of towns and monetary systems in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries brought Jews into increasing financial prominence.

¹⁵ Some scholars have argued for a decline of traditional monasticism from the middle of the eleventh century. However, John Van Engen argues that Benedictines enjoyed almost unbroken prestige until at least the middle of the twelfth century. See Van Engen's article, "'The Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered." New orders like the Cistercians rose in popularity in the twelfth century, but the cloistered model remained the chief paradigm of the religious life until the rise of the Mendicants in the thirteenth century. It could be argued that the Jews enjoyed a similar trajectory of prestige in the high Middle Ages.

International trading contacts (often, though not exclusively, with other Jewish communities) and access to fluid assets—as well as the Jews’ vulnerable minority status—placed their services in high demand. In fact, before the development of guilds and banking institutions later on in these centuries, Jews were often the only ones who provided such services, at least in the sort of volume desired by powerful nobles and prominent ecclesiastical institutions.

The authorities acknowledged the importance of the respective services offered by these two communities and rewarded them by offering privileges—one of the most important forms of currency available in this world, the surest path to protected status. Monks came to serve as the paradigmatic example of a privileged Christian group, while Jews occupied that position among non-Christians. Although the reasons they were able to obtain privileges were different, then, Jews and monks were still peers within this social order.

Second, I submit that the privilege relationships that Jews entered into were not, or at least not very much, the result of a plot on the part of Christian authorities to subject Jews to abject dependence and servitude. It may be true that emperors, popes, and regional or local authorities felt that Jews should be subservient to Christians or that they should occupy a second-class position in Christian society, but the realization of such desires was never the main driving force behind the privileges these same authorities granted to Jews. Although Jews were in some cases exploited by Christian authorities, even under privileged arrangements, they still entered into and perpetuated these relationships of their own volition. It is not evident that the Jews who lived under these arrangements saw their situation as disadvantageous; if anything, the disadvantage lay in

not having enough privileges from the key authorities in their local and regional settings. It is necessary to underscore this point because scholars have usually assumed the worst about privileges granted to Jews, insisting that Christian authorities only granted protections to Jews in order to exploit them.¹⁶ As Elukin explains, “The association of Jews with royal authorities . . . is often presented as proof of the weak position Jews held in medieval society. On the contrary, such connections with the powerful, including kings, should be taken as evidence of how Jews integrated into medieval society.”¹⁷ I submit that it is necessary to reinterpret these relationships, to search for evidence of mutual benefit, of Jewish contentedness within these privilege relationships, and of the normative nature of such arrangements. The aforementioned first argument of this chapter—that Jewish communities and monasteries occupied similar, privileged positions in the high medieval Empire—serves as the initial and perhaps the best evidence of the normative nature of Jewish privilege.

This second contention engenders a third argument that will be developed partially in this chapter and more fully in the brief interlude that constitutes the following chapter: that is, that privilege worked. With a few notable exceptions, privileges obtained by Jewish communities in high medieval Germany did what they were designed to do. Christian authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical, actually did protect the Jews to whom they granted privileges, even intervening on some occasions to put a stop to localized outbreaks of violence before they became larger conflagrations. Moreover, authorities who issued privileges to Jews followed through on their commitment, even

¹⁶ R.I. Moore is a good example. He opines, “As so often in Jewish history special treatment was dangerous in itself, and what began as a privilege later became the means of oppression.” Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 37.

¹⁷ Elukin, 63.

across several generations, to allow the Jews to pursue their economic interests unhindered, in some cases allowing them near monopolies on certain goods and services. Naturally, the emperors, popes, and other privilege-granters of this era were not always consistent in their approach to their privileged Jewish subjects. Some surely tried to obscure, through propaganda or some other means, their close tie to Jewish communities, in an effort to keep up appearances. The thirteenth century emperors' designation of the Jews as *servi camerae nostrae* may have fulfilled exactly that purpose. Some were even unfriendly to Jews and sought to curtail the effects of or undermine the privileges granted by earlier or other authorities. In fact, it was at least in small part because of unfriendly popes (unfriendly either to the Jews themselves or to the secular authorities—especially German emperors like Frederick II—who were allied with Jews) that the Jews' legal and political position began to deteriorate in the thirteenth century. Yet even these popes kept reaffirming previous papal privileges and stepping in to defend privileged Jews, generation after generation, even in the face of public opinion that was decidedly, increasingly against the Jews' privileged position. Hence, this third argument answers the question raised in the initial paragraph of this chapter. The Jews lived in relative peace and prosperity during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries largely because of the privileges that protected them, that defined their legal and political position in the Empire, and that made them peers with other privileged groups, including the monasteries of that same region.

To flesh out these arguments, this chapter will proceed as follows. First, it will discuss privileges obtained by German monasteries in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, using one monastery as a case study and making generalizations from that example about

monastic privilege. From there, it will turn to the topic of Jewish privilege and will lay out, in chronological fashion, the major privileges granted to Jewish communities in Germany by emperors, popes, and other authorities in this era. To some extent, it will differentiate between privileges issued by secular authorities (including bishops and archbishops in their secular roles¹⁸) and ecclesiastical authorities, popes in particular, because the goals and methods of these two types of authorities, as well as the guarantees their privileges made, were often distinct from one another. This section will also account to some extent for the deterioration of Jewish privilege that began in the middle of the thirteenth century and proceeded apace from that point.

1.2 Monastic Privilege

To understand the motivation behind monastic privilege, one must comprehend the place of monasteries in medieval Christendom. In the eyes of medieval Christians—especially the nobility who endowed monasteries and especially after the Viking invasions produced a great deal of social dislocation—monasteries existed to make intercession with God by offering efficacious prayers on behalf of all Christians.¹⁹ Naturally, monks prayed with particular effort for their founders, patrons, and benefactors. Laymen who founded, provided for, or extended privileges to monasteries often considered themselves unfit to pray for their own souls. That was not their role in the

¹⁸ Cathedral cities were particularly important centers of Jewish settlement throughout the Middle Ages. See Alfred Haverkamp, “Juden und Städte—Verbindungen und Bindungen,” in *Europas Juden im Mittelalter: Beiträge des internationalen Symposiums in Speyer vom 20. bis 25. Oktober 2002*, ed. Christoph Cluse (Trier: Kliomedia, 2004), 76-80. Friedrich Lotter explains, “When dealing with the Jews as overlords of towns, bishops used secular, not ecclesiastical, law.” Lotter, “The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law in the High Middle Ages,” *Jewish History* 4,1 (1989): 32.

¹⁹ On this point, see Barbara Rosenwein, “Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression,” *Viator* 2 (1971): 137.

ordered society of medieval Europe, after all. It was considered more effective to have monks who basked in the holiness of the cenobitic life do the praying. Hence, lay authorities granted privileges to monasteries, at least in part, in order to secure intercessory prayers for themselves and their families. While not all privileges came from lay authorities, many did, and we must consider the motives of those laymen who interacted with monks in the privileged relationship.

Beyond the obvious role monasteries played in the medieval economy of salvation, they also had many practical concerns that led them to seek after privileges. Monasteries were landholders; powerful houses like Cluny, St. Emmeram, and Fulda were among the most powerful lords in Christendom, in the sense that they held vast territories and governed the use of these lands, as well as the people who resided thereon. Such concerns help explain the common practice of obtaining privileges from multiple authorities. Holding land in multiple regions would necessitate holding privileges from all the relevant overlords, as well as more general authorities like the king and the pope. Christopher Brooke explains, with specific reference to Cluny, that “in practice a close relationship with many princes and bishops was needed to preserve the large estates and the numerous churches that Cluny came to rule; over the houses reformed by her, or which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries became subordinate to her, a varying pattern of relationship with kings, princes and bishops came to be established.”²⁰ Many monastic houses in the German empire had similar networks of estates and dependent churches; privileges from the emperor, the pope, and the various, dukes, counts, bishops, and other

²⁰ Christopher Brooke, *The Age of the Cloister: The Story of Monastic Life in the Middle Ages* (Mahwah, N.J.: HiddenSpring, 2003), 103-04.

authorities solidified their hold on these possessions and ensured that their claims would continue through the generations.

With these interests as motivation, monasteries sought guarantees of protection and independence, both political and economic, above all other things. Such desires were much the same as those held by other groups who sought privileges in this era.

Protection was perhaps the most basic and common guarantee, and the idea for some early grants of protection seems to have come from the Peace of God movement of the tenth and eleventh centuries, which phenomenon demanded reverence for and protection of ecclesiastical institutions.²¹ On the desire for monastic independence, a more complex issue, Ludovicus Milis explains, “In order to avoid . . . lay intervention, perceived as a hindrance, and to guarantee spiritual, institutional and economic freedom, immunity was often granted by the rulers. Abbeys and their possessions were removed from the normal secular administrative and judicial framework in order to procure a large degree of autonomy for them.”²² This immunity and autonomy were obtained through grants of privilege, which were granted by secular and ecclesiastical powers beginning as early as the Merovingian and Carolingian eras. The papacy in the high Middle Ages took an interest in granting some monasteries independence from lay overlordship, since such guarantees dovetailed nicely with other papal reform efforts.²³ Still, the goal of these

²¹ On monastic involvement in the Peace of God, see Bernhard Töpfer, “The Cult of Relics and Pilgrimage in Burgundy and Aquitaine at the Time of the Monastic Reform,” in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), 41-57 and Geoffrey Koziol, “Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace in Eleventh-Century Flanders,” in *Ibid.*, 239-258.

²² Ludo J.R. Milis, *Angelic Monks and Earthly Men: Monasticism and its Meaning to Medieval Society* (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell, 1992), 20.

²³ Such papal privileges became increasingly common and achieved a kind of standardized language during the latter half of the twelfth century, as Paul Freedman has pointed out in his study of Alexander

privileges, for the monks at least, went beyond merely ensuring physical protection, freedom from lay interference, tax exemption, legal immunity, clarified jurisdiction, or economic independence. As John Van Engen demonstrates, privilege was a key component of the monastic religious outlook. Privileges allowed monasteries to grasp and retain their position as the “first order of Christian society and the primary exemplars of Christian perfection.” They thus defined the relationship between the monks and the rest of society and allowed the monks “to be in the world and not of it, to represent in this world an ideal and a position of leadership based on denial of the world.”²⁴ Without privileges, monks would not have been able to live the kind of life they considered essential for their own salvation, much less set an example of the true religious life for the rest of Christendom. Although later generations came to criticize their privileged position, monks “and their supporters took [this position] for granted, rarely even bothering to explain or defend [it].”²⁵

Privileges granted to monasteries abound in the vast compendium of high medieval monastic sources. They are found in nearly every cartulary, or *Traditionensbuch* as such sources are called in the German critical editions. In addition, monastic chronicles frequently detailed the property and privilege that particular houses acquired. Accounts of monastic prosperity in these sources constituted proof for their authors that their houses had won victories over the devil and the other enemies of

III's 1165 privilege to the monastery of Sant Pau del Camp in Barcelona. Paul Freedman, “A Privilege of Pope Alexander III for Sant Pau del Camp (Barcelona),” *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 31 (1993): 255-63.

²⁴ John Van Engen, “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered,” 303.

²⁵ Ibid.

Christendom.²⁶ Rather than multiply examples, I will investigate monastic privilege via a single case study. Examining the various privileges granted to one particular monastery over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries should provide sufficient information about how these privileges worked, since they were fairly formulaic. The examples provided here include many of the same guarantees, from many of the same authorities, that can be found in monastic privileges across the empire and throughout the high medieval period.

The monastery in question is the Benedictine house of Reinhausen, near present-day Göttingen. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this house managed to obtain privileges from numerous ecclesiastical and secular authorities and thus enjoyed the favor and protection of several of the most powerful patrons possible. The earliest surviving privilege document from Reinhausen appears to have been a forgery of an earlier, authentic document issued by Archbishop Adalbert I of Mainz in the second or third decade of the twelfth century.²⁷ Therein, Adalbert confirmed gifts (the document did not specify their nature) made to the monastery by its founder, Count Hermann I of Reinhausen-Winzenburg, and, in addition, he granted the monks the authority to

²⁶ Van Engen notes that information about the material success of monastic houses was so ubiquitous in monastic sources of this era “that scholars have begun to doubt their reliability. But the religious outlook of their narratives, written to edify the brethren, is clear enough: the establishment of a prosperous and beautiful house marked the victory of God and his saints over the Devil and his hosts.” *Ibid.*, 289-90. Such emphases are ironic, considering that the same monks who recorded in detail the material prosperity of their abbeys castigated the Jews for their materialism.

²⁷ Forgery of privileges and other legal documents was common practice in this era when written documents were coming to replace oral testimony as the basis of legal claims. Documents were needed to ensure the privileges of the monastery would be upheld, so monks produced documents and passed them off as authentic; in their minds, such documents were just as authoritative as the originals, even if they differed in some details. Concerning monastic forgery, Michael Clanchy writes, “A historian today will say that such a charter is a forgery, as indeed it is, but its makers probably felt that it had been written just like their other charters and chronicles to justify the ways of God to men. As God and the patron saint wished the particular monastic house to flourish, they also wished to provide the means to fight the world with the world’s weapons.” Clanchy, 148.

administer pastoral care for the region—that is, the power to function as priests in receiving confession, officiating at Mass, and attend to other priestly duties.²⁸ Since he was the central authority of the region, the decrees of the Archbishop of Mainz would have had real *gravitas*. However, the monks in the following years continued to obtain privileges from the other authorities of the region. Some of these contained provisions that went beyond those things guaranteed by the Mainz Archbishop.

In October of 1144, Emperor Conrad III issued a privilege to the monastery. This document confirmed, and thus bound the emperor himself to uphold, the privileges issued by earlier authorities, including Udo, the bishop of Hildesheim and Count Hermann, the founder of the monastery.²⁹ Conrad went on to spell out other imperial guarantees. The monastery, he declared, was immune from imperial interference and was indeed free from every “public function and tribute” normally owed to the empire.³⁰ Moreover, Conrad placed the monastery under his personal protection and bestowed upon it the right to participate in markets and exact tolls upon its properties. He even gave the monastery the right to strike its own coins.

In subsequent years, more authorities added their names to the growing list of Reinhausen’s patrons. Archbishop Henry I of Mainz confirmed the earlier episcopal privilege in the late 1140s and echoed the Emperor in inserting clauses about protection into the document.³¹ The powerful Duke of both Saxony and Bavaria, Henry the Lion,

²⁸ *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Reinhausen*, ed. Manfred Hamann, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens im Mittelalter 14 (Hannover: Hahn, 1991), 28-30, no.3.

²⁹ These documents, it appears, have not survived.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 32, no.6. “ab omni functione publica et vectigalibus regni liber sit”

³¹ *Ibid.*, 33-34, no.9.

guaranteed protection and confirmed the rights of the monastery to an itemized list of territories in a document from June 1168.³² Finally, in 1207, Pope Innocent III issued a privilege to the monastery with the same kinds of guarantees as the earlier authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical, who had granted privileges to Reinhausen: that is, he placed the monks officially under the protection of the papacy and confirmed their rights to the lands in their possession.³³ So, over the course of the twelfth century, the monastery managed to secure privileges from every major lay and clerical official whose authority extended in some way to central Germany. So important and comprehensive were the privileges obtained by Reinhausen that Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz in 1217 assembled a committee to determine whether the episcopal privileges granted by Siegfried's predecessors Henry and Adalbert were, in fact, genuine. After examining the written texts, the documents themselves, and the seals affixed to the documents, the committee of three clergymen decided that the privileges were real.³⁴ The record of this investigation constitutes an excellent example of the increased emphasis placed on written records in this era. Later, the same archbishop put his privilege into effect by obtaining disputed properties for the monastery.³⁵ The thirteenth century saw other authorities, most notably Hugo, cardinal of St. Sabina and papal legate, and Duke Albrecht of Braunschweig, issue privileges to the monastery of Reinhausen.³⁶

³² Ibid., 37-39, no.12.

³³ Ibid., 42-43, no.18. Pope Honorius issued a similar declaration in 1218. Ibid., 46, no.23.

³⁴ Ibid., 45-46, no.22.

³⁵ Ibid., 47-48, no.26.

³⁶ Ibid., 58-60, 62-63, nos.46-48, 52.

In addition to demonstrating the kinds of guarantees—protection and independence foremost among them—that the authorities made to monasteries in this era, the Reinhausen privileges also reveal the identities and goals of the various authorities who issued privileges, and, in a sense, competed for the clientage of monasteries and other institutions in the high medieval empire. Issuing privileges was a bit like investing in stock for the secular and ecclesiastical officials of the realm and of Christendom in general. Revenue for the privilege-granter usually came in the form of taxation or some other kind of monetary obligation. Even though privileges often specified tax exemptions, these were not always exemptions from the taxes levied by the granter of the privilege but rather from *other* authorities who might claim the power to tax the monastery in question. Still, exclusive taxation of monasteries was not the primary motive behind granting them privileges. The more important form of revenue for the privilege-granting authority was the prestige and honor that came from having a network of dependents, especially those like monasteries who were revered in their own right. It was for this reason above all that authorities reached out to monasteries and other dependents. Privilege cost these authorities effort, money, and potentially injury or death if armed struggle was necessary to protect the privileged entity, but the potential profit outweighed the risk. Privilege relationships also yielded benefit in the form of loyalty in times of crisis or dispute. In a world where emperors competed and fought frequently with popes and where conflicts between regional and local lords often mimicked these more general disputes, these various authorities needed allies. In obtaining privileges from a variety of lords, some of whom were in conflict with one another, monasteries were attempting to navigate this complex, competing system of loyalties, perhaps hoping

that they would never be called on to take sides. They were, in this respect as in others, like the Jews, who also manipulated rivalries to secure protection and independence through privilege.

1.3 Jewish Privilege

In his recent, revisionist study of the Jews in Medieval Europe, Jonathan Elukin explains that the formative changes of the eleventh century—most notably the movement to rid the church of secular influence—actually allowed the Jews to fashion a place for themselves in Christian society. Elukin notes that church reform fostered “a sense of society as divided into separate spheres or at least, contested spheres of influence,” some of which lay outside the pale of Christian influence. It was in these spheres, in the interstices between competing powers, says Elukin, that the Jews dwelt: “These changes allowed Jews social space for their own identities even in an increasingly Christian world.”³⁷ Elukin thus proposes not that Christians placed Jews outside of society, but that the Jews themselves managed to find a niche within that society, nestled between competing factions. This opinion stands, of course, in stark opposition to the influential arguments of R.I. Moore, that church reform and the other related changes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries led to the establishment of a “persecuting society” that defined itself over against outsiders like Jews, heretics, and lepers, who were, as a result of these definitions, excluded and persecuted by the majority culture. Though bold and perhaps insufficiently substantiated in his work, Elukin’s revision is a necessary one, and the privilege documents extended to the Jews of the German lands in the late eleventh through the mid-thirteenth centuries support its general sentiment. Although scholars

³⁷ Elukin, 54.

have paid disproportionate attention to a handful of persecution episodes from the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Empire, the German Jews of that era enjoyed an almost unbroken peace.

Recognizing the divisions created in Christian society during the investiture contest, the Jews of German lands adopted a policy of divide-and-conquer, or rather divide-and-exist. Over the course of the high medieval era, the Jews of Germany obtained privileges from many and various authorities in the Empire, including, at times, prominent members of both sides of the investiture conflict and other church-state disagreements. Jews negotiating on behalf of their community proved to be quite shrewd in their ability to perceive and exploit the divisions within Christianity for their own protection and economic well-being. This section, the longest of this chapter, will be devoted to a recounting and analysis of privileges extended to the Jews of the Empire. It will look first at the privileges granted by secular authorities, including clergymen acting as secular lords, then turn its attention to those issued by the pope and other ecclesiastical authorities. Its argument, as noted before, is that these privileges did what they were meant to do: that is, they protected Jews from widespread persecutions and even most localized persecutions for nearly two hundred years, from the massacres of 1096 to the penultimate decade of the thirteenth century, when the Jewish situation in the Empire took a definite turn for the worse.

The first, or at least the earliest extant, privilege that German Jews secured in this period was issued by Emperor Henry IV to the Jews of Worms in 1074. This was actually part of a broader privilege to all the burghers of Worms, relieving them of paying a customs duty ordinarily imposed on the inhabitants of imperial cities, including

Frankfurt, Boppard, Dormund, and Goslar. This guarantee augmented trade and gave the city's merchants, Jews among them, an advantage over competitors from other locales. The reason for this act, according to the imperial proclamation, was to reward the citizens of Worms, including the Jews, for their loyalty.³⁸ Given the context of recent events, this reward makes good sense. Six months before the January 1074 privilege, Henry had to flee to Worms from the Harzburg, where he had been besieged by a rebel force under the command of the supporters of Anno of Cologne, Henry's longstanding nemesis in imperial politics. Since he could not match the rebels' superior force in the north, Henry withdrew to the traditional Salian power base of Worms, where he received aid from the townsmen.³⁹ The privilege mentions the Jews specifically as beneficiaries of this tax exemption; from that we may surmise that the sizable Jewish community of Worms provided the vulnerable king with financial aid during this time of weakness and uncertainty. It should also be noted that this privilege was extended shortly after the papal election of Gregory VII, and a sense of impending conflict with the pope may have prompted Henry, still a young emperor, to seek allies against the reforming ambitions of the Roman pontiff. After all, just before his death, Gregory's predecessor Alexander II had excommunicated several of Henry's closest allies.⁴⁰ Henry extended an olive branch

³⁸ MGH DD 6.1.341-343, no.267. Aronius 67-68, no.162. Aronius's *Regesten* (first published in 1893 with later iterations in 1902 and 1970) is an invaluable reference work for the study of high medieval German Jewry. It contains abstracts of hundreds of medieval documents that refer to Jews. Where possible, I have followed these abstracts into critical editions.

³⁹ Alfred Haverkamp, *Medieval Germany 1056-1273*, trans. Helga Braun and Richard Mortimer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 110-111.

⁴⁰ Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 110; Ian S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 399.

to Gregory immediately upon the election of the latter,⁴¹ but his courting of other allies seems to have been a kind of insurance in case his effort to make nice with the pope went awry.

Whatever Henry's motivation may have been, there is no doubt that he considered the Jews to be good allies. Indeed, of all the provisions granted in privileges to the Jews by Henry IV, economic guarantees of this sort are the least surprising. Henry knew he could count on the Jews' financial support in a crisis if he gave them leeway in their commercial affairs at other times. Throughout his reign, Henry was surrounded by enemies—popes, dukes, bishops, and others—who threatened to undermine or even remove his authority as emperor.⁴² Consequently, he sought what Siegfried Wittmer calls “problemlose Bundesgenossen,” loosely translated as “allies who contributed much but demanded little in return.”⁴³ The Jews were the group who fit this description most closely, since, through their intimate involvement in trade and finance, they possessed considerable liquid wealth, while all the while living at the mercy of the Christian majority. Jews were willing to spend a great deal of money to ensure their physical protection and commercial privilege, and the emperor had both the means to protect them

⁴¹ Ibid., 400. Henry sent a letter admitting to simony in September 1073 and did penance for this sin in the presence of papal legates the following April. This gesture brought a temporary alliance between pope and emperor; it endured, of course, only a short time.

⁴² It goes almost without saying that a vast amount has been written on the so-called “Investiture Controversy.” Among the more authoritative works on the subject are Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy*, her own translation of her earlier German work *Die Investiturstreit* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1982), and Gerd Tellenbach's classic work *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R.F. Bennett (Oxford: Blackwell, 1940).

⁴³ Wittmer explains, “Zeitlebens musste [Heinrich] sich mit Päpsten, Herzögen und Verwandten auseinandersetzen. Deshalb benötigte der von Problemen gequälte Kaiser *problemlose Bundesgenossen und potente Geldgeber*. Das waren die Juden. Weil sie isoliert inmitten einer christlichen Umwelt lebten, suchten sie Schutz.” Siegfried Wittmer, *Jüdisches Leben in Regensburg vom frühen Mittelalter bis 1519* (Regensburg: Universitätsverlag, 2001), 19. Emphasis added.

and the need for wealth. This special economic arrangement would ultimately benefit both parties, though it would come to define in many respects the terms of Jewish existence in the empire. The emperors, it seems, saw the Jews foremost as a financial means to shore up their own, often-tenuous position in the empire they governed.⁴⁴ Still, since this unbalanced alliance did bring protection to the Jews, they were willing to hold up their end of the agreement. Later privileges demonstrate their continuing importance to Henry's reign.

In the later eleventh century, Jews were able to obtain privileges from sources outside of the emperor. Local and regional authorities also found it in their interest to grant privileges to Jews. Perhaps the best example of this trend is a 1084 document issued by Rüdiger, the bishop of Speyer. Rüdiger began the privilege by offering an explanation for his actions. "When I made a town out of the village of Speyer," he remarked, "I estimated that I would increase the honor of the place a thousand-fold if I should also gather the Jews there."⁴⁵ This shows the reputation the Jews had for their ability to bolster commerce and otherwise contribute to the wellbeing of towns. In exchange for the "honor" they would bring to the city and the three and a half pounds of annual tax levied against them, Rüdiger promised the Jews an environment wherein they could thrive. Along with acquiring real estate for a Jewish neighborhood, he issued a number of economic privileges that gave Jewish merchants great freedom to pursue their

⁴⁴ Such financial arrangements between the Jews and the crown existed in other places as well. For France, see William C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews*, especially chs. 4, 8, and 9. For England, see, among others, the collection *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, ed. Patricia Skinner, especially the articles by Joe Hillaby, Robert Stacey, and Robin Mundill. Mundill's *England's Jewish Solution* remains the most thorough study of the relationship between the English kings and their Jewish subjects, though its chronological scope is limited.

⁴⁵ Aronius, 70, no.168. "Cum ex Spirensi villa urbem facerem, putavi milies amplificare honorem loci nostri, si et Iudeos colligerem."

business interests. Specifically, Rüdiger granted them the power to exchange gold and silver—currency in other words—without paying any kind of exchange fee. He also allowed Jews from outside of Speyer to stay in the city free of charge; since it is likely that most Jews traveling between cities were merchants, this represented another stimulus for Jewish economic activity. Finally, he also permitted Jews to sell meat that they had slaughtered but considered unfit for use—meat that did not meet kosher standards, in other words—to Christians, thus opening up another potential source of revenue.

In addition to granting these economic privileges, the bishop placed the Jews under his personal protection. This extended beyond mere oath, for he built a wall around the Jewish neighborhood. He also allowed the Jews to police their own neighborhood, and he permitted the head of the Jewish community to lead his own judicial system, “that he may judge every quarrel which might arise among them or against them.”⁴⁶ Moreover, in a controversial statement, at least given longstanding church proscriptions, Rüdiger allowed the Jews to hire servants from among the Christian population. Finally, he gave the Jews some of the land allotted for the church cemetery to use for their own burial ground, thus permitting them to remain in keeping with Jewish Law.

These provisions are unmistakably the result of the Jews’ brokering of the terms of the privilege. In fact, a Hebrew document from the same period detailed the rationale behind the Jews’ settlement in Speyer. Its author noted that some of the Jewish inhabitants of Mainz decided to settle in Speyer after their neighborhood in Mainz was destroyed by fire and after they had trouble with the townspeople of Mainz. He went on

⁴⁶ Ibid. “ita archisynagogus suos omnem iudicet querimoniam, que contigerit inter eos vel adversus eos.”

to explain that the Jews went to the bishop of Speyer, who, after granting them a warm reception, “gave us a place in the city and expressed his intention to build about us a strong wall to protect us from our enemies, to afford us fortification.” Concerning bishop Rüdiger, this Jewish author remarked that “he pitied us as a man pities his son.”⁴⁷ This is compelling evidence not only of the Jews’ reliance on privilege, but also of the close relations that sometimes existed between privileged Jews and their overlords.

This strategy of inviting Jews into a town and extending them privileges so that they might provide special services was a fairly common practice throughout the period in question. Authorities invited Jews to settle particularly during the foundation and building of new towns, a frequent occurrence in this period of land-clearing and territorial expansion.⁴⁸ When Duke Ludwig of Bavaria, for example, founded the town of Landshut in 1204, he not only settled and extended privileges to necessary laborers and craftsmen, but also made sure that the town would have Jewish residents, “who provided money for usury to the inhabitants.”⁴⁹ This was an essential service for a town that needed capital in order to build and expand. Rulers like Ludwig recognized that Jews could muster the funds necessary for such an undertaking; extending privileges was the accepted way to entice a person to move to a new place and put their resources to use.

The Jews of the important Rhineland cities managed to extend their guarantee of protection and their trading privileges in the years following the 1084 privilege. This

⁴⁷ This translation is from Robert Chazan, ed., *Church, State, and Jews in the Middle Ages* (West Orange, N.J.: Behrman House, 1980), 59. The Hebrew edition is Abraham Habermann, ed., *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarfat* (Jerusalem, 1945), 59-60.

⁴⁸ The most compelling study of this historical trend remains Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

⁴⁹ Aronius, 162, no.365: “Iudaeus, qui incolis pro usura pecunias accommodavit.”

effort culminated in privilege grants by Emperor Henry IV to more of the Empire's Jews in the year 1090. In two separate documents, one to the Jews of Speyer and another to the Jews of Worms (both of which drew upon Carolingian and most likely Ottonian precedents), Henry made a series of promises to the Jews of those cities. A comparison of the two documents reveals the Jews' ability to exploit the divisions in Christian society in order to secure a safe place for them to live and conduct business.⁵⁰ Specifically, the Jews appear to have used their position with the emperor to distance themselves from the bishop of Worms on the one hand and to make closer their relationship with the bishop of Speyer, who was already their own close ally, on the other hand.

In the Worms privilege, the emperor placed the Jews of that city under his personal protection and sovereignty; this assumption of responsibility purposely excluded the bishop of Worms from assuming jurisdiction over the Jews or meddling in the Jews' affairs. At other points in the document, Henry reiterated clearly that the emperor was the final authority in all matters pertaining to the Jews and that they were not subject to the authority of the bishop or other church officials in the city or region. He also gave Jews power to adjudicate their own legal cases; the "bishop of the Jews," was to be the judge in all such proceedings. However, the Jews could appeal any case to the emperor, not the bishop or another local authority, if the local Jewish judiciary could not reach a decision. Henry decreed, moreover, that the Jews were allowed to employ Christian servants and wet-nurses and that "neither the bishop nor any other churchmen" could

⁵⁰ Lotter, "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law," 32. Lotter notes the difference between the two privileges, remarking that in the case of Speyer, Henry placed the Jews of that town under the protection of the bishop; "whereas in Worms the bishop's position was disputed, and so the king himself claimed to protect the Jews." Ibid. On the tradition of Jewish privileges extending back to Carolingian times, see also Alexander Patschovsky, "The Relationship between the Jews of Germany and the King (11th-14th centuries). A European Comparison," *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 194-197.

forbid them to do so.⁵¹ It is difficult to discern Henry's rationale for excluding the bishop of Worms from any involvement in the Jews' affairs. Adalbert of Saxony, the Worms bishop, appears to have been a supporter of Henry in the early stages of the Investiture Controversy; a January 1076 synod held at Worms, for instance, declared episcopal support for the emperor and condemned the actions of Pope Gregory VII.⁵² It may be the case that relations between emperor and bishop took a turn for the worse in the interim, but the Jews of Worms may also have put pressure on the emperor to free them from episcopal interference. Indeed, the bishop of Worms may simply have been less friendly to Jewish interests than his counterpart in Speyer. Whatever the reasons, Henry showed a willingness to assume authority over and responsibility for the Worms community.

The Speyer privilege was very different in its treatment of the presiding ecclesiastical official in the region. Henry decreed at the outset, "May it be known that certain Jews . . . came into our presence at Speyer and asked that . . . we receive and keep them under our protection. . . . Therefore, we command that this, our authority, through the intervention and petition of Huozmann, bishop of Speyer, be conceded and given to [the Jews]."⁵³ In other words, the bishop of Speyer (the same one who issued the 1084 privilege—Huozmann appears to have been the surname of Rüdiger) negotiated the terms of this imperial privilege. This was perhaps another part of the bishop's strategy to

⁵¹ MGH DD 6.2.549, no.412. "liceat eis ancillas et nutrices christianas habere et christianos ad opera sua etc. nec hoc contradicat episcopus vel aliquis clericus."

⁵² Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy*, 121.

⁵³ "Notum sit, qualiter quidam iudei . . . venerunt in presenciam nostram Spire et rogaverunt, quod . . . sub tuicionem nostram reciperemus et teneremus. . . . Propterea per interventum ac petitionem Huozmanni Spirensis episcopi hanc nostram auctoritatem eis concedi et dari iussimus." MGH DD 6.2.546, no.411. It should be understood that such grants of protection were quite common. The German emperors of this period brought under their personal protection a variety of entities, though mostly those who did not possess the means to protect themselves. Religious houses were the most common communities to enter into this type of arrangement. See, for instance, *Ibid.*, 606-608, no.450 and 621-622, no.460.

attract the Jews and their commercial might to his city, as well as a part of the Jews' strategy to tie themselves even more closely to their strongest ally. Respecting this existing, productive relationship, Henry allowed the bishop to occupy a middle position between the Jews and the emperor. Unlike in the Worms privilege, for instance, Henry gave the bishop power to hear appeals in legal cases involving Jews, rather than allowing the Jews to take such cases directly to the emperor. Again, this seems to have been done with the counsel and permission of the Jews themselves. Such an arrangement is also indicative of the close relationship between the Salian emperors and the bishops of Speyer, an alliance that began with Conrad II's decision to build the cathedral of Speyer as a necropolis for the Salian rulers.⁵⁴

Apart from the difference in the role assigned to the clergy, the two documents are nearly identical. In both privileges, the emperor promised protection of various sorts (e.g., from bodily harm, unjust legal prosecution, etc.), affirmed the Jews' ability to conduct business without interference, and permitted the Jews some measure of self-government. Along with these basic guarantees and certainly at the behest of the Jews themselves, Henry also laid out his policy on the conversion and baptism of Jews, whether forced or voluntary, in both privileges, including the penalty of a twelve-pound fine (paid either to the king's treasury or to the bishop) for Christians who "dare to baptize [the Jews'] sons or daughters against their will" or "baptize those coerced, carried off secretly, or captured with force."⁵⁵ In fact, so great (and, as it turned out, warranted) was the Jews' concern over potential forced baptism that Henry even agreed to special

⁵⁴ See Stefan Weinfurter, *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*, trans. Barbara M Bowlus (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 35-43.

⁵⁵ MGH DD 6.2.546, no.411. Nullus filios aut filias eorum invitas baptizare presumat et, si coactos aut furtim raptos aut vi eorum baptizaverit."

stipulations for those Jews who willingly asked for baptism: “If anyone of them wishes to be baptized of his own free will (*sponte*), they shall be made to wait three days, that it may be determined honestly if they truly reject their own law for the cause of the Christian faith or because of some injury inflicted upon them.”⁵⁶ The emperor also forbade any Jews converting to Christianity from bringing the possessions they held as Jews into their new lives. Conversion thus meant complete loss of property. This provision, again, was unmistakably the result of the insistence of the emperor’s Jewish interlocutors. The timing of these policies is curious and ironic, given the many forced baptisms that took place during the 1096 massacres by the crusading armies. At least some of the crusaders who perpetrated the forced baptisms of Jews must have known of the Henry’s policies on the issue. Hence, their deeds may have been at least partially motivated by willful rebellion against the German emperor, or at least against his policies with which they disagreed.

Detailed and well-intentioned though they were, the privileges granted by the Bishop of Speyer and other regional authorities, and even those provided by the emperor, ultimately proved inadequate during the terrible Rhineland massacres of 1096.⁵⁷ The

⁵⁶ MGH DD 6.2.546-7, no.411. “Si autem aliqui eorum sponte baptizari velint, triduo reserventur, ut integre cognoscatur, si vere christiane religionis causa aut aliqua illata iniuria legem suamabnegent.” The Worms privilege contains nearly identical verbiage. This imperial pronouncement may have had its origin in Talmudic Law. See Lotter, “Talmudisches Recht in den Judenprivilegien Heinrichs IV.? Zu Ausbildung und Entwicklung des Marktschutzrechts im frühen und hohen Mittelalter,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 72 (1990): 23-61.

⁵⁷ For a synopsis of the 1096 persecutions in the various German towns, see Aronius, 179-202. Robert Chazan’s work *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) remains perhaps the best monograph on the subject of the massacres themselves, although a number of influential articles have contributed much to scholarly understanding of these crucial events. See, for instance, the numerous studies of the content and legacy of the Hebrew First Crusade Chronicles, including Ivan Marcus, “From Politics to Martyrdom: Shifting Paradigms in the Hebrew Narratives of the 1096 Crusade Riots,” *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (New York: New York University Press, 1991), 469-483, David Nirenberg, “The Rhineland Massacres of Jews in the First Crusade: Memories Medieval and Modern,” *Medieval*

Hebrew crusade chronicles, which contain the lengthiest descriptions of the famous Rhineland massacres, hint at privilege relations between the Jews and the bishops of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz, in the midst of their lengthy, detailed descriptions of the bloodshed. Of course, one cannot necessarily take these sources at their word. The Hebrew chronicles relied on the traumatic memories of the survivors, so the historicity of the sequence of events they narrated remained subject to the mental scarring of their authors. “History” and “memory” were thus intertwined fundamentally in these chronicles, and scholars are still trying to sort out their exact relationship. Still, even if the narratives recounted in these sources sprang more from traumatic memory than from an objective recounting of events, the fact that the Hebrew chroniclers discussed Christian attempts to protect them is significant. The chroniclers “remembered” their privilege relationships with the bishops and other Christian authorities because these relationships constituted a vital part of their existence.

Since Henry IV was out of the region at the time of the massacres, the bishops of these Rhineland cities, who functioned as both ecclesiastical and secular authorities, were the overlords most directly involved in the events in question. The bishops of Speyer had, of course, issued privileges to the Jews of that community, and the actions of the bishop of Worms and the archbishop of Mainz seem to indicate that they had similar arrangements with their Jewish neighbors, despite the emperor’s claim to full stewardship over at least the Jews of Worms. Whatever the exact nature of their relationships with

Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography, ed. G. Althoff, J. Fried, and P. Geary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 279-310, Jeremy Cohen, “A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade in Jewish Historical Memory, Medieval and Modern,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 9-26, and Chazan’s own book-length study of the chronicles, *God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Chronicles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

the Jews, the bishops of all three of these cities made attempts, though uneven and, in the end, mostly unfruitful, to protect the Jews in the face of the crusader threat.

Of the three cities in question, the crusaders arrived at Speyer first. When they made it to that city and began to attack the Jews, the privilege granted by Bishop Rüdiger and strengthened by Henry IV went immediately into effect. The fullest description of these events is found in the so-called *Mainz Anonymus*.⁵⁸ The author of that chronicle recounted, “When Bishop John [John I of Kraichgau, who had become bishop when Rüdiger died in 1090] heard of [the attacks], he came with a large army and wholeheartedly aided the community, taking them indoors and rescuing them from the enemy.” This action by the privilege-bound bishop—doubly-bound, actually, since he was also the representative of the emperor—effectively saved almost all of the Jewish community of Speyer. He even proceeded to capture and punish some of the perpetrators of an early skirmish in the city, which killed eleven Jews. The chronicler explained that the bishop cut off the hands of the burghers who had joined with the crusaders in the massacre; presumably, the actual crusaders had already moved on before this crackdown. The chronicler also described Bishop John as “a righteous man among the Gentiles, [whom] the Omnipresent One used . . . as a means for our benefit and rescue,”⁵⁹ and he praised the bishop further for doing all of this without accepting bribes from the Jews.

⁵⁸ Chazan declares this chronicle to be “the best and probably also the earliest of the three extant Hebrew narratives.” Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, 42.

⁵⁹ *Mainz Anonymus in Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs*, ed. Eva Haverkamp, MGH Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterliche Deutschlands, vol. 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 2005), 266-67. This translation (and the translation of subsequent passages from the chronicles) comes from *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades*, trans. and ed. Shlomo Eidelberg (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 101.

Unfortunately, privilege did not work quite so well to protect the Jews in the other Rhineland cities.

Worms, home of another privileged Jewish community, had the benefit of forewarning, since the crusaders attacked Speyer first. Still, although local authorities endeavored to fulfill their part of the privilege agreement, they were unable ultimately to protect the Jews in their charge. The Jews' appeal to the bishop of Worms appears to have prompted some negotiation or debate between the two parties, with the bishop ultimately unwilling to accept responsibility for the entire Jewish community. All three of the Hebrew chronicles explained that the Jews split into two bodies. Part of them, including the Jewish leaders⁶⁰, took refuge in the bishop's palace, while the others remained in their homes. This latter group fell victim to the swords and forced baptismal waters first, since they were left exposed, without the bishop's safekeeping. A week after this initial pogrom, the crusaders attacked the episcopal palace as well, killing most of the remaining Jews, including "the notables of the community."⁶¹ None of the three chroniclers explained in detail why the bishop was unable to protect them, as had his counterpart in Speyer. One story from the *Mainz Anonymous* narrative does suggest some frustration with the bishop's impotence, or perhaps with his betrayal. This is the tale of one Simcha ha-Cohen who, when cornered by the crusaders and offered the choice of baptism or death, asked to be taken to the bishop's courtyard, where he claimed he would submit to baptism. Upon arriving there, however, he drew a knife and stabbed the

⁶⁰ The author of the *Mainz Anonymous* explained that "the heads of the community remained there [in the bishop's palace], and most of the community were spared initially." *Mainz Anonymous* in Haverkamp, 284-85; Eidelberg, 103.

⁶¹ *Mainz Anonymous* in Haverkamp, 284-85; Eidelberg, 103.

bishop's nephew⁶² and two other Christians before finally being killed himself. While it is impossible from the evidence in the text to know why he targeted the bishop's kinsman specifically, the circumstances suggest that he was motivated by revenge for the bishop's betrayal of his people.

According to the chroniclers Mainz was the site of the greatest massacre of Jews during the First Crusade. As was the case with the bishop of Worms, the archbishop of the city did attempt to aid the Jews entrusted to his protection. However, two of the chroniclers explained that the archbishop only offered to help the Jews so he could seize their wealth before turning them over to the crusaders. The author of the longest chronicle, attributed traditionally to Solomon bar Samson, explained that the archbishop told the Jews to bring their possessions and assemble in the episcopal palace "so as to herd us together and hold us like fish that are caught in an evil net, and then turn us over to the enemy, while taking our money."⁶³ The chroniclers' criticism of the bishop's court did not cease with that statement. In his narration of the attack on the archbishop's palace, one chronicler noted, "The bishop's people, who had promised to help [the Jews], being as broken reedstuffs, were the first to flee, so as to cause them to fall into the hands of the enemy."⁶⁴ The longest chronicle also narrated the bishop's betrayal of Rabbi Kalonymous, the *parnas* of Mainz, and the last group of Jews left alive and unbaptized after the attack on the city. Even though the bishop succeeded in obtaining safe passage

⁶² The chronicle attributed to R. Eliezer bar Nathan noted that the bishop's nephew was a knight. *Chronicle of Rabbi Eliezer bar Nathan* in Haverkamp, 276-77; Eidelberg, 82.

⁶³ *Chronicle of Solomon bar Simson* in Haverkamp, 292-93; Eidelberg, 24. This last clause seems to be a later addition, since it does not appear in the earlier *Mainz Anonymous*, from which the longer chronicle is partially derived.

⁶⁴ *Mainz Anonymous* in Haverkamp, 320-21; Eidelberg, 109.

of this group out of the city, he subsequently gave them the choice of accepting baptism or meeting their deaths at the hands of the crusaders. Faced with this decision, most of the group chose to take their own lives. Kalonymus himself died while trying to kill the bishop.⁶⁵ This tale may be a later addition, however—the product of different remembrances than those represented in the other Hebrew sources. Indeed, the chronicle attributed to Eliezer bar Nathan mentioned nothing of the archbishop's betrayal and noted only that he managed to take a group of sixty Jews to the village of Rheingau but that the crusaders hunted them down there and killed them. The author of the Mainz anonymous gave the archbishop some of the benefit of the doubt, remarking that “at first it had been his desire to save us, but in the end he turned against us.”⁶⁶ In summary, it appears the archbishop of Mainz did make some attempt to help the Jews; his efforts ultimately failed, and he may have betrayed some of the Jews in the end. That is, at least, how the chroniclers remembered him.

The Hebrew chroniclers also noted that the emperor made some effort, even from his current residence in Italy, to protect his Jewish subjects. The author of the longest chronicle explained that the aforementioned Rabbi Kalonymus sent letters to Henry, begging him to protect them from the threat of a certain Duke Godfrey, who had joined the crusade and sworn to kill the Jews. The chronicler remarked that “the king was enraged and dispatched letter to all the ministers, bishops, and governors of all the provinces of his realm, as well as to Duke Godfrey, containing words of greeting and commanding them to do no bodily harm to the Jews and to provide them with help and

⁶⁵ *Chronicle of Solomon bar Simson* in Haverkamp, 394-95; Eidelberg, 45-47.

⁶⁶ *Mainz Anonymous* in Haverkamp, 294-95; Eidelberg, 106.

refuge.” This may be the reason why the archbishop agreed to aid the Jews in the first place. The order worked initially. According to the chronicler, Duke Godfrey relented and gave up his plan to attack Jews, especially after the Jews bribed him.⁶⁷ Of course, the efforts of Kalonymus were also ultimately in vain, as the community of Mainz became the victims of the worst anti-Jewish massacre of the high Middle Ages. Still, these texts indicate that privilege, both imperial and episcopal, was not absent during the massacres of the First Crusade, as least as the Jewish survivors remembered the events. The authorities who granted privileges to the Jews appear to have made some attempts to follow through on their guarantees of protection, but, with the exception of the bishop of Speyer, their efforts were not enough to counteract the onslaught engendered by this mass movement.

After the slaughters of 1096 the Jewish communities of the German lands lay devastated, their numbers having been either depleted through massacre or compromised by forced baptism. The perpetrators of these murders and sham conversions, a mixed bag of “official” crusading armies and the common folk of the region, changed irrevocably the multi-religious communities of Germany, to which larger and larger numbers of Jews had migrated over the past several decades.⁶⁸ Many of the Jews who survived only did so

⁶⁷ *Chronicle of Solomon bar Simson* in Haverkamp, 296-97; Eidelberg, 25.

⁶⁸ Michael Toch identifies thirteen cities with Jewish settlements; despite the small number of actual communities, several of them held large populations. Toch notes, “As witnessed by the documentation of the 1096 massacres, by the end of the 11th century these few places had come to harbour sizeable communities, reaching in Mainz and Worms a total of a 1000 souls and more. Taking into account the small dimensions of even the most important towns of the period, Jews must indeed have been a very important part of early town populations.” Michael Toch, “The Formation of a Diaspora: the Settlement of Jews in the Medieval German Reich,” *Aschkenas* 7 (1997): 68. Though the Crusade Massacres altered the political situation in profound ways, they certainly did not check the progress of the Jewish population or halt their settlement in more and more towns of the Empire. Alfred Haverkamp explains that “only in Metz, the prosperous center of Lorraine . . . did the pogrom of 1096 seem to have caused the end of a Jewish community.” Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century,” in Signer and Van Engen, 257.

because they submitted to baptism; the shame of conversion, forcible or not, would function as a vital component of their identity henceforth.⁶⁹ The Christians continued to live next to the Jews whom they had either helped to massacre or failed to protect despite desperate appeals. This tension and contention between those who had, before the fateful events of 1096, coexisted more or less peacefully must have been intense.

In the midst of this catastrophe and interreligious tension, Henry IV, who had been bogged down in Italy during the massacres and may have been motivated by guilt at not having protected his Jewish subjects and by anger at the gross violation of his law, took steps to address the obvious concerns of the Jewish communities of his realm.⁷⁰ Foremost among these efforts was the decree that Jews who had been forcibly baptized could return to their native religion without any kind of legal penalty or ecclesiastical censure.⁷¹ For those who were acquainted with Henry's policies toward the Jews, particularly the stipulations in the 1090 privileges about forced baptism, this should not have come as a surprise. By granting Jews permission to return to their mother faith, he was enforcing his own policies, even though, and perhaps at least partially because, those policies contradicted ecclesiastical opinions. As one scholar explains, "When Henry IV

⁶⁹ Two recent works highlight the problems of the survivors, particularly as their shame was manifest in the Hebrew chronicles of the First Crusade Massacres: see Jeremy Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004) and Israel Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), ch.4.

⁷⁰ Friedrich Lotter organizes these imperial regulations into five categories: 1) protection of life and body; 2) protection of possessions and commerce; 3) those concerning servants and slaves of the Jews; 4) protection of Jewish religion and law; 5) procedural law. Lotter, "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewish Law," 34. For a narrative of Henry's actions during and after the massacres, see I.S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 302-303.

⁷¹ The author of the one chronicle noted, "Henricus rex de Ytalia redit, et Iudeis baptizatis iudaizandi ritum concedit." *Annales Rosenveldenses*, MGH SS 16: 102.

subsequently allowed the forcibly converted Jews to revert to their ancestral religion, he probably also wished to redress the blatant infraction of the privileges he had granted.”⁷²

As part of these agreements between the imperial throne and the Jews, Henry also reaffirmed the Jews’ privilege to persist in their customs and chosen professions; these included, but were not limited to, moneylending and trading. In a timely privilege issued from the imperial throne in 1097, Henry announced, “To the Jews of Regensburg, we concede and confirm by royal authority your good customs derived from your predecessors through the grace and favor of our predecessors, namely that you be permitted to sell and collect interest on gold and silver and whatever other metals they wish, according to your ancient custom.”⁷³ This shows that yet another Jewish community—the first away from the Rhineland—was able to obtain a privilege from the emperor in this period.

In addition to aiding the Jews in their attempted return to normalcy after the catastrophic persecutions of the First Crusade, and certainly in an effort to secure more wealth for himself, Henry made efforts to help the Jews recover the property that had been seized from them after the massacres and forced baptisms. The monastic chronicler Ekkehard of Aura, whose work will be examined more closely later in this dissertation, recorded that Henry instigated an investigation at Mainz, the site of the largest massacre,

⁷² Benjamin Z. Kedar, “The Forcible Baptisms of 1096: History and Historiography,” *Forschungen zur Reichs-, Papst- und Landesgeschichte: Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht*, vol. 1, ed. Karl Borchardt and Enno Bünz (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1998), 198-99. See also Lotter, “‘Tod oder Taufe.’ Das Problem der Zwangstaufen während des Ersten Kreuzzuges,” in *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1999), 107-152.

⁷³ MGH DD 6.3.697, no.509. The 1090 decrees had gone into a bit more detail about Jewish possessions, commanding, “De rebus eciam, quas iure hereditario possident *in areis, in ortis, in vineis, in agris, in mancipiis seu in ceteris rebus mobilibus vel immobilibus*, nullus eis quicquam auferre presumat.” These also declared that Jews need not house Christians or provide transportation for them against the Jews’ will. MGH DD 6.2.548, no.412. Emphasis added.

into the whereabouts of lost Jewish property. The Archbishop of Mainz quickly objected to this investigation since the holders of the former Jewish wealth included a number of his relatives. This objection finally forced the archbishop to leave the city in protest. After his departure, many of his contacts within the city informed the imperial inquisitors that the archbishop himself had been a recipient of the goods stolen during the chaos, hence his strong objection to the inquiry and his eventual flight from the city.⁷⁴

Above all other things, the devastated Jewish communities sought protection, both to make certain that the horrors of 1096 would never happen again and to create a protected space wherein they could earn a livelihood. As noted, Henry had put into place a number of protections in the 1090 privileges in order to ensure Jews would be protected either by local authorities or the emperor himself. When these arrangements failed in 1096, the Jewish leaders pressed the emperor for something more permanent. They finally obtained this when Henry established the Mainz Imperial Land Peace.⁷⁵ Following in the tradition of the “Peace of God” declarations of the previous generations and put into place around 1103, this “was to become the cornerstone of law and order in the empire,” and it “was also to serve as a protection for the Jews.”⁷⁶ Henry recognized the need to make protection of the Jews as official as possible, since, as Guido Kisch notes, the massacres “made it clear that the Jews needed protection not merely as merchants or as residents but as non-Christians, exposed to the violence of Christian

⁷⁴ Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicon Universale*: MGH SS 6.209-210; Aronius, 94-95, no.205.

⁷⁵ Such declarations were a common outcome of the so-called “Peace of God” movement. The most thorough study of the movement remains Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *The Peace of God*. See especially the articles by Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier and Christian Lauranson-Rosaz, pp.58-79 and 104-134, respectively.

⁷⁶ Guido Kisch, *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status*, 2nd ed. (New York: Ktav, 1970), 109.

fanaticism and inadequately protected by the mere fact that they possessed a regular position in the social scheme.” As part of this declaration, “Jews . . . received general protection and security,” along with other groups that had no real defensive mechanism—“the churches and clerics and merchants and women.”⁷⁷ With this decree, Henry effectively made Jews an essential component of the “land” over which he ruled. In time, the Land Peace merged with the written privileges to form a solid system of imperial protection for Jews throughout the realm.⁷⁸ Due to the force of Henry’s declarations, the Jews’ protected, privileged position became a vital part—one might say the defining characteristic—of the relationship between Jews and Christians in the empire of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Indeed, this position became much more than a privilege relationship between the Jews and the emperor; it is probably best to refer to it as an entrenched “legal status.”⁷⁹

This privileged legal status granted to Jews by the emperor at the end of the eleventh century persisted through the next several generations. Despite occasional pressure to the contrary by the pope and other ecclesiastical officials, and in spite of dangerous rumors and accusations of Jewish perfidy, most notably a sizable number of ritual murder accusations, the German emperors and other authorities within the Empire continued to take a real interest in protecting and supporting their Jewish subjects. The powerful monarch Frederick Barbarossa was a vital part of this effort, as was his

⁷⁷ Ibid. See above, note 29, for an example of an imperial protection grant to a religious house.

⁷⁸ Lotter explains that “the protective systems of both the privileges and the Land-Peace legislation were combined and supported each other.” Lotter, “The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law,” 33.

⁷⁹ This is Guido Kisch’s chosen terminology. See Kisch, 110.

grandson, the enigmatic Frederick II.⁸⁰ While other emperors, and certainly other authorities in the empire, continued to issue privileges to the Jews, the analysis here will be confined to the two Fredericks, for the sake of brevity.

Shortly after his consolidation of power over the German lands and his coronation as emperor, Frederick Barbarossa confirmed the privileges granted by Henry IV to the various Jewish communities of his realm, even evoking the name of his ancestor Henry in his 1157 proclamation to the Jews of Worms.⁸¹ In fact, the provisions of the 1157 privilege were essentially identical to those of Henry's 1090 privileges; even the amount of the fines levied for wounding, stealing from, or attempting forcibly to baptize Jews remained the same. As in the earlier documents, the emperor promised protection, economic freedom, and a measure of self-government to the Jews.

The privilege arrangement between the emperor and his Jewish subjects remained reciprocal. The emperors of the twelfth century depended frequently on ready Jewish funds, particularly to finance warfare on various fronts. In the case of young Frederick Barbarossa, Jewish support helped him to secure the imperial throne. In 1155, Frederick paid for his coronation by raising a "coronation tax" from the Jewish communities of his realm, or at least those located in imperial cities.⁸² This tax almost certainly funded his journey to Italy to receive his imperial crown from the pope. It may be assumed that

⁸⁰ Other German rulers also granted or reaffirmed privileges to the Jews. As with the declarations of Frederick I and Frederick II, these most often built upon the privileges granted by Henry IV. For instance, in 1116 Henry V confirmed and extended (to several Jewish communities) the freedom from customs in royal cities, a privilege also granted, as noted, to the Jews of Worms by Henry IV in 1074. *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Worms*, vol.1, ed. Heinrich Boos (Berlin: Weidmann, 1886), 52-53, no.61.

⁸¹ MGH Const. 1.226-229, no.163.

⁸² Aronius, 122, no.275. This document referred specifically to Frederick raising a coronation tax in Goslar, which was, and had been since its founding in the tenth century, an imperial city. The Jewish communities in the imperial cities would have been the most likely targets of such measures, since they were the direct subjects of the emperor.

Frederick also used a portion of this money to help pay for his maneuverings in Bavaria in the same period and perhaps even his early campaigns against the lucrative Italian cities, which he attempted to bring into full obedience beginning in the mid-1150s.⁸³ As was the case with his predecessors, Jewish money was vital for the financing of the emperor's projects.

Because this reciprocal arrangement—protection and other privilege guarantees for economic aid—greatly benefited the emperor, Frederick, like his predecessor, was more than happy to give Jews a great deal of leeway in their economic affairs. In an 1182 privilege, Frederick granted the Jews of Regensburg (by that time one of the largest and most well-established of all Jewish communities in the realm) permission to continue their custom of trading goods, most especially gold, silver, and other metals.⁸⁴ Although it was at its root a reiteration of Henry's 1097 privilege to the same community, the language of this privilege is particularly revealing of the emperor's attitude toward the protection of the Jews in his kingdom. Specifically, the document declared that the preservation of the Jewish economic privilege was part of "the duty of his majesty our emperor," the "justice of law," and "the exhortation of reason," all essential components of Roman law.⁸⁵ The emperor further decreed that both imperial majesty and the law dictated that he uphold the rights of all of his faithful subjects, both Christian and non-Christian. The same letter declared that Jews were "recognized as belonging to the

⁸³ See Haverkamp, *Medieval Germany*, 225-231.

⁸⁴ Aronius, 139-142, no.314a. See also Raphael Strauss, *Regensburg and Augsburg*, trans. Felix N. Gerson, Jewish Communities Series (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1939), 36.

⁸⁵ "offitium est imperatoriae maiestatis nostrae et iuris equitas atque rationis hortatio, ut . . ." Aronius, 139, no.314a.

imperial chamber.”⁸⁶ The few decades between the decrees of Henry IV and Frederick I had certainly strengthened ties between the emperor and the Jews of his realm, to the point that Frederick described them with the unmistakable language of possession.⁸⁷ Regardless of the meaning of the emperor’s specific language, the Jews certainly had a hand in strengthening their relationship with the emperor; they did so because they saw the advantages to be gained by it.

These imperial protections reached their most concrete form during the reign of Frederick II. Up until this point, the emperors had bound themselves to specific Jewish communities, with, it seems, a sort of unspoken understanding that these decisions applied to other Jews in the empire. The Land-Peace declarations of Henry IV in 1103 and the reiteration of those decrees by Frederick I in 1179 had promised general protection for a number of groups within those territories, the Jews among them. However, a widespread privilege pertaining to the Jews alone was not necessary, since the Jews only inhabited a select few of the more important cities of the empire. But the first half of the thirteenth century witnessed an exponential increase in the foundation of new Jewish communities within the realm. Michael Toch counts 62 new settlements

⁸⁶ “ad imperialem cameram dinoscuntur pertinere . . .” Ibid. Frederick’s Land-Peace of 1179 had decreed that the Jews, as well as other protected groups (clerics, monks, women, etc.), pertained “ad *fiscum* imperatoris.” From the available evidence, it is difficult to ascertain whether the distinction between *fiscum* and *cameram* was an important one. One may speculate that *cameram*, a term applied only to the Jews in the 1182 privilege, may have indicated a greater intimacy than the more general *fiscum*. “Innovatio Pacis Franciae Rhenensis,” *Friderici I. Constitutiones*: MGH Const. 1.381, no.277.

⁸⁷ Patschovsky argues that this marked the beginning of the idea of Jewish “serfdom,” a legal status that would achieve more concrete legal expression in Frederick II’s 1236 privilege and actual legal realization during the reign of Rudolf of Habsburg in the 1280s. Patschovsky, 203-204, 211-215. As the discussion below suggests, applying the title “serfdom” to the Jewish situation is problematic and misleading.

during that half-century alone, compared to a mere 29 for the period 950-1200.⁸⁸ In short, Jews were on the move during this period, and such migration, both from outside and within the German realm, made a more general privilege necessary. Frederick II made such a decree in the summer of 1236 after the Jews had experienced bitter persecutions in Fulda and the surrounding towns. After proclaiming it the duty of the emperor to protect and uphold all of his subjects, the believers in Christ along with the non-believers, he explained that “the servants of our chamber (*servi camere nostre*) of all Germany beseeched our Highness that we would deign, by our favor, to declare for all the Jews of Germany, the privilege granted by our blessed, august grandfather Frederick, of happy memory, to the Jews of Worms.” Leaving nothing to doubt, the emperor then declared, “We provide for the indemnity and peaceful standing of the Jews of Germany.”⁸⁹ He stated further that all the privileges granted by Frederick I were now in effect for all of the Jews of his realm—that is, “all Jews looking to our chamber.”⁹⁰ Though brief, these statements defined the nature of the relationship between the Jews and the emperor as it had developed by the reign of middle of the thirteenth century.

Scholars have found great significance in this description of as Jews *servi camerae nostrae*, and these same scholars note that this title constituted a special

⁸⁸ Toch, “The Formation of a Diaspora,” 67. On the patterns of Jewish migration involving the German lands, see Toch’s “Jewish Migrations to, within and from Medieval Germany,” in *Le Migrazioni in Europa secc. XIII-XVIII: Atti della XXV Settimana di Studi, 3-8 maggio 1993*, ed. Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Florence: Le Monnier, 1994), 639-652.

⁸⁹ MGH Const. 2.274, no.204. The text reads as follows: “Universi Allemanie servi camere nostre nostre celsitudini supplicarunt, quatenus privilegium divi augusti avi nostri Friderici felicis memorie indultum Wormaciensibus Iudeis et consodalibus eorum dignaremur de nostra gracia universis Iudeis Alemannie confirmare. . . . Nos itaque indemnitati et quieto statui Iudeorum Alemannie providentes.”

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 274-275, no.204.

distinction that would endure in one form or another for centuries.⁹¹ Essentially, goes the argument, the Jews were beholden completely to the emperor; they relied on him for their protection and well-being and in return served in whatever capacity he deemed necessary. Their status within the empire, in other words, was tied irrevocably to the pleasure of the emperor, who saw them as a necessary evil but certainly did not accord them high status.⁹² Other scholars, however, have pointed out that Frederick's description of the Jews as "serfs of the royal chamber" may not be, at least not solely, an indication of their servile status. David Abulafia in particular has argued convincingly against this notion. His summary of the traditional historiography on this issue deserves to be quoted at length:

The clearest statement by modern historians that Jewish 'servitude' can be assimilated to serfdom appears in the free use that has been made by historians of the term 'serfs of the royal chamber' to translate *servus regie camerae*, a term which in any case only came into regular use, as far as can be seen, in the reign of Frederick II, in his Jewry privilege of 1236 and in subsequent privileges conferred by him on the Jews of Vienna, as well as in documents emanating from his administration of Sicily in 1239-40. A past generation of Jewish historians was particularly convinced that the status of the Jews was inherently miserable and characterised by almost continuous persecution; they were therefore inclined to emphasize the negative aspects of this 'servitude.'"⁹³

Abulafia goes on to raise several objections to the notion that Jews were considered serfs, at least in the traditional sense of that distinction. First, he notes that the term *servus* had

⁹¹ Frederick confirmed this label in a 1236 letter to Pope Gregory IX.

⁹² Patschovsky is careful to note that the full implications of this servile status did not become clear until the exploitations of Jews during the reign of Rudolf of Habsburg and, to a much greater extent, during the reigns of Ludwig of Bavaria and Charles IV in the mid-fourteenth century. Patschovsky, 193-194. Frederick II may even have been motivated to declare such a servile legal status by anti-Jewish sentiment, as his 1237 city charter to Vienna seems to indicate. Therein, he remarked that the Jews were worthy of servile status because they killed Christ. See Ibid., 201 and Peter Csendes, "Die Stadtrechtsprivilegien Kaiser Friedrichs II. für Wien," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 43 (1987): 110-134.

⁹³ David Abulafia, "The King and the Jews—the Jews in the Ruler's Service," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, ed. Christoph Cluse (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 45-46.

a variety of meanings in the high Middle Ages. It did not solely mean “serf” in the sense of unfree manor-dweller. The word could also indicate “service,” particularly to the crown, and was sometimes used as a label for servants or ministers of the emperor, especially those who held ministerial status. *Ministeriales* were, of course, unfree knights, but they were often given significant responsibilities, honors, and even lands. Abulafia explains, “In eleventh and twelfth-century Germany, the term *ministerialis* was used interchangeably in the Salian chancery with *cliens*, *minister*, *miles*, *servitor*, *serviens*, and *servus*.”⁹⁴ In other words, Jews seem to have been accorded the same distinction and status as the *ministeriales*, at least by the emperor. While this did have its drawbacks, it was not the base condition denoted by many historians. Abulafia also points out that servitude, particularly of the king or emperor, was considered an honor in this era. Even though the Jews saw themselves primarily as servants of God, “they were happy to act as royal ministers.” Abulafia contends:

“It was not demeaning to serve the ruler. Rather, it was a privilege to do so. And this emerges clearly from the charter in favour of the Jews that the emperor issued in 1236, where he states that those who show themselves favourable to the Jews should not doubt that they act in accordance with the king’s wishes and honour the king through his servants.”⁹⁵

Put simply, the Jews’ status as *servi camerae nostrae* does not seem to have meant what many scholars have assumed it meant.

Abulafia’s revision is a necessary one, but there may be more to this issue than even he indicates. I would like to suggest two other factors that may have played a role in Frederick II’s decision to claim the Jews as his personal servants or ministers. First, it

⁹⁴ Ibid., 46.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 47.

must be remembered that the 1236 document was issued in the aftermath of, and as a response to, the serious ritual murder accusation in Fulda the previous year. This will be discussed in greater detail below, but it is necessary to point out here that the emperor followed his reaffirmation of the earlier privilege and the extension of that privilege to all the Jews of the empire with a declaration of the Jews' innocence and a long, defensive argument against those accusations. By referring to the Jews as his personal ministers, Frederick was essentially decreeing that he would both stand behind and see to the good behavior of the Jews. Calling them his *servi* was thus an attempt both to reassure his other subjects that he was in control of the Jews and to tell those other subjects to refrain from interfering with that relationship.

Second, one must take into account the context of church-empire relations when examining sources like this. Just as Henry IV sought after and privileged Jewish allies to aid him in his fight against the pope, so Frederick II appears to have been making a kind of power play in claiming the Jews of the empire as his personal ministers. When he declared that all Jews “looked absolutely to his chamber,”⁹⁶ he was trying to stake his claim as the sole protector and most important business colleague of the Jews. His label did not represent political or social reality. However, such a claim was necessary for Frederick to make, because the papacy had also granted privileges to the Jews and reaped the benefits that came from such a relationship, as will be examined below. Even though the thirteenth-century popes were increasingly worried about certain provisions guaranteed in Jewish privileges—Christian slaves and servants of Jewish masters, for example—they still made efforts to style themselves the protectors of the Jews of

⁹⁶ “omnibus Iudeis ad cameram nostram immediate spectantibus”

Christendom, and of Germany in particular. A 1247 papal declaration by Innocent IV on the ritual murder charge is particularly revealing of this desire; it may have been written in response to Frederick's efforts to form closer ties with the Jews, or at least to weigh in on the controversy that Frederick had addressed. Though he echoed some of the statements made by Frederick II in his 1236 privilege, Innocent asserted that the German authorities were culpable for the anti-Jewish persecutions taking place within their realm. Directed to the archbishops and bishops of Germany (though it also went to church officials in France), this letter claimed to be a response to "the tearful plaint of the Jews of Germany." According to Innocent, the Jews had complained "that some princes, both ecclesiastical and lay, other nobles and rulers of your districts and dioceses are plotting evil plans against them and are devising numerous and varied pretexts so as to rob them unjustly and seize their property."⁹⁷ Specifically, explained the pope, these authorities accused the Jews of murdering a Christian child each Passover. Innocent reminded his audience of the Augustinian doctrine of Jewish witness and of the Jewish legal proscriptions against killing and touching dead bodies. Essentially, Innocent was merely rehashing old arguments against the now century-old murder charge; the real change here was that the pope was himself accusing the authorities of the realm of complicity in these false charges.

Taken alone, this document seems to indicate that the secular authorities had reversed the privileges they had previously granted to the Jews and decided to persecute them instead. However, it must be remembered that the papacy had for many years been locked in a long struggle with Emperor Frederick II. There is no evidence that either

⁹⁷ ASJ 194-195, no.185; CJ 269-271, no.116.

Frederick or the other officials of the empire had rescinded their long-standing policy of protecting the Jews. If anything, that commitment remained stronger than ever, as Frederick's 1236 declaration and other privileges issued in this era indicate. Innocent's accusations appear to have been part of a papal maneuver, perhaps in response to Frederick's labeling of the Jews as his personal ministers, to wrench the lucrative patronage of the wealthy Jewish communities of Germany away from the emperor and those loyal to him.⁹⁸ That the pope did not mention any specific place where or time when these murder accusations occurred seems to constitute further evidence that the pope was merely attempting to snatch power away from the secular authorities. It may even be the case that the Jews had courted the favor of the pope in the later years of Frederick II's reign, in anticipation of the conflagration that erupted at his death. If that was part of the Jews' thought-process, it was quite a shrewd calculation, as the imperial office suffered an irreversible loss of prestige and power during the Interregnum period that followed Frederick's reign. However, even a close privilege relationship with the pope could not counteract the damage done when the emperor ceased to be their effective protector.

Imperial privileges to Jews had an influence on other areas of the political and intellectual life of the empire, particularly on the development of law. The very protections put into place by Henry IV and subsequent emperors in the privileges they issued to the Jews—especially those spelled out in the Mainz Land Peace of 1103—entrenched themselves in the widely-employed lawbooks of the thirteenth-century Empire: the *Sachsenspiegel*, the influence of which extended throughout the northern part

⁹⁸ See CJ 269, note 1.

of the German lands, and the *Schwabenspiegel*, which was particularly influential in the southern Empire.⁹⁹ It is important to stress that, because these lawbooks were considered so authoritative, local authorities in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries abided by the same provisions that were put into place by the emperors around the time of the First Crusade massacres. Despite occasional persecution episodes against Jews in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the authorities—imperial, regional, and local—persisted in their adherence to the *Landfriede*. By the time of the compilation of the authoritative lawbooks—the *Sachsenspiegel* in the first quarter of the thirteenth century and the *Schwabenspiegel* a few decades later—this peace was simply assumed to be unbreakable. Kisch elucidates, “The authors of both lawbooks consider this peace, from the point of view of law, as something special.” Furthermore, “the special peace was, under all circumstances, an inviolable peace, and its violation carried the penalty of death.”¹⁰⁰

Following imperial and other precedent, local and regional authorities in the twelfth and early thirteenth century often granted their own privileges to the Jews, again almost certainly at the behest of the Jews themselves. The emperor smiled upon such arrangements as long as the terms did not hurt imperial interests, particularly the treasury, in any way. At the establishment of the duchy of Austria, for instance, Frederick I granted the duke of that land the right to administer the affairs of (and presumably to tax) Jews and other moneylenders within his duchy. So long as the duke did not usurp any

⁹⁹ Kisch demonstrates how the language of the 1103 *Landfrieden* was essentially lifted by Eike von Repgow, the creator of the *Sachsenspiegel*. Kisch, 108-110.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 108.

imperial privileges, the emperor agreed not to interfere in his relationship with the Jews of his territory.¹⁰¹

With the privileges in place and with the Jews enjoying protected and sponsored commerce throughout the realm, local and regional authorities jockeyed amongst themselves to secure the lucrative Jewish tax-base and privileged access to Jewish loans.¹⁰² That these local powers desired the right of Jewish taxation is not surprising, since the Jews surely constituted one of the most dependable means of income into which authorities could tap. Because the Jews relied on privilege relationships with the various dukes, prince-bishops, and others for protection, they were unlikely to fail to pay the tax (or even to argue the amount) that essentially comprised their protection fee.¹⁰³ Moreover, due to their wealth, the Jews likely paid more tax than any other element of the community; the fact that certain powers during this period became almost entirely reliant on the Jewish loans and Jewish tax for funding their operations gives some indication of their importance as a taxable community.¹⁰⁴ The care with which

¹⁰¹ Aronius, 122, no.276. On Jewish privileges in Austria during this period, see Klaus Lohrmann, "Der Südosten des Reiches: Jüdische Gemeinden in Österreich, Böhmen und Mähren," *Europas Juden im Mittelalter*, ed. Cluse, 275-276. On this particular privilege, see Harold Steinacker, "Zum Privileg Friedrichs I. für das Herzogtum Österreich (Privilegium minus)," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 11 (1929): 205-239.

¹⁰² Wittmer notes that the successful Christianization of the Slavic lands had, by the early twelfth century, opened up a very lucrative trading network between the west and cities like Kiev, which had access to goods from the Orient. In an attempt to establish a foothold in these eastern markets, many powerful interests (both lay and ecclesiastical) borrowed money from the Jews. According to Wittmer, an annual interest rate of 43% was quite normal for this period. Wittmer, 25-27.

¹⁰³ Often the payments to the authorities were simply spelled out as "protection fees," as was true in the case of the agreement between the Jews and the bishop of Passau. In 1210, having been deprived of possessions through theft, the Jews paid the bishop 400 marks in exchange for protection. GJ 1.266.

¹⁰⁴ This is particularly true for the Jews of England, who, as Robert Stacey recounts, took over nearly the entire loan market in the northern and eastern regions of England after Henry II ruined the businesses of both large- and small-scale Anglo-Norman moneylenders in his realm. The king later confiscated large Jewish estates, particularly that of Aaron of York, in order to collect the revenue from debt payments.

documents from this period detailed Jewish tax information also provides evidence of the importance of the Jewish tax base to the authorities. When they approved Jewish land purchases within their jurisdictions, for instance, city authorities often stipulated the Jewish responsibility to pay taxes like other town inhabitants.¹⁰⁵ It seems authorities were often willing to grant substantial property within their areas of responsibility to specific Jews, in return for the right to tax them in perpetuity.¹⁰⁶ Likewise, charters transferring authority from one party to another carefully spelled out who held the power to tax the Jewish community; the charter of Frederick I granting powers to the duke of Austria in 1156 constitutes a good example of such a transaction.¹⁰⁷ In other cases, Jews acted as guarantors for contracts between various officials of the realm.¹⁰⁸ Such matters will be covered in much greater detail in the next chapter.

Over time, privileges granted to Jews by local or regional authorities became more elaborate, covering every possible contingency and spelling out the rights and

Stacey, "Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England" in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 347.

¹⁰⁵ E.g., the city magistrates of Cologne approved the purchase of a house and land within the city's district by one Minneman, a Jew, with the stipulation that Minneman and his family, including his heirs, would not fail to pay the same taxes that other citizens paid. Aronius, 126, no.292.

¹⁰⁶ Land transfers are excellent sources for gleaning information about both Jewish-Christian interaction and relations between various authorities in this period. An 1170 source, for example, details the three-way transaction between the bishop of Würzburg, the canons of the Würzburg cathedral, and a Jew named Samuel. After procuring a plot of land next to the Jewish school for the cathedral, the bishop transferred it into the hands of Samuel. Instead of purchasing the land outright, Samuel and his heirs were required to pay an annual tax (a peck of wheat) to the canons of the cathedral. *Monumenta episcopatus wirziburgensis*, MB 37.96-97, no.113. Other documents indicate similar transactions: it seems Christian authorities often forced Jews to make some kind of yearly payment instead of purchasing property outright. Cf. Aronius, 128, no.300. This may have been done to ensure a fixed annual income for parties like the cathedral canons.

¹⁰⁷ *Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns*, vol.2, ed. Administrative Committee of the Francisco-Carolinum Museum of Linz (Vienna: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1856), 280, no.187.

¹⁰⁸ For example, a Jew named Teka served as guarantor for Duke Leopold VI of Austria in his 1225 contract with Andreas II, king of Hungary. Brugger, *Regesten*, 1.20-21, no.7.

duties of the Jews and their protectors. The detailed nature of these thirteenth century privileges seems to have come from the Jews' long practice in the art of privilege negotiation. The Jews had, by this point, been bargaining privileges for over a century and a half, and, because of that long experience, they knew how to make such grants ironclad. This elaboration, however, may also be a reflection of the increasingly tenuous position of the Jews in the thirteenth century. Even as papal pressure, ritual murder accusations, and the rise of powerful economic rivals compromised the Jewish position in the Empire both socially and economically, the Jews sought more elaborate, more sure guarantees. The 1244 privilege extended to the Jews by Frederick, the duke of Austria and Styria, is an excellent example of this development.¹⁰⁹ It contained a massive list of thirty items that enunciated every aspect of the official relationship between the duke and the Jews of his duchy. These stipulations covered several major categories of protection, self-government, and economic privilege. Most of these drew on the precedents of earlier imperial privileges, but they were spelled out in greater detail than ever before. The length and specificity of this document seems to reflect a world wherein literacy was on the rise and the use of documents had become the basic standard of legal proof. The majority of guarantees in the charter protected Jewish business, laying down a series of laws that fortified the Jews' ability to collect on pledges pawned to them, even if these items had been stolen before being pawned to the Jews (and with the exception of "bloody or wet garments"—an example of the kind of detail found in this source).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich*, vol.2, ed. Heinrich Fichtenau and Erich Zöllner (Vienna: Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger, 1955), 283-287, no.430; Aronius, 233-237, no.547. The document itself is numbered. The references in the following four footnotes will refer to the numbers within the document.

¹¹⁰ Nos. 1-7, 23, 25, 27-28.

Several of the items guaranteed the Jews the right to govern themselves and carry out their traditions and rituals.¹¹¹ Several more ensured protection of various kinds—against bodily harm, unjust prosecution, and humiliation.¹¹² While a few items did attempt to limit Jewish practices (setting a ceiling on interest rates, for instance¹¹³), the majority promised to protect them from molestation of any kind.

With all of this evidence before us, we can state with some confidence that imperial, regional, and local authorities held close relationships with the Jews of their territories—relationships that were not only mutually beneficial but were also vital to the financial well-being of the realm. The surprising aspect of these imperial, regional, and local protections, given the traditional bent of scholarly literature on the topic of medieval Jewish-Christian relations,¹¹⁴ is that they actually worked, at least for the most part. Localized persecutions, either spontaneous outbursts or those directed by local authorities, did not abate entirely. There exists, for instance, a record of the deeds of Duke Bratislav of Bohemia, who ordered his subjects to plunder the wealth and destroy the homes of Jews who had fled there from the 1096 massacres in Bavaria and the Rhineland, but this seems to have been an isolated incident that resulted from the chaos left by the Crusaders.¹¹⁵ However, because of imperial clientage and its resulting system of protection, Jews did not suffer any persecutions on the level of the First Crusade Massacres until the very end of the thirteenth century, at which point, due to the decline

¹¹¹ Nos. 8, 13, 18, 22, 29.

¹¹² Nos. 9-12, 14-15, 20-21, 24, 26.

¹¹³ No. 30.

¹¹⁴ i.e., given the longstanding focus on persecution.

¹¹⁵ Aronius, 95, no.206.

in effectiveness of imperial privilege and other factors, widespread persecutions unfortunately became the norm.¹¹⁶ Even localized persecutions seem to have been relatively few in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Potential massacres were often defused before they could gain sufficient momentum. During this period, the Jews of the German lands “were not merely a tolerated minority.”¹¹⁷ They were indeed privileged and protected, for they performed vital financial services for the crown, as well as for other important clients—dukes, cities, bishoprics, monasteries, and others. It may well be said that Henry IV, as well as his realm entire, achieved a substantial return on investment, while the Jews enjoyed a peaceful, stable situation wherein they could live their lives and carry out their work.

1.4 Church Policy and the Jews of the Empire

Not everyone accepted or agreed with the provisions spelled out in these imperial privileges without question. This was especially the case for churchmen in the aftermath of the First Crusade. Allowing the Jews to return to their faith, as Henry IV did, constituted an obvious breach of canon law that was made even worse by the fact that a Christian king commanded it.¹¹⁸ Christian baptism, a holy sacrament, could not simply

¹¹⁶ As Michael Toch explains, “Für lange Zeit hatte daneben die tagtägliche Koexistenz das Übergewicht. Periodisch und in zunehmendem Maße wurde sie jedoch durch Ausbrüche der Gewalt der Mehrheit gestört, bis seit etwa 1300 der Konflikt zur Norm wurde.” Michael Toch, *Die Juden im Mittelalterlichen Reich*, 33.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ This was not the only issue upon which the imperial privileges and canon law disagreed. Frederick Lotter notes, “A great many of Henry’s protective prescriptions . . . were not consistent with the corresponding rules of ecclesiastical law, and thus aroused considerable opposition.” He then provides a list of nine questions upon which canon law came into conflict with imperial privileges. Lotter, “The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law,” 34. On the subject of Jewry law in the canon legal sphere, see also Lotter’s article “Zur Ausbildung eines kirchlichen Judenrechts bei Burchard von Worms und Ivo von Chartres,” *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte, Studien zu Ehren von Herbert A. Strauss*, ed. Rainer Erb and Michael Schmidt (Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Autorenverlag, 1987), 69-98.

be undone as if it had never occurred, regardless of the circumstances in which it took place. Rejecting baptism was considered an act of apostasy. Churchmen tried quickly to counteract Henry's decision. Upon hearing rumors of the forcibly-baptized Jews returning to their native faith in southern Germany in 1097, Pope Clement III (who was ironically handpicked as antipope by Henry himself during one of his many disputes with the Roman popes) sent a directive to Bishop Rupert of Bamberg, commanding him to put a stop to this process of apostasy:

“It has been related to us that baptized Jews are being permitted to apostatize and to honor the Jewish rite. Because this is unheard of and absolutely abominable, we constrain you and all of our brothers by the word of God: how great must be your hastening to correct this according to canon law and the precedent of the fathers!”¹¹⁹

Some of the local clergy reacted in similar fashion in the years following the massacres, particularly when they observed the Jews returning to their former religious customs. Frutolf of Michelsberg, for instance, lamented this turn of events in his chronicle, labeling the Jews “dogs” and the synagogue the “vomit” to which they returned.¹²⁰

Despite these objections, however, even churchmen were forced to admit that the Jews were justified in renouncing their unwilling conversions. Some of this submission may have been in reaction to the imperial protections granted the Jews after the massacre; some may even have been a response to the guilt local church officials felt for not protecting their Jewish neighbors better during the actual massacres.¹²¹ Still, whatever

¹¹⁹ Aronius, 94, no.204.

¹²⁰ *Frutolfs und Ekkehard's Chroniken und die anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. Franz Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 108. This identification was obviously not original to Frutolf, but it seemed to him a proper metaphor to describe this brazen breach of canon law.

¹²¹ Robert Chazan contends, “It was the ecclesiastical leadership after all that had initiated the crusade and had attempted to direct it; it was therefore the Church that had to assume the burden of guilt for a

other factors may have existed, there did exist tolerant precedent in the Christian tradition. As scholars have pointed out, Augustine's traditional view that the Jews were continuing witnesses to the truth of Christian scripture and Christian claims, and hence necessary to have around, continued to persist in the minds of Christian thinkers.¹²² His injunction to "slay them not," taken from his exegesis of Psalm 59:12, remained a powerful Christian maxim. Moreover, the balanced policies of Gregory the Great, especially his grants of papal protection to the Jews (i.e., the *Sicut Iudaeis* bulls), continued to serve as the ecclesiastical precedent for dealing with the Jews of Christendom.¹²³ After an initial hard-line stance, this tolerant tradition ultimately won out, and the papacy, despite waffling initially on the issue of forcible Jewish converts, responded to the massacres in a way that was friendly to Jewish interests, punishing some churchmen who were connected to the slaughter and issuing their own bulls of protection.¹²⁴ Frustration over

variety of evils that had manifested themselves during the course of the enterprise." Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, 169.

¹²² The key study of the transmission of these traditions is Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 19-71. The persistence of this tradition is not accepted by all scholars; Kenneth Stow, for example, remarks that Augustine's theory had "gone far underground during the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries." Stow does put more stock in the adherence to Gregory's interpretation of Jewish roles in Christian society. Kenneth R. Stow, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century," *Speculum* 76 (2001): 919.

¹²³ Edward Synan explains, "In a society that was to treasure 'authoritative' texts as the guarantee of doctrinal and cultural continuity, the writings of Gregory the Great were called into council by each succeeding pope on every issue he had handled; for as long as popes held temporal power, Gregory's dossier on the Jews would never cease to prolong his influence." Edward A. Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 35. For an excellent summary of both Gregory's policies and his theological formulations concerning Jews, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 73-94. Cohen is careful to detail the differences between Augustine's and Gregory's conceptions. Despite key differences, however, the works of these two combined to produce a legacy of relative toleration.

¹²⁴ I use the word "punishing" somewhat loosely here. The papal document that addressed most directly the aftermath of the massacres was issued in 1099 by Clement III. Therein, Clement released the clergy and people of Mainz from their obedience to Archbishop Ruothard. This punishment of the chief prelate of Mainz was meted out ostensibly for his involvement in the massacres: "Quanta his temporibus aeclesiae vestrae calamitas ingruerit, quot persecutiones et mala circumquaque pertulerit, quantum aeclesiasticae disciplinae vigor in ea perierit, legatis nostris referentibus et maxime inculcantibus compertum est." However, the real reason for the punishment, it seems, lay in the fact that the Archbishop

the Jews' return to their mother religion remained, but it came to focus partially on the crusaders who perpetrated the massacres and forced baptisms in 1096; this issue will be discussed in more detail in a later chapter.

Thus, after their initial reaction to the perceived apostasy of forced Jewish converts, churchmen joined with the emperor not only in allowing the Jews within Christendom to continue to live as Jews, but in granting privileges and protection to the Jewish community. Twelfth-century popes issued a series of bulls that essentially matched the message of tolerance and coexistence that Henry had proclaimed in the aftermath of the massacres. Fundamental canon law texts, gathered in Gratian's *Decretum* in particular, further affirmed the Jewish place in Christian society.¹²⁵ Augustine's and Gregory's teachings remained the official basis of Christian attitudes toward Jews.

Perhaps the most obvious sources that indicate the papal commitment to protect the Jews are the *Sicut Judeis* bulls issued by most of the popes of the High Middle Ages. Although some of the wording, including the opening phrase "sicut judeis non," was taken from Gregory the Great, and many of the specific protections and privileges had precedents in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, these bulls went beyond these

had committed sacrilege by ferreting away a gold cup belonging to the church of Speyer, which the Jews held, it seems, as a moneylending pledge. *Regesta archiepiscoporum maguntinensium*, vol. 1, ed. Cornelius Will (Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1966), 228, no.26; Aronius, 95-96, no.207.

¹²⁵ A lengthy discussion of the place of the Jews in canon law, a very complex topic indeed, would likely only serve to distract from the purposes of this chapter; put very simply, canon law texts did affirm the need for Jewish protection, though the canonists (i.e., decretists, decretalists, etc.) also rehashed many negative sentiments about the Jews that were inherited from the church fathers. The most thorough study of this issue remains Walter Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews* (Ebelsbach: Gremler, 1988). See also John Gilchrist, "The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades," and James A. Brundage, "Intermarriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law," both in *Jewish History* 3,1 (1988): 9-24 and 25-40, respectively, and Lotter, "Zur Ausbildung Eines Kirchlichen Judenrechts bei Burchard von Worms und Ivo von Chartres."

earlier examples and came to constitute the most comprehensive papal statements on the protected, privileged status of the Jews to that point in Christian history.¹²⁶ The first of these bulls, at least insofar as the written record indicates, was issued by Pope Calixtus II some time around 1120.¹²⁷ Since the document has not survived and is known only through references to it in other texts, it is impossible to state with absolute certainty that Calixtus's *Sicut Judeis* bull was influenced directly by the massacres and forced baptisms of the First Crusade.¹²⁸ Still, the timing of a comprehensive bull offering protection to the Jews and bringing together several earlier protective precedents seems to indicate that the earlier circumstances, especially the forced conversions of 1096 and the subsequent imperial response, had some influence upon papal policy.

Five other popes issued the *Sicut Judeis* bull during the twelfth century; ten would do so in the succeeding century.¹²⁹ The essential text read as follows:

Even as the Jews ought not have the freedom to dare do in their synagogues more than the law permits them, so ought they not suffer curtailment of those [privileges] which have been conceded them.

This is why, although they prefer to persist in their obstinacy rather than acknowledge the words of the prophets and the eternal secrets of their own scriptures, thus arriving at an understanding of Christianity and salvation, nevertheless, in view of the fact that they have begged for our protection and our aid and in accordance with the clemency which Christian piety imposes, we, following in the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory . . . , grant their petition and offer them the shield of our protection.

We decree that no Christian shall use violence to force them into baptism while they are unwilling and refuse, but that [only] if anyone of them seeks refuge

¹²⁶ On the precedents for the *Sicut Judeis* bulls, see Solomon Grayzel, "The Papal Bull *Sicut Judeis*," in *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict*, ed. Jeremy Cohen, 233-235.

¹²⁷ ASJ 44, no.44. It should be pointed out that Calixtus II was the same pope who reached a compromise with the German emperor on the issue of investiture (i.e., the Concordat of Worms). While this agreement can hardly be called capitulation, it does show that Calixtus was willing at least to entertain the emperor's opinion. The bull protecting the Jews may have arisen from a similar kind of compromise.

¹²⁸ Solomon Grayzel, "The Papal Bull *Sicut Judeis*," 235.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 231-232.

among the Christians of his own free will and by reason of faith, his willingness having become quite clear, shall he be made a Christian without subjecting himself to any opprobrium. For surely none can be believed to possess the true Christian faith if he is known to have come to Christian baptism unwillingly and even against his wishes.

Moreover, without the judgment of the authority of the land, no Christian shall presume to wound their persons, or kill them, or rob them of their money, or change the good customs which they have thus far enjoyed in the place of their habitation. Furthermore, while they celebrate their festivals, no one shall disturb them in any way by means of sticks and stones, nor exact forced service from any of them other than such as they have been accustomed to perform from ancient times. Opposing the wickedness and avarice of evil men in such matters, we decree that no one shall dare to desecrate or reduce a Jewish cemetery, or, with the object of extorting money, exhume bodies there interred.

Should anyone, being acquainted with the contents of this decree, nevertheless dare to act in defiance of it—which God forbid—he shall suffer loss of honor and office or be restrained by the penalty of excommunication, unless he make proper amends for his presumption. We desire, however, to place under the protection of this decree only those [Jews] who do not presume to plot against the Christian faith.¹³⁰

It is not difficult to discern that the popes who issued these proclamations were trying to locate a balance between the desire to perpetuate common anti-Jewish biases and the need to protect this valuable minority. While they retained some of the theological and canon legal prejudices against the Jews in these documents (e.g., the doctrine of Jewish obstinacy), they did impose harsh penalties, even to the maximum decree of excommunication, on those who harmed or threatened Jews. They also allowed Jews to pursue their chosen professions and customs without interference, although the language of this guarantee is more muted and vague than that of contemporary imperial privileges. Particularly striking in the papal bull is the proscription against forced baptism, with its accompanying theological justification. As canon law became more important and standardized in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the papacy attempted,

¹³⁰ This is Solomon Grayzel's translation, taken from CJ 92-95, no.5.

through issuing these declarations, to head off another legal conundrum, the likes of which occurred as a result of the forced baptisms in 1096.

Despite containing some language that denigrated and even condemned the Jews, the *Sicut Judeis* bulls essentially constituted privileges. Like the grants made by the emperors and other authorities in the German Empire, the bulls guaranteed some measure of economic freedom and political independence. The key feature in the bull, as with the imperial privilege, was the guarantee of protection. Indeed, as it was considered official doctrine and church law¹³¹, the *Sicut Judeis* bull represented one of the strongest components of the protection system sought by Jews and built by secular and ecclesiastical authorities after the First Crusade massacres. Such decrees remained the fundamental papal position until the Counter-Reformation.¹³² While the earlier decrees may have been intended initially for and read mostly by Roman Jews and others who lived in close proximity to the pope, over time these documents achieved recognition throughout Christendom. Solomon Grayzel remarks, “It may be assumed that . . . knowledge of the Bull had penetrated beyond Italy and that, by the latter part of the twelfth century, the Jews of the rest of Europe saw in it a statement that could be turned into a ready defense.”¹³³

¹³¹ Canon law scholars of the thirteenth century referred at times to this guarantee of protection. Vincentius Hispanus, for instance, argued that “Jews were justiciable in courts Christian because they had placed themselves under the protection of the church.” Pakter, 62.

¹³² A major shift in papal Jewry policy came in the mid-sixteenth century, during the pontificates of Paul IV and Pius V. See Kenneth Stow, “Hatred of the Jews or Love of the Church: Papal Policy Toward the Jews in the Middle Ages,” *Antisemitism Through the Ages*, ed. Shmuel Almog (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988), 85-86.

¹³³ Grayzel, “The Papal Bull *Sicut Judeis*,” 236.

1.5 Thirteenth-Century Papal Jewry Policy

Even though the *Sicut Judeis* bull remained the foundation of papal Jewish policy throughout the high and late Middle Ages, later popes, beginning in earnest with Innocent III, did oppose, curtail, and even condemn certain Jewish practices, either real or perceived. Removed from the First Crusade massacres by a century and, after the death of Frederick Barbarossa, holding a relatively strong position vis-à-vis the emperor, Innocent and his successors chose to err on the side of protecting Christians from potentially-corrosive Jewish practices, rather than placing protection of the Jews above Christian concerns. The papacy continued to condemn violence against Jews, but it offset this commitment with an active campaign to reign in Jewish privilege, or at least elements of the privileges issued by authorities like the German emperors. The final canons of the Fourth Lateran Council contained the key points of this papal stance.¹³⁴ Such a position brought the papacy into conflict with the German emperors, Frederick II in particular, but the papacy remained committed to its position and tried to influence political policies throughout Christendom. This policy shift may have been part of an effort both to correct the capitulation of the previous generations of church leaders and to leverage the pope's position against the emperor.

This overcorrection of papal policy may be observed quite well in papal correspondence with the prelates of Germany. In fact, the popes of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries appear to have been very concerned about the privileged place of the Jews in the German lands, much more so than they were with the Jews in other regions of Christendom, and their letters to German prelates reflect this concern. For

¹³⁴ CJ 308-313.

example, in a bull dated 4 March 1233, Gregory IX decried Jewish excesses and demanded that the bishops, archbishops, and other prelates of Germany enforce papal strictures, since, at present, “Christian piety, solely in considering their humanity, accepts and supports” the Jews.¹³⁵ In other words, in the eyes of Gregory IX and other popes of this period, Jews were only permitted continued existence in Christian realms because Christian piety “humanely” dictated that existence. Such permission did not, however, grant Jews free reign to pursue whatever interests they wished. Christians were the landlords, Jews mere tenants. Hence, such complaints about Jewish behavior in the German lands as reached the ears of the pope had to be dealt with swiftly and surely by local ecclesiastical leaders. Specifically, declared Gregory, Jews must be made to abide by the strictures of the Fourth Lateran Council, which, it seems, had largely been ignored in Germany because of the wide latitude imperial privileges granted the Jews.¹³⁶ This and other papal letters demonstrate the extent to which Gregory IX and other popes of this age were concerned about the status of the Jews in German lands.

By contrast, when Gregory IX addressed the ecclesiastical officials of France only a month after the aforementioned letter to Germany, the idea of Jewish preservation took on an entirely different meaning, for Jews in France lacked the privileged place the Jews of Germany enjoyed, at least in the thirteenth century. Whereas the pope defined rigidly the place Jews ought to have in Christian society in the earlier letter, he laid out Christian obligations to protect Jews in the latter correspondence. Therein, Gregory called specifically for the release of Jews from French prisons, where they had been subjected to

¹³⁵ ASJ 141-2, no.134. “eos pietas Christiana solius humanitatis intuitu recepat et sustinet”

¹³⁶ He mentioned specifically the wearing of distinctive badges, one of the declarations of the Fourth Lateran Council. Ibid., 142, no.134.

cruel treatment, even torture, and harsh conditions, including the withholding of food and water.¹³⁷

This change in papal policy in an effort to counteract the privileges upheld and extended by the emperor simply added another disagreement to the multitude of conflicts already existing between pope and emperor in the High Middle Ages. The two parties certainly did not need further provocation to inspire their war of words and contention over lands and leadership in Christendom. This dispute over the Jewish position in society appeared in lists of grievances drawn up by one party or the other. For instance, Gregory IX, in his August 1236 condemnation of Frederick II, noted that the emperor offended in depriving certain churches of the income from Jewish quarters in the cities of the empire.¹³⁸

Still, despite papal opposition to the policies of the emperors, the imperial privileges continued to hold sway within the empire for much of the thirteenth century. There were, of course, areas in which the papal attitudes succeeded in influencing the laws and privileges of the empire. Probably the most obvious such issue concerned slaves owned by Jews and servants employed in Jewish households. Given the paucity of direct references to this practice (outside of papal correspondence), it is difficult to know whether Jews in the high Middle Ages actually held Christian slaves. There is more evidence, certainly, that they employed Christians as servants, but one must still be careful not to take papal and episcopal commentary on this issue at face value. Nevertheless, the perception existed very strongly that Jews had Christian slaves and

¹³⁷ Ibid., 143-145, no.135; CJ 200-203, no.70.

¹³⁸ ASJ 162, no.153.

servants. It is not unlikely that this issue simply served as a concrete cause into which popes and other churchmen channeled their myriad frustrations over the Jewish position in Christian society. In any case, debate and Christian consternation over this issue came to affect Jewish privilege.

Friedrich Lotter summarizes this debate admirably in his excellent article on imperial Jewry-law. He points out that the 1090 privileges granted by Henry IV to the Jewish communities of Worms and Speyer granted “Jews the right to continue owning non-Christian slaves already in their possession.”¹³⁹ Such a concession added another act to the long dramatic debate over Jewish slave-holding. Although early church councils had forbidden Jews from owning Christian slaves, the frequent appearance of the issue in both royal and papal documents over the course of the Middle Ages indicates, at the very least, that this practice was perceived by Christians as a persistent problem. Objection to this practice had formed, for instance, the substance of the famous conflict between Bishop Agobard of Lyons and the Jews of his diocese in the ninth century; Agobard’s letters to Louis the Pious have taken their rightful place as essential texts of the history of the Jewish-Christian debate.¹⁴⁰ While Louis the Pious and Henry IV confirmed the conciliar declaration that Jews could not own Christian slaves, their insistence that Jews had a right to own slaves of any kind angered many churchmen, and these churchmen expressed similar concerns about the servants of Jews. After all, employment in a Jewish

¹³⁹ Lotter, “The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law,” 35.

¹⁴⁰ The authoritative study of Agobard remains Egon Boshof, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon: Leben und Werke*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen 17 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1969); for Agobard and the Jews see pp.102-138. See also Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 123-145 and Bachrach, *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*, 84-105. Bachrach takes pains to show that Agobard’s pleas to Louis the Pious did little to turn the emperor from his protection of Jewish interests, since Jews played such a vital economic role in the Carolingian realm.

household limited the one's ability to be exposed to and potentially convert to Christianity. Henry's decree specifically and forcefully forbade Christians from baptizing slaves owned by Jews and imposed a fine of three pounds (in addition to the return of the slave) on anyone making the attempt.¹⁴¹

Despite clerical opposition, the German emperors continued to uphold this privilege. Frederick I included it in his 1157 decree, and Frederick II did likewise in more than one of his declarations.¹⁴² However, increasing papal pressure seems to have taken effect by the middle of the thirteenth century. Gregory IX, in particular, confronted this issue quite forcefully during his pontificate; his statements on the matter came to be canonized in the *Liber Extra* and thus became a part of official canon law.¹⁴³ In the aforementioned 1233 letter to the German bishops, he addressed this problematic issue directly. After dwelling upon the Christian mercy that permitted the very existence of the Jews and lamenting the Jews' seeming inability to accept a position of perpetual servitude in Christian society, Gregory exclaimed, "Not without grief do we relate, and with shame do we write, that the Jews settled throughout Germany have become insolent to such a degree that they do not fear to commit, in direct affront to the Christian faith, those excesses that are criminal not only to speak, but even to think." Specifically, Gregory bewailed, "They have Christian slaves, whom they force to be circumcised, and

¹⁴¹ MGH DD 6.2, 547, no 411.

¹⁴² Frederick II's 1236 general privilege merely confirmed the Worms privileges issued by Henry IV and Frederick I (and hence upheld the prohibition against baptizing Jewish-owned slaves), but his 1238 charter to the Jews of Vienna mentioned this prohibition specifically. The 1238 charter may be found in J.A. Tomaschek, ed., *Die Rechte und Freiheiten der Stadt Wien*, vol.1 (Vienna: A. Hölder, 1877), 20, no.8.

¹⁴³ Lotter, "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law," 36.

whom they compel to live as Jews.”¹⁴⁴ Having forced these Christian slaves to undergo Jewish rites, claimed Gregory, the perpetrators then announced publicly the slaves’ entrance into Judaism. With rumors like these reaching Gregory’s ears, it is little wonder that he took official action, issuing decretals that confirmed and strengthened the earlier conciliar prohibition against Jewish slave-owning.

The practice of Jews hiring Christian servants also came into question during the thirteenth century. This was not a new issue either; like Jewish slave-holding, it had been condemned since the patristic era, although the prohibition was certainly ignored a great deal of the time. The privileges granted by Henry IV included not only permission for the Jews to continue this practice, but also a warning to ecclesiastical officials not to interfere with this privilege.¹⁴⁵ Frederick I used the very same words in his declaration of 1157.¹⁴⁶ However, the church issued increasingly tough decrees on this practice in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The Third Lateran Council, for instance, threatened excommunication for Christian servants and nurses who resided in Jewish homes.¹⁴⁷ While they could not stop Jews from hiring Christian servants, in other words, they could prevent such a thing from happening by providing sufficient incentive to Christians to refuse the work. In 1205, Innocent III tried to abolish entirely the practice

¹⁴⁴ ASJ 142, no.134. “non sine dolore narramus et scribimus cum pudore, quod Iudei per Teutonium constituti facti sunt adeo insolentes, ut illos excessus committere in contumeliam Christiane fidei non pavescant, quod non solum dicere, sed etiam est nepharium cogitare. Habent etenim mancipia Christiana, que circumcidi faciunt, et iudaizare compellunt.” This rumor of forced circumcision became an integral part of the perception of Judaism as heresy, as the evidence from Bernard Gui’s manual for inquisitors demonstrates. See Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Between Judaism and Christianity: The Semicircumcision of Christians according to Bernard Gui, his Sources and R. Eliezer of Metz,” *Harvard Theological Review* 94,3 (2001): 285-321.

¹⁴⁵ MGH DD 6.2.549, no.412. The Bishop of Speyer, as noted, had conceded the Jews of his diocese the same privilege in 1084. Lotter, “The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law,” 41.

¹⁴⁶ MGH Const. 1.228, no.163.

¹⁴⁷ CJ 296.

of Jews hiring Christian servants.¹⁴⁸ A number of papal letters from the thirteenth century indicate the papacy's commitment to root out this perceived problem.¹⁴⁹

Ultimately, the church's opposition to the Jewish practice of owning slaves and employing Christian servants seems to have had an impact on imperial policies. Although Emperor Frederick II confirmed earlier statements about Jewish rights to retain their slaves, Duke Frederick of Austria contradicted the emperor and failed to grant this right in his privilege to the Jews of his duchy in 1244.¹⁵⁰ Concerning this turn of events, Lotter remarks, "This seems to signal an advance of the ecclesiastical point of view on the question of baptizing slaves owned by Jews—a conclusion supported by the 1259 Synod of Fritzlar." At that gathering, the bishops of the province of Mainz "decreed that the Jews had to release their Christian slaves."¹⁵¹ Papal pressure also seems to have influenced the imperial stance on Jewish servants. Lotter explains, "In 1238 . . . Emperor Frederick II withdrew permission to hire Christian servants, maidservants, and nurses in his charter for the Jews of Vienna, as did Duke Frederick II in his privilege for the Jews of Austria in 1244. . . . This development may be taken as evidence that in the course of the thirteenth century the Church was making headway against the secular rules that infringed its canons."¹⁵²

Still, while there is little doubt that the popes of the thirteenth century enacted and supported much harsher policies against the Jews than their twelfth-century predecessors

¹⁴⁸ ASJ 86-87, no.82.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 141-143, 180-181, nos.134 and 171.

¹⁵⁰ See note 107, above.

¹⁵¹ Lotter, "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law," 36. For the Fritzlar synod, see Aronius, 271-272, no.646.

¹⁵² Lotter, "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law," 42.

had done, they never went so far as to condone open persecution. Quite the contrary, the essential tenets of *Sicut Judeis*, the bull which reached its apex during the thirteenth century, remained as binding as ever. The thirteenth-century popes wanted to curtail Jewish privilege, not compromise their security or stop their business, especially insofar as their participation in the economy benefited the church. Jewish security was in the vital interest of the papacy, for the popes often exploited the Jewish financial operation to accomplish tasks that otherwise would have been much more difficult. Most obviously, popes of this era frequently granted Christians release from debts owed to Jewish lenders in exchange for participating in Crusades and other church ventures.¹⁵³ As discussed above, on at least one occasion, the pope may have tried, through rumor-mongering, to replace the German emperor as the chief patron and protector of the Jewish community in the Empire.¹⁵⁴

1.6 Conclusion

In an effort to lay the groundwork for an examination of interactions between Jews and monks, this chapter has tried to position both communities within the political and social landscape of the high medieval German empire. While it has devoted far more space to the Jewish situation than it has to the monastic condition, its central contention is that Jewish communities and monasteries occupied similar legal and political positions in this world, since both relied on privileges to maintain their existence and pursue their prerogatives. Both monasteries and Jewish communities were candidates for privilege

¹⁵³ Kenneth Stow explains, "Crusaders . . . were privileged with moratoria on the principal of their loans and the remission of interest paid *before* their departure." Stow, "Papal and Royal Attitudes toward Jewish Lending in the Thirteenth Century," *AJS Review* 6 (1981): 163.

¹⁵⁴ ASJ 194-195, no.185; CJ 268-271, no.116. See also the discussion of this document above.

because of several shared factors. These factors, above all other things, made them peers in the high medieval Empire. The first common factor is the most obvious: both Jews and monasteries were defenseless. Neither community had soldiers at their disposal, and they were thus completely reliant on those who did command arms. This is why both communities sought the protection of the emperor and other lords who were part of the *bellatores*. With the militarization of the church in the high Middle Ages, these communities probably perceived that the pope and other ecclesiastical lords could protect them militarily as well, although the pontiff's protective power certainly relied more on the threat of excommunication and eternal damnation than on the fear of physical harm. Regardless, the idea of the benefactor protecting the defenseless was one of the key components of the privilege relationships between the various lords and both Jewish communities and monasteries.

Defenselessness was not, however, the only factor in the system of privileges that Jews and monasteries held in common, and one of the purposes of this chapter has been to suggest another factor that linked the two communities. Jews and monasteries were candidates for similar kinds of privileges—and were peers—because they both had power and thus commanded respect. Of course, this is to some extent a semantic argument since “power” is a subjective term; one could perhaps argue that the two communities sought privileges solely because they were, in fact, powerless. But power in medieval society entailed more than the mere ability to command armies. Power and respect could also be generated by the very services or functions that monasteries and Jewish communities performed for lords and others in Christian society. Put another way, both Jews and monks had power and commanded respect because they both had something

valuable to contribute to the economy, at least in its more inclusive, medieval definition. As has been discussed, monasteries were vital players in the economy of salvation. Their prayers and other spiritual services were considered more efficacious than those of individuals or communities who had not taken up the cloistered life. The respect accorded monasteries allowed flagship Benedictine houses like Cluny and Gorze to perform increasingly lengthy and elaborate liturgies in this period and to found large networks of daughter houses. This respect permitted reforming orders to establish their own networks, including numerous houses in far-flung locations. In creating this monastic matrix, monks of various orders were simply responding to demand and building on the respect accorded them by the surrounding society. Jews, of course, had considerable financial resources that gave them power and commanded respect. The various kings, nobles, and clergymen who granted them privileges did so at least partially with the expectation that they would benefit from the Jews' wealth and economic acumen. Both communities were thus able to leverage these offerings to achieve the privileges that kept them safe, allowed them to thrive and progress, and otherwise defined their place in Christian society.

While this chapter has discussed the granting of privileges to monks and Jews, it has not addressed in enough detail their effectiveness at protecting those communities. Few would doubt that monasteries were protected from widespread violence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but the dominant scholarly narrative holds that the Jews of this era faced an unrelenting barrage of violence and marginalization. It is not enough simply to show that Jews held privileged status. Because of the prevalence of this persecution narrative, it is necessary to reexamine some of the events around which that

narrative is constructed, especially in light of the evidence of privilege presented in this chapter. It is necessary, in other words, to examine, albeit briefly, how Jewish privilege held up under threat. Such is the pursuit of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2

REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 2: PRIVILEGE PUT TO THE TEST

2.1 The Success of Jewish Privilege

This chapter represents a departure, or rather an interlude, from the core discussion of this work. Building on the discussion of Jewish privilege in the last chapter, it demonstrates the effectiveness of Jewish privilege by offering a revisionist interpretation of a number of persecution episodes that occurred in Germany during this period: specifically, the persecutions of the Second and Third Crusades and the various murder accusations (ritual or otherwise) brought against Jews in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Many scholars have treated these developments from a variety of angles, but few if any studies have focused intently on efforts taken by Christians to aid or protect Jews during these famous episodes.¹ Although the evidence of these developments shows an escalation of persecution over time (as it has traditionally been employed to demonstrate), the sources that describe these episodes also reveal that privilege relationships were actually effective at protecting Jews. While this discussion is somewhat tangential to the main topic at hand, it is necessary to explain not only the privileges themselves but also the effects of the privileges on Jewish life. After all, the

¹ Significant contributions to the secondary literature on these persecution episodes include the various articles by Gavin Langmuir collected in his *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* and the articles collected in *Judenvertreibungen in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Friedhelm Burgard, Alfred Haverkamp, and Gerd Mentgen (Hannover: Hahn, 1999). Creative (and, for some, controversial) rethinking of these events can be found in Israel Yuval's *Two Nations in Your Womb*, ch. 4 and 6.

Jews' privileged status affected the ways their Christian neighbors, including monks, viewed them. The historical trajectory laid out in this chapter will thus have bearing on issues examined later, especially the discussion of Jewish conversion in the final chapter.

The privilege documents and other sources examined in the previous chapter have led to the conclusion that Christian authorities, both lay and ecclesiastical, expressed a firm commitment to protect the Jewish minority. Even though secular and church authorities occasionally disagreed on exact allowances, they also granted considerable economic and social privileges to the Jewish communities, with the understanding that these measures would ultimately benefit the authorities. While this situation led, on occasion, to exploitation (e.g., the pope forgiving Christian debts owed to Jews), it also largely freed Jews from fears of widespread persecution. With such protections in place, would-be persecutors were forced to consider the consequences of molesting Jews. Put simply, the privileges issued to Jews actually worked.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of these measures, we turn our attention to the aforementioned examples of anti-Jewish persecution from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Scholars have often cited these occurrences as evidence of escalating persecution, for which the First Crusade massacres serve as a convenient beginning. While I will not dispute the notion that persecution escalated and became more sinister over time, I will suggest that these episodes, or at least the sources that narrated them, illustrate the effectiveness of the imperial and papal decrees that forbade the physical persecution of the Jews. Rather than seeing these episodes as an unbroken, systematic trajectory of persecution, it seems more accurate to view them as sporadic, localized outbursts spurred by local tensions and resentments. In every instance between the First

Crusade and the widespread massacres that occurred at the end of the thirteenth century, privileges kept these outbreaks from escalating further than they did and indeed halted many eruptions nearly at their beginnings.

2.2 Jewish Privilege during the Second and Third Crusades

Ephraim of Bonn, a mere boy during, and perhaps an eyewitness to, the events he wrote about much later in his life, remarked in his *Sefer Zekirah* that in 1146, “Radulf, the priest of idolatry, arose against the nation of God to destroy, slay, and annihilate them just as wicked Haman had attempted to do. He set forth from France and traveled across the entire land of Germany . . . to seek out and contaminate the Christians with the horizontal-vertical sign.”² There is no doubt that, beginning with Urban II’s famous speech at Clermont in 1095, the Crusades inspired a tradition of zealous preaching, the like of which has been seen at few other times in Christian history.³ The recapture of Edessa by the Muslims in late 1144 revived some of the zeal evinced by the preachers who carried Urban’s message to the Christian world a half-century earlier. Unfortunately for the Jews of Germany, this preaching also threatened to resurrect the same nightmare scenario the elderly among them had faced as children.⁴

The catalyst for the threat of renewed persecution and massacre was Radulf, a Cistercian monk of uncertain origin and a fierce enemy of the Jews. Ephraim recorded,

² Ephraim of Bonn, *Sefer Zekirah* or *The Book of Remembrance*, in Eidelberg, 121.

³ On this trend, see especially Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1991). Cole suggests that the need for preaching became much greater during the build-up to the second crusade than it had in the first because of the chilly response by the nobles to the initial call for crusade. It was ultimately Bernard of Clairvaux’s preaching tour that gave the crusade the momentum it needed. *Ibid.*, 40ff.

⁴ On the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the crusade preaching, with special emphasis on the Second Crusade, see the excellent article by Rudolf Hiestand, “Juden und Christen in der Kreuzzugspropaganda und bei den Kreuzzugspredigern,” in *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp, 153-208.

“Wherever [Radulf] went, he spoke evil of the Jews of the land and incited the snake and the dogs against us, saying: ‘Avenge the crucified one upon his enemies who stand before you; then go to war against the Ishmaelites.’”⁵ This language certainly hearkened back to the justifications used by anti-Jewish Crusaders during the tragic events of 1096. In any case, Radulf effectively roused the ire of the Christian population, to the point that they began to turn against their Jewish neighbors. This threat constituted the first major test of the protections put into place in privileges issued by the emperors, popes, and other lay and clerical authorities in the early twelfth century.

When violence against Jews surfaced in several German towns, narrated Otto of Freising, “many Jews fled under the wings of the prince of the Romans for protection.”⁶ Because of the close alliance the Jews had formed with the emperor over the past several decades, this was, not surprisingly, their first reaction to the threat of persecution. Responding to this plea for help, the emperor did his part to protect the Jews from the rampages of the Crusaders. Otto recounted that many Jews fled to the imperial cities of the region, Nuremberg in particular.⁷ In fact, as Otto is the oldest extant source for the existence of Jews in Nuremberg, this flight may have constituted the founding of the Jewish community in that town.⁸ Ephraim of Bonn also narrated the Jews’ flight to the fortresses of the realm’s authorities; in some cases, they paid substantially for access to

⁵ Ephraim of Bonn in Eidelberg, ed., 122.

⁶ Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, ch.38: MGH SS rer. Germ. 46.58. “multi sub principis Romanorum alas tuitionis causa confugerent.”

⁷ Ibid. “Unde factum est, ut non pauci ex ipsis huiusmodi inmanitatem fugientes, in oppido principis quod Noricum seu Norinberch appellatur aliisque municipiis eius conservandam vitam se recipent.”

⁸ GJ 1.249.

these protections, but their efforts appear to have bought them the protection they sought.⁹

With Radulf still preaching, however, the threat to the Jews remained very much alive. Around the same time as Radulf began his campaign, Pope Eugenius III sent one of the most influential churchmen of the day, his former Cistercian colleague Bernard of Clairvaux, on a preaching tour of western Europe. While the point of this preaching tour was to drum up support for the new crusade, it quickly turned into a mission to preserve the Jews when news of Radulf's campaign and popularity reached the ears of Bernard.¹⁰ While there is no evidence that Eugenius instructed Bernard to preach against Radulf, such a scenario makes sense, given the protection promised in the *Sicut Judeis* bulls to which the pope was bound. Whatever the pope's role in Bernard's message, the words of this respected monk enabled the pope to make good on the privilege guarantees he had made to the Jews of Germany. Through both preaching and well-placed letters, Bernard sought to deflect Radulf's acerbic message and insist that Crusaders take out their aggressions on the Muslim infidels, rather than on the Jews in their midst.

This effort first required discrediting the mistaken messenger. In one letter, Bernard remarked that Radulf "has come neither by man nor through man, nor has he been sent by God. If he boasts himself to be a monk or a hermit, and on that basis assumes for himself the freedom or the duty of preaching, he can and ought to know that

⁹ The bishop of Cologne leased the fortress of Wolkenburg to the Jews of Cologne for what Ephraim described as "a large sum." The Jews also paid the keeper of the castle "many gifts, so that he would leave the fort and hand it over to them alone, and no stranger or uncircumcised one was allowed to join them." Ephraim claimed to have been one of the Jews who stayed in Wolkenburg while the threat remained. Ephraim of Bonn in Eidelberg, 123-124.

¹⁰ One of the purposes of Bernard's tour was to recruit Conrad III to take up the cross. On the relationship between church and empire in the context of the Second Crusade, see Jonathan Phillips, "Papacy, Empire and the Second Crusade," in *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, ed. Jonathan Phillips and Martin Hoch (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 15-31.

a monk does not have the office of teaching, but of mourning.”¹¹ More personally, Bernard labeled Radulf “a man without feeling!” and “a man without foresight, whose foolishness has been raised up on a candlestick that it may be seen by all who are in the house!”¹² Bernard thus treated Radulf both as an undisciplined, renegade monk and as a threat to the success of the crusade. Acting as both the personal representative of the pope and as the spokesman for the Cistercian Order, Bernard sought to call Radulf to monastic discipline and to regain official control of the Crusade.

Protecting the Jews was an important aspect of the control that the church had failed to maintain during the First Crusade but was determined to seize during the Second.¹³ In order to drive home the need for Crusaders to take their lead from the official church, Bernard emphasized the church’s theological and canon legal position on the Jews. In a letter addressed to the people of England but also sent to Christians in Eastern France and Bavaria, the regions of his preaching tour, Bernard explained, “We have heard, and we rejoice, that the zeal of God burns within you, but it is altogether necessary that you not neglect the tempering influence of knowledge. The Jews ought

¹¹ Bernard, *Epistola* 363: SBO 8.320-21. “Homo ille, de quo agitur in litteris vestries, neque ab homine, neque per hominem, sed neque a Deo missus venit. Quod si se monachum aut eremitam iactat, et ex eo sibi assumit libertatem vel officium praedicationis, potest scire, et debet, quod monachus non habet docentis, sed plangentis officium”

¹² Ibid.: SBO 8.321. “O hominem sine pectore! O hominem sine fronte, cuius stultitia elevata est super candelabrum, ut appareat omnibus qui sunt in domo!”

¹³ Robert Chazan explains, “Surely the most significant factor in this improvement in the fate of the Jews during the great crusades of the twelfth century was the preparedness on the part of the sponsoring authority, the Church, and its determination to control these crusades more effectively than it had the first.” Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, 173. Secular authorities, both kings and local officials, also took a great interest in the organization of the crusade, in order to prevent any kind of destructive uprising from taking place within their territories. See Jörg R. Müller, “Judenverfolgungen und – vertreibungen zwischen Nordsee und Südalpen im hohen und späten Mittelalter,” in *Geschichte der Juden im Mittelalter von der Nordsee bis zu den Südalpen*, vol.1: *Kommentarband*, ed. Alfred Haverkamp (Hannover: Hahn, 2002), 197.

neither to be persecuted, nor massacred, nor even driven into exile.”¹⁴ The rationale for this restraint lay in the fact that the Jews “are for us the living letters, manifesting continually the passion of the Lord. Accordingly, they are also scattered into all regions, so that while they pay everywhere the just penalties for so horrific a deed, they constitute witnesses of our redemption.”¹⁵ Furthermore, remarked Bernard, “when the fullness of the Gentiles will have entered in, then all Israel will be saved, as the Apostle says.”¹⁶ So the doctrine of Jewish witness and the belief in eventual Jewish conversion—the enduring message of Augustine and a key component of the Christian eschatological tradition, respectively—retained their strong influence and underlay Bernard’s message.

Although he never referred directly to the massacres of 1096, there is little doubt that Bernard’s words to those caught up in the fervor of the Crusade were influenced by the earlier massacres, or rather by the deliberations on Jewish security that had taken place in the intervening years. His adoption of the collective voice (i.e., speaking for the entire church) and his summing up of the position of tolerance and coexistence that had been expressed by both empire and papacy in the first decades of the twelfth century seem to indicate that the privileges and protections granted to Jews had taken firm hold by the time of the Second Crusade. Such a collective policy, made by the popes, upheld by secular authorities, and adhered to by churchmen and indeed by all Christians, was not to be trifled with. In attempting to incite Christians to act against “the Church,” Radulf

¹⁴ Bernard, *Epistola* 363: SBO 8.316. “Audivimus et gaudemus quod in vobis ferveat zelus Dei, sed oportet omnino temperamentum scientiae non deesse. Non sunt persequendi Iudaei, non sunt trucidandi, sed nec effugandi quidem.”

¹⁵ Ibid. “Vivi quidam apices nobis sunt, repraesentantes iugiter Dominicam passionem. Propter hoc et in omnes dispersi sunt regiones, ut dum iustas tanti facinoris poenas luunt ubique, testes sint nostrae redemptionis.”

¹⁶ Ibid. “cum introierit gentium plenitudo, tunc omnis Israel salvus erit, ait Apostolus.”

became guilty of vain ambition. As Bernard charged, “Setting forth his words and his works, he attempts to make for himself a name on par with the great names of the earth, but he does not have the means to bring this about.”¹⁷

Although Bernard was a committed enforcer of the protective privileges granted to Jews in this period, he himself seems to have harbored tremendous animosity toward the Jews and considered them a threat to Christian society.¹⁸ Usury was, for him, particularly troubling, and he preached against that practice at the same time he was arguing that Jews ought not to be harmed.¹⁹ In the moment, however, he still served as a vital executor of the Jewish privileges described above. As noted in the introduction to this work, Bernard serves as a prime example of the ambivalence engendered by monastic interaction with both real and textual Jews in this era. Whatever his motives, Bernard’s vehement preaching and condemnation of Radulf succeeded in deflecting ire away from the Jewish communities of Germany. After a personal meeting with Bernard, Radulf agreed to stop preaching and return to his monastery.²⁰ As Ephraim of Bonn indicated, the Jewish communities of Germany continued to hail Bernard as a hero long

¹⁷ Bernard, *Epistola* 365: SBO 8.322. “verba et opera eius praetendunt, conatur sibi facere nomen iuxta nomen magnorum qui sunt in terris; sed non habet sumptus ad perficiendum.”

¹⁸ See, for instance, David Berger, “The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews,” 89-108 and Jeremy Cohen, “‘Witnesses of our Redemption’: The Jews in the Crusading Theology of Bernard of Clairvaux,” in *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman*, ed. B.S. Albert et. al. (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1995), 67-81. Both Berger and Cohen argue that Bernard ultimately fanned the flames of the anti-Jewish violence he ostensibly preached against.

¹⁹ It seems that usury was an absolutely vital element of Bernard’s conception of Jews. Abulafia contends that Bernard “internalized the concept of being Jewish in a Christian sense by making the word *judaisare* mean ‘lending money on interest.’ Christian moneylenders were to his mind tantamount to baptized Jews. Anna Sapir Abulafia, “The Intellectual and Spiritual Quest for Christ and Central Medieval Persecution of Jews,” in *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews: Medieval Roots, Modern Perspectives*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 73.

²⁰ Jonathan P. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 86.

after he preached his sermons against Radulf's excesses.²¹ Although a number of Jews were killed during the Second Crusade and a few were baptized forcibly (and subsequently allowed to return to their faith, as had happened fifty years prior²²), the privileges put into place in the early twelfth century succeeded in protecting the Jews of Germany from a second series of widespread massacres.²³

Without exception, this protection held fast in German lands during all subsequent crusades; these mass undertakings, with all their attendant zeal and emotion, never again threatened the Jews as they had in 1096.²⁴ Two Jewish witnesses to the organization of the Third Crusade—R. Eleazar b. Judah and R. Moses b. Eleazar—both described the fear that accompanied the call to crusade in 1187 and 1188. R. Eleazar even recorded hostile words spoken by the crusaders at that time: “Then all the Gentiles said to the Jews: ‘Behold the day for which we have waited has arrived—the day for killing all the

²¹ If Ephraim of Bonn's account is any indication of general attitudes, Bernard's legend seems to have grown among German Jews. In addition to praising Bernard as “a decent priest,” Ephraim describes him as stating that “whosoever touches a Jew to take his life, is like one who harms Jesus himself.” Ephraim of Bonn in Eidelberg, ed., 122.

²² *Annales Herbipolenses*: MGH SS 16.3.

²³ Most of the incidents described by Ephraim of Bonn involved persecution against individuals rather than large Jewish communities. While he referenced larger massacres in at least three places, he did not describe any of these in detail. The only incident he recounted at length was the persecution at Würzburg in 1147, which occurred more as a result of a murder accusation than from crusading fervor. Chazan remarks that “with the possible exception of . . . poorly reported incidents . . . , there is no evidence for assaults perpetrated by roving crusader bands or for attacks planned and organized by large numbers of crusaders in a given town—the most devastating patterns of violence seen during the First Crusade. . . . The paucity of information in [Ephraim's] account must reflect a clear improvement in conditions for the Jews during the Second Crusade.” Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, 172.

²⁴ Gerd Mentgen does argue that a “crusade mentality” continued to influence anti-Jewish actions after the Third Crusade, including the Fulda blood libel of 1236 and the so-called Shepherd's Crusade of 1320. Mentgen, “Kreuzzugsmentalität bei antijüdischen Aktionen nach 1190,” in *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, ed. Haverkamp, 287-326. Be that as it may, the authorities in thirteenth-century Germany still succeeded in stopping persecutions before they became widespread.

Jews.”²⁵ Such threats, or at least the perception that such threats existed, once again forced many Jews to seek refuge away from their homes in the major towns of the Empire. In Mainz, the setting for both of the aforementioned accounts, a small number of Jews remained behind to negotiate a protective agreement with the Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa. The report of R. Moses detailed the imperial commitment to the Jews; simply put, Frederick prescribed severe penalties for any crusader who attempted to harm a Jew.²⁶ Although large numbers of enthusiastic and potentially hostile men gathered at Mainz to go on crusade, the protections of the emperor and other authorities held firm. R. Moses’s missive ascribed this seemingly miraculous turn of events to divine intervention²⁷, but it would appear that Jews had, by the end of the twelfth century, gained a certain amount of confidence in the protection afforded by their privileged position. The decision the small group of Jews made to stay behind in Mainz to negotiate with the emperor seems to bear this out.

2.3 Murder Accusations and Jewish Privilege

The various ritual murder accusations brought against Jews in this period—parsed out so well by Gavin Langmuir under the rubrics “blood libel,” “ritual crucifixion,” and “ritual cannibalism”—provided perhaps the most serious challenge to the imperial and ecclesiastical systems of Jewish privilege in Germany during the high Middle Ages.²⁸

²⁵ The most thorough description of these two sources is Robert Chazan, “Emperor Frederick I, the Third Crusade, and the Jews,” *Viator* 8 (1977): 83-93. The sources themselves may be found in Adolf Neubauer and Moritz Stern, *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin: L. Simion, 1892), 76-78.

²⁶ Attacking and injuring a Jew led to the loss of a hand. Killing a Jew resulted in capital punishment. Chazan, “Emperor Frederick I, the Third Crusade, and the Jews,” 90.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 92.

²⁸ See Langmuir’s essay “Ritual Cannibalism” in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 263-81.

While there is little doubt that this charge was both psychologically and physically destructive for the Jewish communities of Europe, it is surprising to note how little momentum it gained in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is true that Christians leveled this charge at Jews in the Empire numerous times during this period. The historical record also indicates that these accusations became more numerous in the German lands after around 1250. Though that may be true, it does not change the fact that this infamous yet pitiful falsehood failed in every case (at least before the 1280s) to lead to widespread massacre.²⁹

The earliest murder charge against the Jews of Germany occurred in Würzburg in 1147 and was almost certainly the result of, or at least connected to, the crusading fervor that rocked that city that year.³⁰ Whether the attacks were made by crusaders or simply by the local rabble, the attackers justified their actions by charging the Jews with the murder of a Christian. Ephraim of Bonn recorded, “The enemy made false accusations in order to justify their attack upon them. They declared, ‘We have found a Gentile in the river whom you slew and threw there. He has thus achieved sainthood and is working miracles.’”³¹ The major Latin source for these events, the Würzburg Annal, described the corpse as being cut into several pieces that the townspeople fished out of the River Main.

²⁹ This observation becomes all the more stark when compared to the much more destructive murder charges of the late fifteenth century. See the two excellent studies of these later events by R. Po-chia Hsia: *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) and *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

³⁰ Along with the Norwich case recorded by Thomas of Monmouth, this murder accusation was one of two that appeared during the 1140s. Historians have debated which came first and whether the two episodes were related. See Yuval, 167-170 and John M. McCulloh, “Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich, Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of the Myth,” *Speculum* 72 (1997): 698-740.

³¹ Ephraim of Bonn, in Eidelberg, 127.

Gathered together, these were buried in the church.³² Angered by this supposed murder and infused with the zeal inspired by the new Crusade, the Christian attackers slew twenty-two Jews. Ephraim did mention a half-hearted attempt to baptize at least one of the Jews by force, but, according to his record, the attackers resorted to beating and binding the victim once she displayed intransigence.³³ The Christian annalist stated that many Jews were killed while others submitted to baptism in order to stave off death; only very few remained alive in the Jewish faith, according to that source.³⁴

While both the Hebrew and Latin accounts definitely described persecution, even massacre, close reading of these sources reveals that the authorities took no part in the persecution. On the contrary, they took measures in the aftermath to help the Jews recover from these calamities. Ephraim of Bonn explained that the surviving Jews of Würzburg hid in the courtyard of one of their Christian neighbors; then, “on the following day, they fled to Fort Stuhlbach.”³⁵ Ephraim also mentioned that the bishop of Würzburg donated a spot in his own garden, described by Ephraim as a “Garden of Eden,” for the burial of the Jewish dead.³⁶

The narrative provided by the Würzburg annalist likewise hinted at the authorities’ efforts to aid the Jews. For instance, the annalist placed the massacre of Jews right after the burial of the body and, importantly, before the perceived miracles started to occur. This narrative structure seems to indicate that the uprising against the Jews was a

³² *Annales Herbipolenses*: MGH SS 16.4.

³³ Ephraim claimed that she spat upon the cross erected near the font and that she was able to escape her captors with the help of a Christian laundress. Ephraim of Bonn in Eidelberg, 127.

³⁴ *Annales Herbipolenses*: MGH SS 16.4.

³⁵ Ephraim of Bonn in Eidelberg, 128.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

spontaneous occurrence: an outbreak of violence occasioned by the crusading fervor then present in Würzburg. In fact, the annalist directly ascribed the massacre to crusading influence, although in noting that townspeople joined with the crusaders in the killing, his description also suggested that local tensions were released by the presence of the crusaders.³⁷ After narrating this spontaneous pogrom, the annalist went on to describe a series of miracles at the tomb of the deceased; these signs inspired the crusaders to hail “Theoderic” (a name they seem to have chosen for the body) as a martyr and demand his immediate canonization. The refusal of bishop and clergy to grant this request touched off a new outbreak of violence. While the annalist did not specifically mention Jews in the description of these riots, he did point out that the bishop protected those who “desired protection at the tower”—a group that must have included some of the Jewish survivors of the earlier massacre.³⁸ Although the riots reached a fever pitch, to the point that the cathedral canons “dared neither to go up to choir nor to sing Matins” on Holy Thursday,³⁹ this protection ultimately proved effective: the standoff ended after Easter week, when the crusaders left the city for the Holy Land. So, while the authorities were not able to prevent the initial outbreak of violence, likely because they were not prepared for it, they did move quickly to protect Jewish survivors and prevent the violence from spreading.

Over the next several decades these protective arrangements spelled out in the privileges proved so effective that, even when the murder was no falsehood, the

³⁷ *Annales Herbipolenses*: MGH SS 16.4. “tam cives quam peregrini subito furore correpti, domos Iudeorum irrumpunt et in eos irruunt”

³⁸ Ibid. “volentes ad turrium presidia.”

³⁹ Ibid. “canonici in ipsa sacratissima nocte cene Domini timore persecutorum nec chorum ascendere nec matutinas canere ullatenus auderent.”

authorities were able to preserve the lives of most of the threatened Jews. In February 1187, according to Ephraim of Bonn, a deranged Jewish man of Neuss, near Cologne, murdered a Christian maiden. As with the accusation in Würzburg four decades earlier, the Christians demanded both justice and revenge and struck as a mob against the Jewish quarter. The mob killed the murderer and six other Jews by breaking them on the wheel and leaving their bodies there for all to observe. They later seized the mother and uncle of the deranged killer and subjected them to torture. Another Jewish family was baptized forcibly, though they returned unimpeded to their faith shortly thereafter. Even the archbishop of Cologne, Philipp von Heinsberg, participated in this retribution, fining the Jews of Neuss and seizing property from other Jews in the region, although, upon being bribed, he allowed the Jews to remove the bodies from the wheel.⁴⁰

This may sound initially like a classic example of anti-Jewish persecution, the kind of hasty, supposed justice exacted with impunity from Jewish communities all too often during the Middle Ages. Yet in this case, the archbishop who participated in the persecution did not go unpunished. By disobeying Frederick Barbarossa's commands to attend him at court on a pair of occasions, Philip von Heinsberg had already fallen out of the emperor's favor; this seizure of Jewish assets gave Frederick another excuse to demand his strict obedience. Thus, nearly a year later, Frederick, assisted by a legate from the college of cardinals, accepted Philip's unconditional submission, whereupon the archbishop agreed to swear three oaths, one for each of the court sessions he failed to attend, and one for exacting a fine from the Jews and defaming their protector, the emperor, in the process. Philip also paid a hefty fine for his disobedience and freelancing.

⁴⁰ Aronius, 144-145, no.322; also *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, vol. 2, ed. Richard Knipping (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1901), 252, no.1279.

In this case, as in many others, the emperor skillfully employed his promised protection of the Jews to force the hand of his powerful subjects.⁴¹

The thirteenth century witnessed a marked increase in both the number and vehemence of these accusations. In addition, as noted previously, the church's official stance on the place of Judaism within Christian society took a less friendly route beginning with the papacy of Innocent III. However, even with the resulting heightened tension, the protections guaranteed in the privileges continued to function effectively in the Empire throughout this century. Secular and ecclesiastical leaders continued uphold Jewish privileges and legal protections. Unfriendly ideological winds certainly did batter the hatches of Jewish life, but the Jewish communities of the Empire could continue to count on their protectors to keep widespread persecution and massacre at bay.

The greatest threat to Jewish existence in Germany came in 1235 and 1236, which must have been particularly trying, frightening years for the Jews of the Empire. The most deadly murder accusation to date nearly led to widespread massacre, as the Christian accusers attempted to exact general punishment of the empire's Jews by taking their case to the emperor himself. This particular accusation also differed significantly from earlier murder accusations; Langmuir has identified the Fulda murder accusation of early 1236 as the first true "blood libel" in European history.⁴²

⁴¹ Ibid., 261-62, no.1317.

⁴² Langmuir, "Ritual Cannibalism," in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 281. Langmuir declares, "Of one thing, however, we can be certain. A new fantasy, the medieval libel of Jewish ritual cannibalism, was created by some people at Fulda in 1235."

Though the sources on this affair differ on certain details,⁴³ they all agree on the basic outline of the story. Jews living near the monastery of Fulda managed to trap several Christian boys in a mill-house. There, according to the chroniclers, the Jews cut open the boys' veins and collected their blood for ritual purposes, killing the boys in the process; the Jews obfuscated the evidence of their wicked deed by leaving the bodies in the mill-house and putting it to the torch. The Christians of the region discovered the crime (by some unmentioned method) and transferred the bodies to the nearby town of Hagenau. Convinced of Jewish culpability, the Christians caught and executed nearly three dozen Jews, including those who confessed knowledge of the plot.

After this initial pogrom, the Christians involved in the case remained furious and decided to inform Frederick II of the Jews' perfidy. In so doing, they were attempting to overturn nearly a century and a half of imperial privileges and protections for the Jews with one decisive strike. If they could convince the emperor that all of the Jews of the empire were guilty of so nefarious a crime as ritual cannibalism, they reasoned, then perhaps his eminence would finally commit himself to rid the empire of its Jewish presence. Perhaps some of these Christian accusers were aware of the attempted expulsions of Jews from the French realm in 1182; after all, Hagenau lay near the border between France and the Empire.

This new, sinister accusation may well have forced the emperor to reconsider his alliance with the Jews. The author of the *Marbach Annal* wrote:

⁴³ Three major sources describe the murder itself: *Annales Ephordenses*: MGH SS 16.31, *Annales Marbacenses*: MGH SS 17.178, and *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*: MGH SS 25.324. The sources differ in important ways on the exact details, including the date and the Jewish motivation for the murders. The author of the *Annales Ephordenses* claimed the events occurred near the beginning of January and failed to elucidate the reason for collecting blood "in sacks lined with wax," while two other sources placed it around Easter and insisted that the blood was used for Passover rituals.

The emperor, not otherwise having power to calm the disturbance that arose then against the Jews, called together many great, powerful, and learned men from various parts and inquired diligently from their wisdom whether, as the common rumor held, Jews had need of Christian blood on Passover, declaring firmly that, if this charge was true, every Jew of his empire would be killed.⁴⁴

However, this turn of events did not materialize, since, according to the chroniclers, the Jews knew how to manipulate the opinions of the emperor. They claimed that a few well-placed and substantial Jewish bribes succeeded in convincing the emperor that the boys had died accidental deaths. The chroniclers, it seems, were at a loss to explain the emperor's thought process. One commented simply that Frederick "had been able to find nothing of certainty on this matter;" thus, he "relaxed the severity of the imperial decree" (i.e., that he would execute all of the Jews of the empire if he found them guilty).⁴⁵

Another chronicler asserted that the emperor was himself culpable and thus damned, since his acceptance of the substantial bribes made him party to the horrific crime: "If that wretched emperor [*iste miser imperator*] did not punish the Jews for such an iniquitous deed, the most powerful judge will not fail to punish both him and them in the prisons of hell!"⁴⁶ So by pardoning the Jews, Frederick himself became, for some, an enemy to the Christian cause. Nevertheless, foment as they might, these chroniclers and critics of imperial Jewry law could change neither the authorities' commitment to the privileges nor the protected status of the Jews.

⁴⁴ *Annales Marbacenses*: MGH SS 17.178. "imperator tumultum, qui tunc contra Iudeos ortus est, aliter sedare non valens, multos viros potentes magnos et litteratos ex diversis partibus convocans, diligenter a sapientibus inquisivit, utrum, sicut fama communis habet, Iudei christianum sanguinem in parasceue necessarium haberent, firmiter proponens, si hoc ei de vero constaret, universos imperii sui Iudeos fore perimendos."

⁴⁵ Ibid. "Verum quia nichil certi super hoc experiri poterat, severitas imperialis propositi"

⁴⁶ *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*, MGH SS 25:324. "si iste miser imperator Iudeos pro tam iniquo facto non punivit, ille potentissimus Arbiter et hunc et hos in claustris inferni punier non obmittet."

The Fulda accusation did compel the emperor to conduct a thorough investigation into Jewish practices, although, contrary to the claims of the Marbach annalist, this investigation's main point seems to have been to establish Jewish innocence. Langmuir explains:

In fact, as we know from Frederick's own words, because of books he had read and Jewish converts he knew, he did not believe the charge. Nonetheless, because rumors were flying around Germany, he summoned the magnates of the empire to discuss the charge. Since they expressed diverse opinions, he then sent letters to the kings of Europe, asking them to send converts from Judaism to Christianity to determine the truth.⁴⁷

By all accounts, this gathering actually took place. With Frederick as their audience, the converts pointed out that both the Bible and the Talmud forbade both murder and the consumption of blood; they also reasoned that the Jews would not be so foolish to commit acts that would endanger themselves so much. These testimonies seemed, at least to Frederick, to place Jewish innocence beyond doubt, and he proclaimed the Jews not guilty of the Fulda crime. In fact, this turn of events prompted Frederick's 1236 privilege, the most universal proclamation of Jewish protection and privilege to date. In its closing sentences, this document included full absolution for the Fulda Jews, and indeed all the Jews of Germany, from the murders with which they had been charged.⁴⁸ So the greatest threat to the general security of the empire's Jews since the second crusade actually succeeded in bolstering their security and privileges. Neither emperor, nor local lords, nor church went along with the accusations; in fact, all acted very quickly to dispel these destructive rumors and reestablish the protective mechanisms already in place.

⁴⁷ Langmuir, "Ritual Cannibalism" in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 264-265.

⁴⁸ MGH Const. 2.275, no.204. "Iudeos loci predicti ab obiecto crimine ac alios Iudeos Alemannie a tam gravi infamia dictante sententia principium pronuntiavimus penitus absolutos."

The decisions of 1236 certainly did not put a stop to rumors and accusations that made the Jews' existence so uncertain, even with the various privileges in place. The death of Frederick II and the destructive political conflict that followed his death made the Jews' position in the Empire far more precarious than it had been at any point since the First Crusade. The increased frequency of the murder and blood accusations by the middle of the thirteenth century prompted extraordinary measures by other authorities to protect the Jews. After issuing the same sort of denial of Jewish guilt several times in the early part of the century, the papacy added emphasis to its responses later in the century, perhaps because the popes became the main patrons of the Jews after the collapse of imperial prestige during the Interregnum period.⁴⁹ A 1272 document issued by Gregory X, for instance, insisted that Christian testimony against Jews accused of ritual murder was not sufficient for conviction, unless the prosecution included the testimony of a Jew as well. The same document also stipulated that Jews could only be arrested for ritual murder if they were caught in the act, a circumstance the pope declared to be highly unlikely, since, as had been established before, Jews by their own law obviously forbid both the drinking of blood and the eating of any animal without a cloven hoof.⁵⁰ As ritual murder accusations were becoming especially prevalent in the German lands, Gregory X also issued a specific mandate "to all Christians (*Universis Christifidelibus*)" of Germany to protect their Jewish neighbors against these false charges.⁵¹ The papacy thus

⁴⁹ Innocent IV's exhortation to all Christians, issued 9 July 1247 (only four days after the aforementioned letter to the German bishops), is indicative of the blanket denial of the murder charge. Therein, Innocent forbade anyone to "accuse them of using human blood in their religious rites, since in the Old Testament they are instructed not to use blood of any kind, let alone human blood." CJ 275, no.118.

⁵⁰ ASJ 242, no.234.

⁵¹ ASJ 245, no.237. Gregory X was trying to reinforce an earlier mandate issued by Innocent IV.

attempted to protect Jews, but their efforts and those of other privilege-granters proved less and less effective in the second half of the thirteenth century, a period that witnessed the eruption of initially localized persecutions into wider conflagrations.

2.4 Protection (or Lack Thereof) Elsewhere

Scholars of medieval Jewish-Christian relations have occasionally compared the various regions of medieval Europe to determine which realms were the most hostile to their Jewish subjects. Such comparisons have usually concluded that the German lands were among the least friendly locations for Jews in this period. This perception seems to have its origin in the writings of the fourteenth-century Iberian Jewish scholar R. Judah b. Asher, who “described the *regnum Teutonicum* as the ‘land of persecution.’”⁵² The assumption has endured to the present. Even in his recent, revisionist work, Robert Chazan asserts that the “economic and political backwardness” of Germany led to a situation wherein “periodic persecution during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was far more common in this area than in France and England.”⁵³ However, a brief comparison with other regions demonstrates even further both that German authorities, relative to those in other areas, invested heavily in protecting their Jewish subjects and that those efforts succeeded. While one must beware too hasty a comparison between regions with different political and social structures and with different sizes and characters of Jewish communities, the relative unfriendliness of the authorities of other regions—at least from a cursory comparison with the privilege-granters of Germany—is quite striking.

⁵² Jörg R. Müller, “*Erez gezerah*—‘Land of Persecution’: Pogroms against the Jews in the *regnum Teutonicum* from c.1280 to 1350,” in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 245.

⁵³ Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe*, 103.

While the French kings did side with the Jews during twelfth-century persecution episodes like the Blois murder accusation in 1171⁵⁴, they proved hostile to their Jewish subjects in other ways. This was especially the case for the long-reigning monarchs Philip II and Louis IX. Gérard Nahon explains, “During his reign of forty-three years, Philip Augustus followed a Jewish policy which alternated between despoliation, persecution, and exploitation.”⁵⁵ In addition to arresting large numbers of Jews, seizing their assets, and severely limiting their business practices, he attempted to take the ultimate step in 1182 when he expelled all Jews from his realm.⁵⁶ Although he readmitted them in 1198 (and indeed it seems many never left), Philip set an intolerant precedent that subsequent French kings followed.⁵⁷

Indeed, after the Jews were readmitted to France, the French kings continued to enact oppressive policies against them, particularly on the issue of usury. Indeed, the French authorities’ hostile policies on this one vital issue—the lifeblood of many Jews’ livelihoods—constitute perhaps the key feature that distinguishes their relations with Jews from those of the German authorities. While it was not uncommon for medieval rulers in many lands to cancel or suspend portions of debt owed to Jews, in an effort to win loyalty from their subjects, the French kings of the thirteenth century went so far as

⁵⁴ The count of Blois, on the other hand, appears to have sided with the local mobs who executed 32 of the 40 Jews in Blois. On this incident, see Chazan, “The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 36 (1968): 13-31; see also Jordan, 18-19 and Gérard Nahon, “From the *Rue aux Juifs* to the *Chemin du Roy*: The Classical Age of French Jewry, 1108-1223,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 323-324. Nahon details various elements (e.g., privileges, loans, persecutions) of the relationship between the Jews and the regional lords in the kingdom of France.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 329.

⁵⁶ Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews*, 30-32.

⁵⁷ On Philip and the Jews, see also John W. Baldwin, *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 230-233.

to investigate closely and campaign against Jewish usury.⁵⁸ Joseph Shatzmiller explains that, during the reigns “of Saint Louis and his brother Alphonse of Poitiers, the Jews were forced by the monarchy to make restitution [for usury]. *Enquêteurs* were sent to the provinces to collect complaints from individuals about usury extracted from them.” Once identified, the claimants were compensated with funds confiscated from the Jewish communities of the realm.⁵⁹ Moreover, the French kings, like some of their counterparts in other realms, were key players in the investigations and trials brought against the Talmud—some of which led to the burning of that sacred Jewish text—in the middle of the thirteenth century.⁶⁰ There existed no parallel to these measures in the German lands.⁶¹

The relatively small Jewish community of England experienced its own serious problems with Christian authorities, all of which culminated ultimately in the expulsion

⁵⁸ Perhaps the most common example of this practice of absolving debts owed to Jews was the papal practice of granting such absolution to warriors for going on crusade. Innocent III alone issued at least four such decrees at various points during his pontificate. See ASJ 71, 78-79, 92, nos.67, 74, 75, 92.

⁵⁹ Joseph Shatzmiller, *Shylock Reconsidered: Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 59. Less invasive, though still troublesome for the Jews, was the thirteenth-century Crown of Aragon’s official rate of interest. Ibid., 55-58.

⁶⁰ The Paris, Barcelona, and Tortosa disputations are well known, thanks to the work of modern historians. For the texts (Joseph b. Jehiel of Paris, Nahmanides, etc.) of these public trials, refer to Hyam Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages* (Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1982). For a detailed discussion of the significance of the trials, see Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, 51-99 and *Living Letters of the Law*, 317-363; Robert Chazan, “The Condemnation of the Talmud Reconsidered (1239-1248),” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 55 (1988), 11-30 and *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). English authorities also waged attacks on the Talmud. In a 1286 mandate from Pope Honorius IV, John Peckham, the archbishop of Canterbury, was commanded to root out this source of heresy. See ASJ 262-264, no.255. Of course, the expulsion order from Edward I four years later rendered this request essentially moot.

⁶¹ Although German Jewish leaders like Meir of Rothenburg lamented the burning of the Talmud in Paris in 1242, their practices and texts were well protected by authorities in the Empire throughout the twelfth and through much of the thirteenth century. On Meir of Rothenburg’s poetic lamentation over the Paris Talmud burning, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 317-318 and Toch, *Die Juden im Mittelalterlichen Reich*, 30, 34.

from that realm in 1290. That momentous event was preceded, however, by a series of persecutions and lesser expulsions, in which the authorities not only did not protect the Jews, but indeed participated in and even led without reservation. Local authorities (i.e., those not connected to the royal court, both lay and ecclesiastical) in particular seem to have had no problem persecuting and expelling Jews. The Jews' total reliance on the crown—whose command of the loyalty of the nobility remained tenuous throughout this period—for protection certainly exacerbated this problem. By around 1190 (and possibly coinciding with the massacres of the Third Crusade in England), Jews found stability only in areas where the king administered their communities directly.⁶²

The murder accusations brought against Jews in England, the place where the charge may have originated⁶³, provide further evidence of the Jews' precarious situation in that realm. Like both France and Germany, England witnessed a series of murder accusations in the late twelfth century. However, the resulting preponderance of local shrines to the victims of these supposed murders set apart the English cases from their continental counterparts. While the local authorities in the German lands took action to protect the Jews and discredit the accusers, ecclesiastical officials in England readily

⁶² Robert Stacey describes the expulsions during the 1190s of Jews from Bury St. Edmunds, Bungay, Thetford, and Castle Rising as being ordered by the local authorities. Similarly, once control over Leicester had passed from the crown to Simon de Montfort in 1232, Jews were promptly expelled from that city. Stacey, "Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 350.

⁶³ This is the much-disputed argument of Gavin Langmuir, spelled out in his article "Thomas Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder," in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 209-236. See also Lotter, "*Innocens virgo et martyr*: Thomas von Monmouth und die Verbreitung der Ritualmordlegende im Hochmittelalter," in *Die Legende vom Ritualmord: Zur Geschichte der Blutbeschuldigung gegen Juden*, ed. Rainer Erb (Berlin: Metropol, 1993), 25-72. The most significant and controversial challenge to this argument is set forth by Yuval in *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 135-204.

accepted these tales and promoted the shrines that arose from them.⁶⁴ Even the king himself eventually embraced the accusation during the 1255 affair over the murder of Hugh of Lincoln. On that occasion, Henry III, likely influenced by his close advisor John of Lexington, imprisoned some 91 Jews in London and sent eighteen of them to the gallows in as public a fashion as possible.⁶⁵ There is little doubt that this spectacle inflicted irreparable damage on the Jewish communities of England.

Although these forays into Christian-Jewish relations in areas outside of Germany have been cursory, they serve to illustrate the relatively positive situation the German Jews found themselves in during the high Middle Ages. While their coreligionists in other realms endured frequent persecution from both the mobs and the authorities, particularly over the issue of usury, the Jews of the Empire enjoyed both wide-ranging economic and political privileges and steady protection throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

2.5 The Breakdown of Privilege

After two centuries of relative peace between Jews and Christians, widespread violence again erupted within the borders of the empire in the 1280s. The “Good Werner” murder accusation of the 1280s and the so-called Rintfleisch massacres of 1298 were both destructive and widespread, in contrast to the localized, abortive persecution

⁶⁴ Langmuir notes that “by the middle of the thirteenth century, five shrines to alleged victims of ritual murder had been established, of which four were in England.” Langmuir, “The Knight’s Tale of Young Hugh of Lincoln,” in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 242.

⁶⁵ This was in addition to the execution of the original confessor, who had been granted immunity by John of Lexington. Upon arriving in Lincoln on 4 October and hearing the confession, Henry rescinded the immunity and ordered the man executed immediately. Ibid., 258-259.

episodes of the twelfth and thirteenth century.⁶⁶ More widespread, longer-lasting massacres followed in the following decades, the Armleder and Black Death pogroms being the most famous.⁶⁷ This eruption of unmitigated violence came as a result of important changes in the realm. After the death of Frederick II and the short, chaotic reign of his son Conrad IV, the Hohenstaufen Dynasty came to an abrupt end. The period of intense infighting that followed was one of the most destructive eras in all of German history.⁶⁸ During this Interregnum, the various princes of the realm could never reach consensus on a ruler, even though kings continued to be crowned. This factionalism ensured that no ruler, even one with a crown, could achieve more than regional dominion. Political chaos ruled largely because the nobles of the empire, as well as the popes, who sowed division among the nobles and otherwise influenced German affairs, feared a return to the kind of power and domination the Hohenstaufen had exercised. As a consequence of this indecision and consequent armed struggle, the prestige and powerful position enjoyed by German emperors since the eleventh century suffered a severe

⁶⁶ For an overview of the persecutions of this period, see Müller, “*Erez gezerah*—‘Land of Persecution,’” 245-60. On “Good Werner”: Gert Mentgen, “Die Ritualmordaffaire um den ‘Guten Werner von Oberwesel’ und ihre Folgen,” *Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte* 21 (1995): 159-98. On Rintfleisch: Lotter, “Die Judenverfolgungen des ‘König Rintfleisch’ in Franken um 1298. Ein endgültige Wende in den christlich-jüdischen Beziehungen in deutschen Reich des Mittelalters,” *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 15 (1988): 385-422, and idem, “Hostienfrevelvorwurf und Blutwunderfälschung bei den Judenverfolgungen von 1298 (‘Rintfleisch’) und 1336-1338 (‘Armleder’),” in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: internationaler Kongress der MGH, München 16.-19. September 1986*, vol. 5, MGH Schriften 33,5 (Hannover: Hahn, 1988), 533-83.

⁶⁷ On the Black Death massacres: František Graus, *Pest – Geissler – Judenmorde: das 14. Jahrhundert als Krisenzeit*, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1994) and Christoph Cluse, “Zur Chronologie der Verfolgungen zur Zeit des ‘Schwarzen Todes’,” in *Geschichte der Juden im Mittelalter von der Nordsee bis zu den Südalpen*, vol.1, ed. Haverkamp, 223-42.

⁶⁸ The key study of German and European politics in this era remains Martin Kaufhold, *Deutsches Interregnum und europäische Politik: Konfliktlösungen und Entscheidungsstrukturen 1230-1280*, MGH Schriften 49 (Hannover: Hahn, 2000).

decline. This was particularly the case in Italy, the wealthy cities of which were so vital to the fiscal health of the Empire.

The quarter-century absence of their most powerful patron inflicted irreparable damage on the Jews' privileged position.⁶⁹ Even after the political situation stabilized somewhat in the last decades of the thirteenth century, the Jews were never again able to achieve the closeness with the emperor they had enjoyed during their century and a half of relative peace. The weaker German emperors and kings (not all achieved the imperial title) of the later Middle Ages occasionally tried to make good on their privilege relationship with the Jews, but their efforts suffered from their relative weakness as rulers.⁷⁰ At the same time, the perceived closeness of the Jews to the unpopular kings and emperors sometimes led to persecution. It does not seem coincidental that the rioters of the 1298 Rintfleisch massacres performed a mock election of their own king previous to attacking the Jewish communities of the realm. The people who had suffered both physically and financially during the violent Interregnum period had lost confidence in and all sense of loyalty toward their ruler. The rumored host desecration of 1298 was like a match to the existing powder-keg of resentment. As the most visible representatives of royal oppression, the Jews were easy targets for those in whom this animosity had long festered.

The privileges that protected Jews so well in the earlier period thus ceased to work so effectively by the end of the thirteenth century. The breakdown of imperial

⁶⁹ Kaufhold notes that the Jewish experience in this period is a good indicator of the atmosphere of heightened political conflict. *Ibid.*, 347.

⁷⁰ In his chronicle, Ellenhard of Straßburg did explain that the Rintfleisch massacres would have spread over all of Germany if not for the efforts of Albrecht of Hapsburg. Ellenhard of Straßburg, *Chronicon*: MGH SS 17.139.

power and the increased presence of the ritual murder accusation, as well as the appearance of a new charge—host desecration—all combined to frustrate the protective arrangements between Jews and authorities.⁷¹ While many of the existing privileges remained in place⁷², at least officially, they were not able to stem the tide of increased violence and anti-Jewish sentiment that produced the widespread, violent persecutions of the fourteenth century.

Still, the presence of these later persecution episodes should not blind us to the fact that the Jews enjoyed a high level of privilege, protection, and even toleration, in the Empire during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Indeed, the authorities' failure to protect the Jews in so many later medieval episodes makes the success of these earlier privilege arrangements stand out even more. These privilege relationships surely influenced both actual relations between Jews and Christians and the way the two communities viewed each other. They certainly had an effect on the attitudes of monks in the Empire, at least on certain issues that related to Jews, as a later chapter will discuss.

⁷¹ On host desecration: Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 47-82; Gavin I. Langmuir, "The Tortures of the Body of Christ," in *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000-1500*, ed. Scott L. Waugh and Peter D. Diehl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 287-309; M. Despina, "Les accusations de profanation d'hosties portées contre les juifs," *Rencontre Chrétiens et juifs* 5,22 (1971): 150-73 and 5,23 (1971): 179-96.

⁷² In his chronicle, Andreas of Regensburg described the actions of Albrecht I of Habsburg, who assumed the throne the same summer as the Rintfleisch massacres took place. Andreas explained that the new king avenged the massacred Jews by abasing and seizing the property of the peasants and burghers (*pauperes rusticos atque cives humiliando eos et res eorum diripiendo*) responsible for the massacres and by resettling Jews in the cities affected by the massacres (*Judeos alios recollocans in civitatibus, de quibus exterminati fuerant priores*). Andreas of Regensburg, *Chronica pontificum et imperatorum Romanorum*: QE, n.f. 1.71.

2.6 Conclusion

Acknowledging that widespread persecution of Jews was nearly non-existent in the German lands during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries forces us to view Jewish-Christian relations in this region and period in a different light than many historians have normally brought to bear. Toleration and peaceful coexistence, whether forced or voluntary, and not persecution, constituted the status quo. Due to their close economic ties to the emperor, the pope, the various dukes and other nobles of the realm, and a large number of bishops and other ecclesiastical officials, Jews held, or at least had access to, real power in this world. In this respect, they occupied a political and legal position not unlike that of monks. Christians could not simply bend Jews to their will with impunity, as Emicho and the crusaders had done in 1096. Killing, forcibly baptizing, or otherwise compromising the Jews' safety or status brought serious legal consequences, even in those instances when Christians had some kind of real or contrived excuse for their actions. It is against this background of protection and enforced legal strictures that we must read Christian texts about and images of Jews, such as those discussed in later chapters.

As privileged peers in the society of high medieval Germany, and as co-beneficiaries of the relatively stable political system put into place by imperial and regional authorities, Jewish communities and monasteries came into relatively frequent contact with one another. There is significant evidence, much of it untapped or misunderstood by scholars, of social and economic interaction between Jews and monks in the Empire of this period. With the political and legal foundation of the Jewish-

monastic relationship now laid, the next chapter turns to an exploration of social and economic data and the relationships detailed therein.

CHAPTER 3

REAL INTERACTIONS, PART 3: BUSINESS PARTNERS

3.1 Introduction

It should by now be clear that Jews and monasteries both functioned within the same legal and political system—the system of privilege—and that the two communities held remarkably similar positions in the political sphere. While, for the most part, we can only infer from the sources that document privilege that their joint involvement in this system led the two communities to interact, and perhaps compete, there is abundant evidence from other sources—mostly social and economic in nature—that Jews and monasteries did business with each other on a relatively frequent basis. This was particularly, and obviously, the case for urban monasteries in towns with significant Jewish populations: St Emmeram's in Regensburg or St. Marien in Trier, to mention only two examples. But it was also the case, at times, that even rural monasteries found reasons to interact with Jews.

The purpose of this chapter is to flesh out the social and economic context that led the Jews and monasteries of the high medieval empire to interact in marketplace, street, and court, as well as through the mundane sorts of dealings that are normal for neighbors who see each other on a near-daily basis. It will first map the locations of Jews and monasteries in order to demonstrate the proximity of the two communities. The chapter

will then turn to economic interactions between Jews and monks. In doing so, it will first demonstrate that the Jews were involved in the economy of the empire—on the local, regional, and universal levels—to an extraordinary degree. It will then show that, because monasteries also had interests in acquiring property, securing market rights, making use of debt, and farming taxes, they dealt with Jews in such matters on a frequent basis. Finally, it will examine a few compelling sources that demonstrate the kinds of social interactions Jews and monasteries had in this period. As we will see, their proximity and economic dealings led some Jews and monks to engage in lively discourse, make social calls, and even establish friendships with one another.

3.2 Proximity

In the urban landscape of the high medieval German empire, both Jews and monasteries held prominent positions. Most of the leading towns of the empire, especially those located on major waterways like the Rhine, the Danube, the Main, and the Mosel, contained both a Jewish community and at least one influential monastery. As shown in the previous chapter, both Jews and monasteries usually occupied central, conspicuous parts of these towns. Regensburg serves as an excellent example. Its Jewish community developed at least as early as the mid-tenth century (the beginning of its documentary record), though some traditions suggest a much earlier Jewish presence in the city.¹ Documents note the presence of a block of Jewish houses—the beginning of a predominantly Jewish neighborhood—in the first quarter of the eleventh century. The Jews of Regensburg enjoyed a privileged and prosperous existence throughout the high

¹ GJ 1.285-86. See also the map in Toch, “The Settlement of the Jews in the Medieval German *Reich*,” 57.

medieval period.² Recent research has suggested that the city's Jewish synagogue—built only a short distance from the cathedral and bishop's palace—“was designed as a contact zone between Jews and Christians for regulating mutual affairs such as legal and economic matters.”³ In addition to (and alongside) this prominent Jewish community, Regensburg also contained several influential monasteries that held leading positions in the city's political, social, and economic life. The most influential of these was certainly St. Emmeram's, a house founded in the early eighth century. St. Emmeram's gained its independence from the bishops of Regensburg in the tenth century and went on to become a major center for the Gorze reform.⁴ In addition to St. Emmeram's, several other monasteries existed in and around the city, including, most notably, the *Schottenkloster St. Jakob*, a center for the influx of Irish monk-missionaries sent to central Europe. There were several more monasteries (Ensdorf, Prüfening, Prüll, etc.) in close proximity to the city as well. Of course, the major cities of the Rhineland also had prominent Jewish communities from an early period, and several of them, especially Cologne and Trier, were the sites of important monasteries as well.⁵

² Wittmer, *Jüdisches Leben in Regensburg*, 11.

³ Silvia Codreanu-Windauer, “Regensburg: The Archaeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter,” in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 397. See also Cluse, “Stadt und Judengemeinde in Regensburg im späten Mittelalter: Das ‘Judengericht’ und sein Ende,” in *Jüdische Gemeinden und ihr christlicher Kontext in kulturell-räumlich vergleichender Betrachtung. Von der Spätantike bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Christoph Cluse, Alfred Haverkamp, and Israel J. Yuval (Hannover: Hahn, 2003), 367-68.

⁴ On the history of this important abbey, see especially the articles from a 1991 conference in the volume *St. Emmeram in Regensburg: Geschichte, Kunst, Denkmalpflege: Beiträge des Regensburger Herbstsymposiums vom 15.-24. November 1991* (Kallmünz: M. Lassleben, 1992).

⁵ On Cologne, see Matthias Schmandt, *Judei, cives et incole*. On Trier, see Hans Hubert Anton and Alfred Haverkamp, eds., *Trier im Mittelalter*, 2000 Jahre Trier, vol.2 (Trier: Spee, 1996), especially the section by Frank G. Hirschmann on monasteries (pp.399-476) and the one by Alfred Haverkamp on Jews (pp.477-499).

In addition to these well-studied cities, one should not overlook a place like Magdeburg, which had both a long-established Jewish community and several monasteries. This city achieved prominence during Carolingian times and came to constitute the major site in the eastern empire for the trade of slaves (presumably from Slavic lands) and cloth by the Ottonian era. The Benedictine monastery of St. Maurice was the most important monastic house not only in the city, but probably in the entire region. Founded in the mid-tenth century, it derived its major income from the city's market and customs-house.⁶ In addition, Magdeburg came to have at least five other monastic houses (one Benedictine, two Premonstratensian, two Cistercian) in its orbit during this period. Magdeburg was also the site of the earliest Jewish settlement in the eastern part of the empire. Jews make their earliest appearance in the city's documentary record in the second half of the tenth century, around the same time as in other places where Jewish communities are better studied.⁷ This appearance is not surprising, since the city lay directly on the Elbe, the major waterway of the eastern Empire, and because the Ottonians effectively made the city their capital. After the creation of the archbishopric in the city in the 970s, both the Jewish community and the monastery of St. Maurice passed into the jurisdiction of the archbishop, so both communities dealt with and sought privileges from that figure.⁸

It is clear from these examples that Jews and monks lived relatively close to each other for the simple reason that they both resided in the same cities and often depended

⁶ GJ 1.163-64.

⁷ Michael Toch does note that the permanence of this Jewish community, as well as that of the Jewish settlement in nearby Merseburg, is still open for debate. See Toch, *Die Juden im Mittelalterlichen Reich*, 5.

⁸ GJ 1.164.

upon the grace or privilege of the same lords. Of course, occupying space in the same city and being part of the same network does not necessarily lead to interaction, but, in the case of Jews and monasteries in towns like Regensburg, Cologne, Trier, and Magdeburg, the documents do indeed demonstrate a great deal of interplay between the two communities. This was particularly so because Jewish communities were often located adjacent to the monasteries themselves or to other properties controlled by monastic houses. Abundant and varied evidence from across this era attests to this fact.

Property transfer records are particularly important sources for reconstructing the economic and social relations between Jewish and monastic communities. In the next section, this chapter will treat in great detail the interaction between Jews and monasteries in the real estate market. For now, it is important to note that such sources show monasteries acquiring properties located near to or connected in some way with Jews. Regensburg provides several demonstrative sources, the first of which comes from the early eleventh century. It notes that a burgher named Rizimann gave the monastery of St. Emmeram three plots of land “next to the Jewish residences.”⁹ Since this is the second-earliest extant source to mention the Jewish community of Regensburg (the first describes a disputation over Christian miracles in 981), it is difficult to tell how large that community was, but it was in any case significant enough to serve as a landmark in Rizimann’s testament.¹⁰

The references to the proximity between Jews and monastic properties in Regensburg, as in other cities, increase in the documentary record of the twelfth and

⁹ Aronius, 64, no.150. “prope Judeorum habitacula.”

¹⁰ See Hermann Hage, ed., “*Stadt and Mutter in Israel*”: *Jüdische Geschichte und Kultur in Regensburg*, Ausstellungskataloge zur Regensburger Geschichte, vol.2,3 (Regensburg: Studio Druck, 1995), 13.

thirteenth centuries. In one example, the monastery of Prüll ceded a piece of land in Regensburg to one of the burghers of the town—by the name of Conrad—to hold for the rest of his life, presumably with some rent obligation paid to the monastery. The document notes that the tract was called “ad Judaeos,” likely indicating that the plot in question lay next to Jewish residences.¹¹ In another example, Adalbero, from the monastery of St. Paul in Regensburg, bestowed several parcels of land upon the monastery of Rohr, which lay southwest of Regensburg in the middle of an important viticultural region. Among these gifts were two pieces of property in a Jewish area of the town.¹² The Tradition book for the monastery of Rohr, like other sources, calls this place simply “inter Judaeos,” yet this description was apparently enough to indicate precisely the location of the relevant plots of land.¹³

We see from these examples that locations in many cities were often identified by their proximity to a Jewish street, house, neighborhood, or other landmark.¹⁴ Though this does not constitute absolute proof of proximity, we may assume that such names reflected the presence of Jews on those streets, in those neighborhoods, or in close proximity to whatever landmark was so named. Regensburg, for instance, had a “Jewish bridge (Judenbrücke)” spanning the Danube; that landmark makes an appearance in several

¹¹ *Codex chronologico-diplomaticus episcopatus Ratisbonensis*, vol.1, ed. Thomas Ried (Regensburg: Schaupp, 1816), 227, no.246.

¹² *Die Traditionen, die Urkunden und das Älteste Urbahrfragment des Stiftes Rohr 1133-1332*, ed. Hardo-Paul Mai, QE, n.f. 21.42-43, no. 36.

¹³ This proximity at times goes beyond location next to Jewish residences. In at least one instance, a monastery acquired property located next to a Jewish cemetery (*iuxta cimiterium Iudeorum*). Aronius, 191, no.433.

¹⁴ Among many examples of identified Jewish landmarks, a source from Vienna in 1204 records a gift of four plots of land given by Gottfried, the treasurer of Vienna, to the Church of St. Stephan. The plots were located next to a Jewish school (*iuxta scolam Iudeorum*) on the bank of the Danube River. *Ibid.*, 161, no.363.

monastic documents. Two witnesses to gifts given to the monastery of Obermünster, for instance, are identified respectively as “Arnolt de ponte iudeorum”¹⁵ and “Pernolt de Judenbrukke.”¹⁶ Perhaps the most shocking reference to a Jewish landmark comes from the monastery of Eberbach. The source notes that in the year 1225 the monks reached an arbitrated agreement with the inhabitants of the village of Arheilgen to share the use of the forest of Wintershagen. They marked the border between their two territories with a stream that ran through the forest. The document identifies the stream as the place “where a Jew was murdered.”¹⁷ This does not, of course, constitute evidence of proximity, but it does show that references to Jews were used to distinguish, map, and demarcate property in this era. For purposes of location, such an identification was surely very effective.

3.3 The Real Estate Market

Monastic records of property transactions have already been used to demonstrate proximity, but even more important is the information they contain about Jewish involvement in the real estate market. Therein lay one of the most important spaces for interaction between Jews and monks. A perusal of real estate documents from this period provides abundant evidence that Jews were active property-owners and land speculators in the towns, and sometimes even the rural regions, of the empire. The details of these sources provide an excellent window onto an economic landscape wherein the Jews were

¹⁵ “Schenkungsbuch des Stiftes Obermünster zu Regensburg,” in *Schenkungsbücher bayerischer Klöster*, ed. Franz Michael Wittmann and Karl August Muffat, Quellen und Erörterungen zur Bayerischen und Deutschen Geschichte 1 (Aalen: Scientia, 1969), 185, no.50.

¹⁶ Ibid., 198, no.84.

¹⁷ *Urkundenbuch der Abtei Eberbach im Rheingau*, vol.1, ed. K. Rossel (Wiesbaden: Roth, 1862), 244, no.136. “rivulum ubi Iudeus occisus est”

vital and ubiquitous players and, as such, dealt on a frequent basis with important persons and institutions, including monasteries.

One of the most important source collections that detail Jewish involvement in the real estate market comes from the *Schreinskarten* kept by the parish of St. Lawrence in Cologne; while this is not a monastic source, it does demonstrate how vital a role the Jews played in property acquisition and selling during this era.¹⁸ This collection contains evidence of the economic activities of several generations of influential Jewish families in Cologne. These Jews do not come across in the sources as cowering pawnbrokers living on the outskirts or in the less desirable neighborhoods of the city. On the contrary, they enjoyed a privileged and prominent status; this lofty position is illustrated by the kinds of properties they owned, sold, or speculated in. The focus of this chapter does not call for an examination of every generation of these Jews, especially since Matthias Schmandt has already examined this collection in detail in his study of the Jews of medieval Cologne.¹⁹ A brief look at the dealings of one generation should suffice to demonstrate their elevated station in this society.

In the 1130s and 1140s, a Jew by the name of Solomon (*Salemannus*), together with his wife Rachel, purchased several properties in Cologne. The first of these, for which the couple paid the substantial sum of 36 marks, occupied the space between one of the city walls and, it appears, a major thoroughfare; moreover, it lay both next to the residence of a certain Lord Conrad and across from the city's *Bürgerhaus*. Ownership of this property entailed a tax obligation of six Groschen annually, to be paid, it seems, to

¹⁸ Robert Hoeniger, ed., *Kölner Schreinsurkunden des zwölften Jahrhunderts. Quellen zur Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Stadt Köln*, 2 vols. (Bonn: E. Weber, 1884-94) and Robert Hoeniger and Moritz Stern, eds., *Das Judenschreibsbuch der Laurenzpfarre zu Köln* (Berlin: L. Simion, 1888).

¹⁹ Schmandt, *Judei, cives et incole*, 18-38.

the court of the archbishop.²⁰ The second property also lay across from the *Bürgerhaus*, next to a house owned by two well-positioned brothers: Gerard, a canon at the Church of St. Gereon, and Volmer, a city official. Unlike the earlier property, this one did not have any tax obligation attached to it. This second transaction was completed before a gathering of town magistrates.²¹ Finally, Solomon bought a third property—including both “house and court”²²—from a fellow Jew, Isaac, who had built the house some years earlier. Purchased at a higher price than the earlier houses—57 Marks or nearly double the price he paid for the other properties—this plot did not have a tax burden or interest obligation for Solomon or his heirs. The sale record notes that Henry, one of the city officials, instigated the formalities of the sale and testified to the transaction before a gathering of the citizens. Included among the names who gathered on this occasion and testified of the validity of the transaction was another Jew, Ekebret.²³

From these purchases and many other documented cases like them²⁴, one learns a number of important things about Jewish involvement in the real estate market of

²⁰ Aronius, 116-117, no.256: “notum cunctis esse cupimus, qualiter ego Salemannus et uxor mea Rachel domum quandum, quae sita est contra domum in quam cives conveniunt quae etiam discreta est a pariete Azelini usque ad plateam, hanc, inquam, domum erga dominum dominum Cuonradum et uxorem eius Linkardim tam ad usum nostrum quam omnis posteritatis nostrae pro 36 marc. emimus, ut singulis annis 6 nummos ad censum curiae persolvamus tam nos quam posteritas nostra.”

²¹ Ibid., 117, no.257.

²² “domum et curiam”

²³ Ibid., 117, no.258.

²⁴ On the subject of Jewish involvement in the real estate market, Würzburg has a documentary record similar to that of Cologne. An example that shows close interaction between Jews and clergy comes from an Episcopal record of 1170. In that year, Bishop Herold of Würzburg obtained a piece of land next to a Jewish school. After securing the plot, he offered it to a Jew, Samuel, and his wife Gutha. In exchange for legal ownership and use of the land, this Jewish family was required to pay to the cathedral canons a measure of wheat each year on the feast day of St. James. By the stipulations of the agreement, if Samuel or his heirs wished to sell the property, they first had to offer it to the canons. This agreement thus benefited both involved parties: the cathedral and the Jews. MB 37.96, no.113. See also MB 37.153, no.156 and Aronius, 153-54, no.342. For a treatment of the settlement and property interests of the Würzburg Jewish community, see Karlheinz Müller, *Die Würzburger Judengemeinde im Mittelalter*, 33-38

Cologne and other high medieval German cities. Two observations seem particularly important. First, it is apparent that the Jews—at least the most affluent of them—were interested in and successful at obtaining urban property. In Solomon’s and other cases, the properties in question were not on the city’s outer fringes (either geographically or culturally), but rather were prime pieces of urban real estate. Second, these land purchases were made with the collusion of prominent citizens. They were decidedly not clandestine, back-room deals made without the knowledge of Christian burghers. In purchasing such lands, Jews cultivated relationships with important Christian members of the community; they became the neighbors of the rich and famous in the most basic sense—living next to them. Even more importantly, Christian authorities helped Jews make these purchases. In order to complete the transactions, Jews, like other prominent landholders, needed to pass their purchases through a public approval process. They needed instigators, sponsors, and witnesses. Solomon and Rachel, in the manner of prominent townsmen and even nobles, procured their choice property with the aid and consent of their neighbors and fellow-citizens. Documents that recorded these transactions often carried the seals of the Christian authorities involved, thus ratifying the purchase in the eyes of the public.²⁵

The aforementioned records may also indicate an attempt on the part of powerful Jews, like Solomon and his wife Rachel in Cologne, to secure blocks of houses or even

and Roland Flade, *Die Würzburger Juden: Ihre Geschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart* (Würzburg: Stürtz, 1987), 6-10. Recent research using the recovered gravestones of the medieval Jewish cemetery of Würzburg has revealed a thriving, highly-organized, and well-educated population of Jews living in the town between the mid-twelfth and mid-fourteenth centuries. See Müller, “Würzburg: The World’s Largest Find from a Medieval Jewish Cemetery,” in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 379-89.

²⁵ For another example, a 1216 document described the sale of a prominent city plot in Boppard by the Church of Bamberg to the Jew Isaac; this document carried the seal of the city of Boppard, lest any unfriendly interest question the transaction’s validity. Aronius, 180, no.404.

entire neighborhoods for Jewish use. Indeed, Matthias Schmandt notes that Solomon's purchase of these adjoining properties was a major step in the establishment of a permanent Jewish community in the city.²⁶ The fact that Solomon and Rachel were not the only Jews to purchase lands in Cologne during middle decades of the twelfth century bears this observation out. In fact, there exist abundant sources showing that Jewish-purchased lands and houses lay next to other Jewish lands and houses. The Cologne neighborhood wherein the largest number of Jews resided came simply to be called *inter Judeos*, mirroring the title of the Jewish neighborhood of Regensburg, in documents dating from as early as 1091.²⁷ This term appeared with regularity in land purchase documents, such as the source that recorded the purchase of a house in Cologne by the Jew Vives of Coblenz in the 1150s.²⁸

The trend of Jews purchasing lands next to (and often from) other Jews continued in Cologne and other German cities into the next century. Several records produced in Cologne in the 1230s and 1240s describe the purchase of land and houses in the town by members of the Jewish community. Again, as noted in more than one of these documents, the purchased house sat opposite that of another Jewish family, suggesting that the Jews of Cologne worked in tandem to secure proximate plots within the town.²⁹ Not all of these appear to have been choice parcels of land—one in particular was identified as

²⁶ Schmandt, "Cologne, Jewish Centre on the Rhine," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 369.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 368.

²⁸ Aronius, 125, no.302: "domus inter Judaeos." In his editorial comments, Aronius refers to this part of Cologne as "der Judengasse," although the Latin does not indicate a specific street.

²⁹ *Westfalia Judaica: Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Westfalen und Lippe*, vol.1: 1005-1300, ed. Bernhard Brilling and Helmut Richter (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1967), 35-36, nos. 9 and 11.

being “at the dungheap [*ad sterquilinium*].”³⁰ Despite this, the Jews by the end of the thirteenth century came to own most of the houses in a neighborhood of Cologne bounded on one side by the Church of St. Lawrence and on the other side by the City Hall.³¹ This accomplishment shows beyond doubt that the Jews possessed a shrewd understanding of how to work the real estate market and build a coherent community. Their behavior was not unlike that of guilds, religious confraternities, and other urban interest groups during the same era.³²

Not only were Jews active on the buying end of the real estate market, but they were also active in selling various properties, especially in cities like Cologne, during this period. In the generation after Solomon and Vives made their mark on the urban landscape of Cologne, Gottschalk, another Jew, was similarly active in both buying and selling properties to Jews and Christians. At some point in the 1160s or 1170s, a Jew named Gerard purchased a house adjacent to the *Michaelskapelle* from Gottschalk’s family.³³ Gottschalk shows up again in the documentary record of the next decade, this time selling a piece of property to one Hermann, a goldsmith in Cologne.³⁴

This high level of involvement in the real estate market of the high medieval empire often brought Jews into economic interaction with monasteries, since these institutions were likewise major real estate players. Some of these sources describe fairly

³⁰ Ibid., 36, no.11.

³¹ See the map in Schmandt, “Cologne, Jewish Centre on the Lower Rhine,” in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 374.

³² See the comparison of guilds and religious confraternities in Epstein, *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe*, 51-52.

³³ Aronius, 148, no.327.

³⁴ Ibid., 149, no.332.

straightforward transactions, such as the record from the *Schreinskarten* of St. Lawrence parish that documents a deal between the Jew Joseph and the convent of nuns connected to St. Agnes church. It notes simply that the nuns sold Joseph a house next to a bakery in Cologne.³⁵ In similar fashion, a record from Duke Ludwig of Bavaria explains that a certain abbess named Mechthild, probably of the abbey of Obermünster, sold a plot of land, probably in Regensburg, to a Jew named Aaron in 1225.³⁶ One-time agreements of this sort, however, were the exception rather than the rule, as other sources indicate.

Business partnerships between monasteries and Jews in the real estate market could, in some cases, stretch on for years. The Abbey of St. Kilian, a house of cloistered canons regular who controlled the Church of St. Kilian in Würzburg, serves as an excellent example of extended contact between Jewish and monastic property interests. This house had very close economic dealings with several influential members of the Würzburg Jewish community in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Indeed, between 1180 and 1211, there were at least ten separate property transactions between the two entities, the volume alone of which suggests that the two parties trusted and respected each other to an extraordinary degree.³⁷ None of the records of these transactions are entirely straightforward; that is, they do more than simply indicate that Jew X sold Property Y to the abbey, or vice-versa. On the contrary, these valuable

³⁵ Ibid., 286, no.691.

³⁶ Ibid., 191, no.432. The abbey to which Mechthild belonged is not given in the source; however, the lead witness on the document is the prior of Obermünster; this leads Aronius to speculate that she belonged to that house. Since the document comes from the court of the duke of Bavaria, this explanation seems likely.

³⁷ Ibid., 133-136, 142-144, 146-148, and 170, nos.312, 313, 315, 317, 318, 320, 324, 326, 329, and 383.

sources seem to depict a well-established and mutually beneficial business partnership between the city's Jews and the house of canons.

The complexity and depth of this business relationship is on display in the records of their transactions. For example, in the year 1180, Samuel, a Jew from Rothenburg with ties to Würzburg, purchased a piece of real estate from Count Ekehard, the son of Billung the Schultheiss. The plot in question was located next to the residence of Billung himself and was thus in a very prominent place in Würzburg. The major stipulation of this land deal was that Samuel, the Jew, would “deliver the property, together with the buildings, to the altar of the precious martyr Kilian and the appointed delegate of his order.”³⁸ This meant, essentially, that Samuel was required to become a vassal of the monastery, in exchange for being granted full control of the property in question. As a mark of his commitment to the abbey, Samuel was to furnish “eight pounds of wax annually on the feast of Saint Kilian.”³⁹ Otherwise, Samuel exercised usufruct over the property, to live in it or pass it on to someone else, to erect new buildings or tear down old ones, as he pleased. Interaction in the real estate market thus generated a vital and lasting social relationship between the Jew and the monastery.

Samuel was not the only Jew to have such a close relationship with the brothers of St. Kilian. In fact, the abbey seems to have purposely sought out such relationships with Jews. The obligations sometimes ran the opposite direction. In 1184, for instance, the canons participated in multiple property deals with the Jewish couple Vivis and Sarah; these were accomplished through a third-party agent (*fideicommissarii*), the twelfth-

³⁸ MB 37.111, no.126: “eandem aream simul cum aedificiis . . . ad altare preciosi martiris Kyliani et sociorum eius legitime delegatam contradidit”

³⁹ Ibid. “in festo sancti Kyliani VIII nummatas cerae annis singulis persolvat”

century equivalent of a Century 21 realtor. First, the couple entrusted (*delegasse*) a six-acre vineyard to the monastery. In return, the abbey promised to pay them a measure of wheat annually on the feast day of Saint Michael. The source proclaims that the Jews sought this transaction with the monastery “in the hope of protection and favor.”⁴⁰ In other words, they sought a privilege from the monks, the terms of which included the common guarantee of physical protection. Later the same year, the couple, again working through their agent, bestowed their personal residence on the abbey, again “in the hope of protection and favor,” then received it back as a kind of fief, in exchange for an annual payment of two pounds of wax and the promise that they could sell the property in case of hardship. This fairly normative agreement illustrates the level to which the Jews were integrated into the all-important social networks of the day. In the case of the monastery of Saint Kilian and their Jewish interlocutors in Würzburg and the surrounding region, property became an important way to establish social ties with powerful entities who could protect and sponsor them, just as it was for many others throughout the social and political landscape. Both communities were thus remarkably integrated into the larger polity: economically, politically, and socially.

In a number of cases of monasteries selling or otherwise transferring land to Jews, the agreements required that Jews make an annual payment of some kind to the monastery, as seen already in the St. Kilian sources. Another example comes from the Abbey of St. John the Baptist in Regensburg, also a house of Augustinian canons. In 1229, the canons worked through a local official (*obellarius*) to work out an agreement with a Jew named Abraham. Under the terms, which were, the source declares, in

⁴⁰ Ibid., 124-25, no.135: “spe defensionis et gratiae.” The monastery received other properties from Jews for the same stated reason. See, for instance, RB 1.355.

keeping with Jewish law, Abraham assumed control of a house and connected plot of land in Regensburg on the condition that he pay the abbey sixty pence (*denarii*) annually.⁴¹ Rather than being one-time transactions, such agreements fostered a lengthy business relationship between the monks and Jews in question. The payments received from Jews came to constitute, in these instances, important items on the income ledger of the monastery.

Another case that demonstrates the lasting, and potentially complicating, nature of these real estate agreements between Jews and monks comes from the town of Boppard. In 1237, the nearby abbey of Marienberg sold a house in the town to a local knight, Rudewin Schade, for fifty marks. The record of this business deal explains that the house belonged formerly to the Jew Simon. It seems Simon had obtained the house in the first place from the monastery with the condition that it would revert to the control of the monastery if, upon Simon's death, his heirs were unable to find a suitable buyer. Although the source does not say explicitly that Simon's heirs were unable to find a buyer after his death, the monastery's command of the land deal seems to indicate that this is what happened. Nevertheless, the record states that the deal was completed with the approval of Simon's wife and children, so we can assume the monks provided them with some remuneration.⁴²

Jewish and monastic property speculation and other business interests, rather than being isolated ventures, were integrated components of the broader market. At times, Jews and monks partnered with other entities in their business interests. In 1230, for

⁴¹ Aronius, 197, no.446.

⁴² *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der jetzt die Preussischen Regierungsbezirke Coblenz und Trier bildenden mittelrheinischen Territorien*, ed. Leopold Eltester and Adam Goerz (Coblenz: Hölscher, 1874), 456-57, no.596.

example, the Premonstratensian abbey of Gottesgnaden in Saxony became a member of a league of investors in the salt mines of Elmen; a Jew, Tidericus, was also a partner in this venture. Before agreeing to join the conglomerate, however, the monastery insisted, as a condition of their entry, that Tidericus renounce his claim to a certain piece of property in Elmen in which the monastery was also interested. This stipulation put the league into a difficult situation, since Tidericus had already been granted membership by the consent of the other members. In order to secure the involvement of the monastery, the arbiters for both sides eventually worked out a compromise wherein the abbey and the Jew would share the use of the property in question.⁴³ If one approaches this case with the notion that Jews were powerless and exploited, one would probably see this as just another example of Jewish vulnerability. However, the fact that Tidericus was part of such a prominent business partnership with powerful Christian entities serves as evidence of his powerful position. In my opinion, his ceding partial usufruct of the property in question indicates the importance of the monastery to the league and the extent of the monastery's involvement in economic affairs, rather than the powerlessness of the Jew. Moreover, the compromise made by both parties demonstrates the willingness of Christians and Jews to work together to further their mutual interests.

As some of these examples illustrate, real estate deals between Jews and monasteries were not always one-on-one transactions. They most often involved other parties, thus further demonstrating that the economic interaction between these two

⁴³ Aronius, 197, no.447. "arbitris vero prepositi et capituli visum fuit, quod cum arbitris adversae partis non possent concordare, nisi Tidericus Iudeus de Sconebeke iuri, quod se in areis ecclesiae de Gratia Dei in Elmene sitis habere dicebat, renunciaret. Quod arbitri adversae partis non admiserunt, cum idem Tidericus in partem salinarum fontis ipsorum de communi sociorum consensu fuerat admissus. Admiserunt tamen quod omni iure, quod habebat in areis antedictis, renunciaret, preterquam quod in eam partem iuris arearum dictarum, ad quam ipsi admitterentur, ipse simul admitteretur."

communities was but a component of the economy of town, city, region, and empire. The other parties involved in such partnerships were usually secular or ecclesiastical authorities—bishops, archbishops, counts, dukes, or even the emperor. In January 1224, King Henry VII, the recently-crowned, teenaged son of Emperor Frederick II, issued a privilege to Marienberg Abbey. Like most imperial privileges, this one included an itemized account of the properties owned by the privileged entity, in this case the monastery—acknowledgement on the part of the authority that the privileged person or institution in fact owned or controlled all the listed items. Among the properties included in the document was the house of one Simon, “formerly a Jew and afterwards baptized.” Although the record does not say what happened to Simon’s ownership of this property, it does explain that this and two other houses were bestowed upon the monastery by Emperor Frederick II.⁴⁴

Several examples of authorities collaborating in property transactions with Jews and monasteries come from the eastern part of the German-speaking lands, in the duchy of Silesia. In these sources, the Jews seem to be particularly well-placed in the real estate market, to the point that they owned, or at least had an ownership stake in, vast swaths of land, including entire villages. Their position as powerful landlords bound them both economically and socially to the region’s nobility, under whose auspices they carried out their business. Land transfer documents and other sources illustrate the give-and-take that accompanied such relationships. In the early thirteenth-century, for example, Duke Henry I “the Bearded” of Silesia (perhaps known best as the husband of St. Hedwig)

⁴⁴ *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der jetzt die Preussischen Regierungsbezirke Coblenz und Trier*, 186-187, no.224. “specialiter tres domus infra Bopardiam site, quas pater noster Fridericus Romanorum imperator eidem ecclesie et nos contulimus, domus Symonis quondam iudei postea baptizati, domus Remboldi sacerdotis in Burnhoven, area una ante domus ipsius portam sita et domus Christine quondam dicte Comitisse.”

became embroiled in several land deals which also involved powerful Jews and the house of St. Vincent, a Premonstratensian abbey in Breslau. In 1203, he bestowed upon the abbey the village of Falkner (near Breslau), part of which was owned by a Jew named Joseph.⁴⁵ The next year, Henry added to the properties he had already given to the abbey, granting the canons a farm that had been owned by Joseph and another Jew, Kaskel.⁴⁶ Later the same decade he exchanged these properties for one of his estates.⁴⁷ In these cases it might be tempting to see in these documents the seizure of Jewish goods in favor of Christian institutions, but, given the place Jews held in the real estate market of this period, particularly in the east, I believe these episodes should be viewed as simple purchases of holdings by a lord from one of his vassals to give to another of his vassals, a common occurrence in this social context. Other sources show this process in motion. For instance, a certain Count Peter purchased a village from the Jews and later bestowed it on the brothers of St. Vincent's.⁴⁸ Whatever their social relationship with other powerful players, the Jews of the region had frequent dealings with this important abbey through the real estate market, as was the case in other parts of the German lands.

Many real estate documents, particularly charters, clarify ownership or control over a particular parcel of land and thus reveal conflict over land. Indeed, competing land claims between Jews and other parties were not uncommon in this world. Influential Jews, protected and given space to conduct business by the systems of privilege in the empire, simply acted like the realm's other prominent landholders: that is, they laid claim

⁴⁵ Aronius, 160, no.360.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 161-62, no.364.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 166, no.375.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 160, no.361.

to their property, even if such a claim brought them into conflict with entrenched institutions like monasteries.⁴⁹ Jews were often at least partially successful in pressing their claims.

An exemplary case of land conflict comes from the *Codex Traditionum* (Book of Inheritances) of the Benedictine monastery of Formbach. One of the entries for the year 1196 records that Wergand, a burgher of Vienna, gave ten talents to Abbot Henry of Formbach for “the cure of his soul” before his departure on the Third Crusade. He also handed over some thriving vineyards (*potestativa vineta*) that had previously been bestowed upon him conditionally by his lord, Hugh of Molansdorf. When the burgher and the abbey had nearly reached an agreement on the terms of this land deal, the Jew Schlom, a powerful figure who served as treasurer of the court of Duke Leopold of Austria, “stirred up a dispute against [the monastery],” claiming that Wergand was, in fact, his vassal and that the vineyard in question belonged rightfully to him. Since Duke Leopold happened to be traveling in the region, the monks appealed the case to him. According to the monastic source, Schlom tried to put tremendous pressure on the duke to reach a decision in his favor. After counseling with his ministerials, Leopold granted the vineyard to the monastery, a decision that was seen by the monks as the result of God’s intervention. Nevertheless, the duke also proclaimed that Schlom could collect

⁴⁹ In a high-profile land dispute in 1257, the Jewish brothers Lublin and Nekelo, who both served as officials of the duke of Austria, contended with Bishop Conrad of Freising over large land holdings near the village of Urleugestorf. The settlement required the Jews to pay a substantial sum to obtain the usufruct of the land, but, as a result of the settlement, the bishop helped them obtain a sum owed to them by a former occupant of the property in question. Ibid., 263-64, no.267. That they were able to prosecute such a case among such powerful figures with partial success further demonstrates the prominent position some Jews occupied in the economic affairs of the empire, even as their political and social position deteriorated in the late thirteenth century.

that year's harvest of fruit, as well as twenty talents from the monastery. In other words, he had enough clout to sway the duke's opinion at least partially in his favor.⁵⁰

Another case of land conflict between Jews and monasteries occurred in Regensburg in the 1220s. Sources indicate that the monks of St. Emmeram appealed their case to Pope Gregory IX, who issued a judgment. They complained that the Jews of Regensburg had infringed wrongfully on territory belonging to the monastery in order both to build a synagogue and to bury their dead. The monks claimed, moreover, that the Jews did this spitefully, in order to demonstrate their contempt for the abbot and monks of St. Emmeram.⁵¹ Given the topographical context, their complaint about infringement makes sense. At some point in the few years preceding this case, the Regensburg Jews had replaced the existing Romanesque synagogue with a larger building constructed in the early Gothic style. The new synagogue was larger than the old one; according to Silvia Codreanu-Windauer, "The synagogue was extended by 16 feet to the west and a new structure was created on the foundations of the Romanesque predecessor, a vaulted two-aisled hall partitioned by three columns."⁵² This enlarged building may well have infringed on property also claimed by the monastery, since both communities occupied the heart of the city and stood in close proximity to one another. The pope sent clergymen, including the abbot of Prüll, to investigate and arbitrate the dispute, and he

⁵⁰ *Monumenta Formbacensia*: MB 4.85-87, no.115.

⁵¹ Aronius, 194-95, no.440: "querellam . . . recepimus, continentem quod Iudei Ratisponen. quasdam terras ipsius monasterii detinentes contra iustitiam occupatas synagogam construxerint et mortuos suos sepeliunt in eisdem, in ipsorum et dicti monasterii iniuriam et contemptum, alias sibi graves et iniuriosi non modicum existentes."

⁵² Silvia Codreanu-Windauer, "Regensburg: The Archaeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 395. She also notes that this new structure is the one made famous by Albrecht Altdorfer's early sixteenth-century etching, made shortly before the final expulsion of the Jews from Regensburg and the subsequent destruction of the synagogue. Codreanu-Windauer's article includes this image as well as several diagrams of the synagogue complex.

declared that the Jews would have to restore the pertinent properties to the monastery if they were found guilty of infringing. However, since the archaeological record does not indicate any change to the synagogue, the two communities must have worked out a settlement of some sort.⁵³

Still more evidence of both Jewish prominence in the real estate market and Jewish-monastic interaction in property transactions comes from the witness lists appended to the property transactions themselves. Legal tradition dictated that transactions of this sort required witnesses who could attest to the terms of the deal in question. On occasion, Jews appeared on the witness lists of monastic documents that detailed property transfers and the like. This was most common when powerful nobles were involved in such affairs with the monasteries. These authorities frequently had Jewish financiers and advisors in their entourages, and these Jewish advisors would have participated in the legal and economic processes involved in transferring property, including the witnessing of the transfer itself. For example, in a charter dealing with the transfer of a parcel of land to the monastery of Untersdorf by Ludwig, duke of Bavaria, around the year 1214, a *Fridericus Judaeus* is named in the witness list, along with various counts and other important men from that region of the duchy.⁵⁴ Other documents contain similar references.⁵⁵

⁵³ Another case involving a Jewish cemetery occurred in 1269 in Worms. In that instance, the abbey of Mary Magdalene and the Jews of Worms laid claim to the same piece of territory, part of which contained the burial ground. Aronius, 310, no.736.

⁵⁴ *Monumenta Understofensia*, no.37: MB 14.141-43. The same name appears in at least one other witness list during this same period. See *Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising*, vol.2, ed. Theodor Bitterauf (Aalen: Scientia, 1967), 408, no.1571.

⁵⁵ In the *Schenkungsbuch* of the Augustinian prior of Berchtesgaden, one “Ernustus Judeus” is named among the witnesses for the transfer of several vineyards to the priory. “Schenkungsbuch der Probstei Berchtesgaden,” in *Schenkungsbücher bayerischer Klöster*, 363, no.215.

Although Alfred Haverkamp has contended that we cannot know for certain the meaning of the surname or title “Judeus,” its appearance in these documents should at least give us pause. Haverkamp’s argument, specifically, is that the surname does not necessarily indicate a converted Jew (or the scion of a converted Jew); he never fully entertains the possibility that actual, unconverted Jews might appear on witness lists.⁵⁶ I propose that, given the presence of Jews in circles of power—particularly in the realms of real estate and finance—the men identified on witness lists by the surname or title “Judeus” may very well have been actual Jews. Their regular appearance in monastic land transfer documents and similar sources demonstrates that they carried out regular economic activity with monasteries and other powers in the empire. The social and economic interactions hinted at in these real estate documents are normative; Jews do not seem to have been excluded, or even singled out very much, on the basis of their religious identity. Given all that, it seems possible, even likely, that unconverted Jews would appear on the witness lists for property transactions. After all, one would expect authorities to turn to their peers and partners in the real estate market when choosing witnesses for important land transactions; Jews, as we have seen, were both. If this interpretation is correct, it certainly challenges many of the assumptions that scholars have held about the Jews of this era, especially the idea that Jewish social status, as well

⁵⁶ Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 273-77. Given Haverkamp’s focus on converts in this article, such a conclusion is understandable. He is debating the assumption of some scholars that the appellation “Judeus” indicated that the person so named was himself a Jewish-born convert to Christianity. Haverkamp does reference the earlier contention of Robert Hoeniger that “Judeus” referred in some cases to an unconverted Jew, but he dismisses Hoeniger’s argument as part of an erroneous, romantic notion of peaceful coexistence between Jews and Christians in the early twelfth-century Rhineland.

as their occupations and economic opportunities, became increasingly limited and marginalized during the high Middle Ages.⁵⁷

3.4 The Realm of Finance

The other major economic space wherein Jews and monasteries interacted was, not surprisingly, the realm of finance. The basic assumption in historical writing about Jews of this period is that they made their living by lending money to Christians, particularly those in the urban centers of Christendom.⁵⁸ This view goes hand-in-hand with the notion that Jews were buttonholed almost exclusively into this disparaged occupation (along with other disreputable tasks like peddling and pawn-brokering) by Christian authorities in the high Middle Ages, despite once being major players in the broader economy, with rural, urban, local, regional, and international business interests.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ On this notion of marginalization, among many others, see Moore, 75-82 and a more nuanced portrait in Lester K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 42-46, 56-57. Among those who argue against this position, see Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 213-18.

⁵⁸ On this topic generally: Michael Toch, "Jüdische Geldleihe im Mittelalter," in *Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Bayern: Aufsätze*, ed. Manfred Treml and Josef Mirmeier (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1988), 85-94 and Shatzmiller, *Shylock Reconsidered*.

⁵⁹ This view has its origins in the grand narrative histories of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In his general history of the Jews, long a standard text, Heinrich Graetz insists that the Jews of Germany were forbidden from owning landed property and were thus forced into financial occupations. He also explains that legal restrictions forced most German Jews to move to the cities and engage in moneylending. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 5.380-81 and 6.230. This view has persisted through much of the twentieth century. In an oft-read survey published in 1976, H.H. Ben-Sasson asserts, "After the First Crusade a decisive economic change occurred in the lives of the Jews dwelling in the north-western and central European countries. The range of their livelihoods gradually narrowed, until on the whole they were dependent on one branch alone. This phenomenon, itself a result of social and political conditions that were affecting the Jews unfavourably, had grave consequences in the social sphere and in the realm of their security. The declining safety of the Jews once society at large had become accustomed to seeing their blood shed with impunity, the worsening attitude of Christian society as a result of the steady increase in incitement and animosity from the twelfth century onwards, the rise of cities and general developments with respect to money and credit all combined with the ecclesiastic prohibition of interest to transform Jewish life and to produce its singular and damaging economic and social character." H.H. Ben-Sasson, "The Middle Ages," in *A History of the Jewish People*, ed. H.H. Ben-Sasson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 469-70. A dissenting view comes from Salo Baron, who emphasizes the

Jews thus provided a service that was vital to the economy yet scorned vehemently by the very people who benefited most from the practice. Such a situation could not be other than precarious.

This common historiographic view must at least be acknowledged, although, if accepted, it seems to limit the scope of interpretation of Jewish economic activities in this period. For this reason, in addition to stressing that Jews had economic interests apart from moneylending, it seems important to ask, or rather re-ask, the fundamental question: why did the Jews lend money? The widely-held explanation—that Christian authorities and general economic trends limited their economic opportunities to the point that they had no other option—does not satisfy entirely, given the wealth of evidence about Jewish involvement in other parts of the economy, the real estate market in particular. While we cannot entirely rule out curtailment of economic opportunities as a factor in Jewish moneylending, two other reasons for the practice seem more important. To wit, Jews lent money to Christians at interest because they were not theologically forbidden to do so and, quite simply, because they had money and saw in the lending of it the opportunity to make more.

Jewish moneylending is one of the paradoxes of medieval society. It demonstrates that the Jews held both a powerful and a precarious position in this world. On the one hand, Jews held enough capital and were accessible enough to lend both vast sums to emperors, popes, dukes, bishops, and other powerful individuals and institutions

persistence of Jewish land-ownership even in the most hostile regions of Christendom, as well as their involvement in all sorts of craft and trade occupations throughout the Middle Ages. He even declares that “Jewish agriculture never completely disappeared from the European scene and the alleged complete outlawry of Jewish landholdings throughout medieval Europe is another example of a widely accepted historical myth.” Salo W. Baron, “Medieval Christendom,” in *Economic History of the Jews*, ed. Nachum Gross (New York: Schocken, 1975), 36-47.

and small amounts to people of lesser prestige. On the other hand, they were in prime position to do this because of theological restrictions on Christians lending money to other Christians. Culturally, Christians cast aspersions on Jews because the Jews performed a very profitable task that Christians were forbidden, or at least harshly discouraged, to do. That sentiment, coupled with Christian stress over weighty debts, made the Jewish situation precarious.

Still, despite the cultural precariousness of the Jews' activities as moneylenders, this profession did bring them into close and frequent contact with a wide variety of their Christian neighbors, both the powerless and the powerful. Recent research into this topic has shown Jewish moneylending to be remarkably integrated into the broader economic landscape.⁶⁰ In the German lands, where ecclesiastical authorities often wielded tremendous secular power in functioning as regional lords, the Jews worked in close cooperation with bishops, archbishops, and abbots, as well as lay authorities, to power the political and economic machinery of the realm. Powerful churchmen and lay lords—the influential prince-bishops of the empire, for instance—were willing to run interference for Jewish business interests if it meant they could tap into the capital that came from Jewish transactions. In the year 1281, for example, Berthold, the Bishop of Würzburg, pledged to protect the Jews of his city from the exactions of the emperor for a period of

⁶⁰ See especially Annegret Holtmann, "Jewish Moneylending as Reflected in Medieval Account Books: The Example of Vesoul," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 305-315. Holtmann examines two Jewish account books, written in Hebrew, that detail both small and large loans extended by a consortium of Jewish money-lenders, centered in Vesoul, to peasants and nobility in Burgundy in the first two decades of the fourteenth century. As Holtmann explains, some of these Jews were so invaluable to their Christian debtors that they actually became permanent members of the courtly entourage. Moreover, Jews worked in close collaboration with Christian bankers and moneylenders, especially Lombards, who flourished in the same region.

ten years. In return, the Jews provided the bishop with a thousand pounds a year for the duration of the agreement.⁶¹

Bishops and other churchmen relied not only on very wealthy, influential Jews for large sums of money but also on lesser Jewish money-lenders and pawn-brokers for smaller loans—a sort of symmetric parallel to the Jews’ own dealings with both powerful authorities and peoples with lesser means. This practice becomes apparent when one examines sources like a 1213 document that details the efforts of Lütold, bishop of Basel, to pay the six Marks remaining on his outstanding balance to a Jewish moneylender and thus redeem the episcopal ring and sacred vestments he had pawned to raise necessary funds.⁶² Such petty transactions were both common and important to the day-to-day workings of episcopal and other courts; by providing such loans, Jewish loans of various amounts came to constitute the grist for the courtly treasuries’ mills.

Despite the qualms they may have had about borrowing so frequently from Jews, Christian authorities came to rely heavily on Jewish loans to fund building projects and to pay for other costs associated with their offices. In addition, Jews served frequently in positions of financial responsibility in the secular and ecclesiastical courts of the day—as mint master for the bishop of Würzburg⁶³ or the duke of Austria⁶⁴, for instance. Still, while most authorities were usually flexible enough about the cultural and theological restrictions on working with Jews that they simply ignored or dodged them, there were some authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical, who sought to curtail what they saw as

⁶¹ RB 4.135.

⁶² Aronius, 173-74, no.392.

⁶³ Ibid., 188-89, no.425.

⁶⁴ *Monumenta Formbacensia*: MB 4.86, no.115. This was the Jew Schlom discussed above.

severe breaches of propriety, and to limit both the amount of usury and the sorts of transactions that could take place, especially after the middle of the thirteenth century.⁶⁵ A 1227 provincial synod in Trier, for example, attempted to lay down the strictures that governed the borrowing of usurious money by church institutions in the archdiocese. “Let priests never pawn any church trappings, and let clergymen not dare to pawn anything to the Jews without our explicit permission,” declared the synod in no uncertain terms.⁶⁶ Such stern language surely indicates that such practices were taking place. The synod also forbade clergymen from involving themselves in any business with the Jews in order to turn a profit, and it tried to forbid Jews from practicing medicine on or giving medicine to Christians, even adjuring Christian authorities to impose penalties on Jewish physicians.⁶⁷

Such restrictions increased as the thirteenth century wore on, and the entrance of Christian business interests, particularly the banking families of Italy, into the realm of finance dealt another blow to Jewish financial power. Nevertheless, even though the Jews were crowded out in some places by oppressive restrictions and the rise of Christian banking interests, they still acted as major financiers to most German lords until at least the end of the fifteenth century. Since the Jews were so vital to the economic interests of the elite, the persecutions of the fourteenth century not only maimed and displaced dozens of Jewish communities, but also damaged the economic interests of many powerful ecclesiastical and lay princes. One 1354 letter from the cathedral chapter of

⁶⁵ This coincides with the weakening of Jewish privilege, as explained in the previous chapter. For examples of this effort to limit Jewish usury, see Aronius, 260-62 and 313, nos.618, 623, 741, and 742.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 194, no.439. “Sacerdotes numquam exponant aliquid de ornamentis ecclesiasticis nec aliquid religiosi audeant exponere Iudaeis sine nostra licentia speciali.”

⁶⁷ Ibid. The synod also declared that priests were not to dispute with Jews in the presence of laymen.

Trier to Pope Innocent VI, for instance, cited the Black Death massacres of the Jews as the major reason for the archiepiscopate's condition of near bankruptcy.⁶⁸ Such a source hints strongly at the robust nature of economic interactions between Jews and Christian institutions—particularly the volume of Christian indebtedness to Jews—in the period preceding Rintfleisch, Armleder, and the Black Death.

Along with their colleagues among the secular and ecclesiastical elite, monasteries throughout the German lands entered into frequent money-lending arrangements with Jewish financiers. The records that document these financial transactions are rarely devoted solely to this information and thus lack any systematic or chronological account of these relationships. As a result, it is difficult to work out their exact developmental trajectory. Jewish loans to monasteries appear to have been a well-established practice by the middle of the twelfth century, and they show up in much greater numbers in the sources from the thirteenth century, in large part because monasteries kept more detailed records as time passed. As with so many other aspects of Jewish life, their financial relationships with monasteries seem to have become quite strained after the middle of the thirteenth century, though it is difficult to discern the cause of this rift. It may be simply that more sources from this period have survived, so the resentment and consternation they express appears all the more stark when compared with the relatively few sources that contain such sentiment in the earlier period. It may be that the monasteries went into greater and greater debt over the course of time (perhaps with an incomplete understanding of the concept of interest), to the point that

⁶⁸ Alfred Haverkamp, "Erzbischof Bladin und die Juden," in *Baldwin von Luxemburg, Erzbischof von Trier—Kurfürst des Reiches (1285-1354): Festschrift aus Anlaß des 700. Geburtsjahres*, ed. Franz-Josef Heyen, *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhochdeutschen Kirchengeschichte* 53, (Mainz: Gesellschaft für mittelhochdeutsche Kirchengeschichte, 1985), 437.

their debt burden threatened their very existence. It may even be that the political upheaval of the second half of the thirteenth century led to an economic crisis, but the existence and nature of such a phenomenon is difficult to sketch from these sources. As is the case with most historical circumstances, the growing tension in these financial relationships during the thirteenth century was likely the combination of several factors. Still, this tension did not stop Jewish loans to monasteries; monks continued to seek money from Jewish lenders long after the thirteenth century. Whatever the factors that determined its trajectory, one should keep this general chronological framework in mind when investigating the components of the financial relations between Jews and monasteries. The balance of this section will be devoted to such an exploration.

First, some comments on the terms of these arrangements. Sometimes the parties to the loan arranged for contracts to be drawn up; these detailed the amount of the loan and the terms of repayment. Examples of loan contracts are mostly straightforward, and, at times, lacking in details. Many record loans of fairly small amounts. For instance, in 1169, the Jew Walther obtained a loan contract from a monastery in Würzburg (probably St. Stephen, although the source fails to mention the name of the house). In exchange for the loan (the amount of which is also not specified), the monastery agreed to pay Walther two measures of corn and five containers of wine annually.⁶⁹ In similar fashion, the Premonstratensian Abbey of Freising took out a twenty-pound loan in 1259 from the Jew Woelfin; they agreed to pay a half-pound of interest at ten pence per week for the life of the loan.⁷⁰ Contracts are not the only documentation that concerns Jewish loans to

⁶⁹ Aronius, 128, no.300.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 269, no.642.

monasteries, however. Official records kept by the monasteries—cartularies or tradition books, for instance—frequently note debts owed to Jews. A monastic document from 1288 for the Benedictine convent of Rohr acknowledges that the house was in arrears to the Jew Gnenlin, though Count Albert III of Hals and two of his vassal knights guaranteed the repayment of the abbey's loans.⁷¹ The monks, it seems, needed the sponsorship of the count in order to secure the loan.

There were surely multiple reasons why monasteries sought loans from Jews, but the three most common reasons, it appears, were to purchase land, to pay off debt to other creditors, and to pay taxes owed to higher authorities. Like other prominent players in the high medieval economy, monasteries often sought to add to their wealth by purchasing land, and they called upon Jewish moneylenders to help them finance such ventures. Monasteries did not always seek funds directly from Jews to make such deals work; Jewish financiers in some cases served as third parties to ensure the success of the transaction. For example, in 1264, Xanten abbey purchased a house from a Christian burgher for five and a half marks. The deal stipulated that the former owners of the house would pay an episcopal fee that was attached to the property; in fact, a half mark of the purchase price went to the treasurer of Xanten to make sure this fee was paid. In case the former owners were not able to pay the fee, the deal stipulated that the treasurer could borrow the fee money from a Jewish moneylender; the former owners would then be responsible for settling the account with the Jew.⁷² The monastery surely had prior relationships with Jewish financiers in order to involve them in the contract. Whatever

⁷¹ *Die Traditionen des Stiftes Rohr*: QE, n.f. 21.231-33, no.70.

⁷² *Rheinisch-Westphälischer diplomatischer Codex oder Urkunden-Sammlung zur Geschichte der Erzdiözese Köln*, vol.1, ed. A.J. Binterim and J.H. Mooren (Mainz: Müller, 1830), 303-04, no.161.

the exact relationship between the monastery and the Jews, the availability of Jewish money—or at least the perception that it was available—permitted the land deal to conclude successfully.

Like many of the nobility in this period, monasteries had become accustomed by the high Middle Ages to living beyond their means.⁷³ When debts came due, they routinely turned to more loans in order to procure the necessary liquid capital to make payments. Over time, of course, this practice only increased the debt burden. Borrowing to pay off debt often followed borrowing to purchase lands or other assets. Since the initial loans frequently, perhaps most often, came from Jewish moneylenders, monasteries sometimes had to look elsewhere—to Christian sources of capital, in other words—for help with paying them off. In 1257, the monastery of Prüfening borrowed one hundred pounds from Alhard Irhaer, a burgher in Regensburg, in order to achieve a “loosening of the abbey’s debts owed to Jews and others.”⁷⁴ Tax burdens could also force a monastic institution to borrow money—Weltenburg Abbey’s loan from Jewish creditors to pay its tithe to the pope in the 1280s is a good example of this trend.⁷⁵

In order to obtain a loan from a Jewish creditor, a monastery usually had to provide some collateral, although at times a written contract could negate this requirement. The need to pledge something valuable to the Jews understandably created a great deal of consternation, since the act always came with the possibility, perhaps a

⁷³ On this point see, among others, Georges Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 233-37.

⁷⁴ While not all of the monastery’s creditors were Jews, the Jewish creditors were the only ones identified specifically. *Monumenta Priflingensia*: MB 13.87, no.12. “ad solucionem pignorum ecclesie nostre judeis obligatorum aliisque”

⁷⁵ *Die Urkunden des Zisterzienserklosters Otterberg 1143-1360*, ed. Martin Dolch and Michael Münch, *Beiträge zur pfälzischen Geschichte* 8.2 (Kaiserslautern: Institut für pfälzische Geschichte und Volkskunde, 1995), 210, no.369.

probability in some cases, that the monks would either suffer severe penalties for not paying on time or even lose their items permanently if they proved unable to pay altogether. Loan contracts between Jewish financiers and monasteries often spelled out the penalties for late payments and defaults. In a 1264 agreement between the monastery of Göttweig and the Viennese Jew Schalun, for example, the abbot ceded three farms in the village of Pettendorf to the Jew in exchange for eighteen pounds. According to the terms of the loan, the Jew collected all income produced by the farms while he held them as pledges. In fact, states the contract, Schalun could also collect the entire earnings of the farms for the whole of the year 1264 if the abbey failed to redeem the pledge before the end of Easter that year.⁷⁶

In addition to or instead of pawning land holdings like the house in the previous example, many monasteries that were desperate for money pawned their liturgical vestments, church ornaments, and similar items, even though higher church authorities frowned upon this practice.⁷⁷ Hardship sometimes forced monasteries to resort to such measures in order to shore up the institution's precarious financial position. In the 1250s, Michelsberg Abbey in Bamberg suffered several robberies, likely due to the perilous political circumstances and consequent lack of security of the early Interregnum period.

⁷⁶ Brugger, *Regesten*, 1.49, no.36; also *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, vol.2, ed. Anton Mayer (Vienna: Verlag und Eigenthum des Alterthums-Vereines zu Wien, 1896), 96, no.1509.

⁷⁷ Monasteries were not the only church institutions to do so. Episcopal courts often pledged their sacred items as collateral against Jewish loans, as when Lütold, bishop of Basel, pawned his episcopal rings and vestments to a Jew. The relevant source indicates that he had to borrow money from Count Rudolf of Homberg in 1213 in order to redeem these pledges. Aronius, 173-74, no.392. Sometimes the decision to pawn church inventory was made, understandably, during a time of transition or vacancy, perhaps by individuals whose self-interest outweighed the interests of the church. For example, after the death of Arnold of Selenhofen, Archbishop of Mainz, in 1160, rapacious clergymen plundered a number of items from its treasury and pawned them to the Jews of that city. Another portion of the treasury was simply stolen. Ibid., 125, no.287. While plundering of the monastic treasury during vacancies of leadership is really a separate matter worthy of its own lengthy discussion, it is notable for our purposes that Jewish moneylenders became involved in such cases.

To raise funds quickly, the monks pawned a gilded book and some church ornaments at steep interest rates to Jewish financiers in Bamberg.⁷⁸ Another case involving the pawning of sacred items—this one even more extreme—comes from the monastery of St. Leonard in Alsace around the year 1215. The source that describes these transactions claims that the monastery had fallen into serious dilapidation since its height under the abbots Liutold and Godfrey. By this point the monks had reached such desperate straits that they decided to pawn several books, including a copy of St. Gregory's *Moralia in Job*, five sacred vestments, two candlesticks, and a gilded cross to the Jews of Ehnheim for five marks. That was still not sufficient money for their needs, it seems, because they also pawned a goblet, three more vestments, and four more books to the Jews of Rosheim for nine pounds and twenty pence.⁷⁹ Other examples of such activities abound in monastic sources from this period.⁸⁰

Monks who pledged their monastery's sacred accouterments to secure loans must have done so with confidence that they would be able to pay off the debt and redeem the holy items. Unfortunately for them, redeeming these pledges was, at times, a difficult proposition, due either to poor long-term account management or to the amount of the monastery's overall debt. Most of the descriptions of the actual pledged items in monastic documents occur in conjunction with a description of the measures, some of

⁷⁸ Ibid., 264-65, no.629.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 174, no.394.

⁸⁰ Monastic trappings ended up in the hands of Jews through indirect channels as well. In 1184, Dietrich, Margrave of the East March bought a chalice from Lauterberg Abbey; years later, Count Ulrich of Wittin, who obtained the chalice from Dietrich, pawned it to the Jews of Halle. *Chronicon montis sereni*: MGH SS 23.160.

them drastic, that monks had to take to redeem them from their Jewish creditors. Such measures will be discussed in greater detail below.

Comments in monastic sources about the stress that accompanied a runaway debt load are quite common, especially in sources that date from the middle of the thirteenth century and after. It seems the pressure became particularly acute when monasteries like the aforementioned Abbey of St. Leonard found themselves in arrears to several creditors at once. Monastic authors characterized debt loads by turns as crushing, debilitating, and exhausting; whatever their description, they certainly constituted a major distraction from the pursuit of heavenly things meant to characterize the life of the monastery, at least for those who saw to the financial affairs of the house in question. This consternation manifested itself in two major ways. First, monks directed anger and frustration at their Jewish creditors, and particularly at the fees or interest rates these Jews charged. It is quite possible that either they or their predecessors who had negotiated the initial loan terms with Jewish lenders did not fully understand the concept of interest. Second, they agonized over their financial sustainability and, it seems, faced real fears that their houses would never recover from, and would perhaps succumb to, their indebtedness. One finds an example of the first mode of thought in a public statement issued in 1257 by Abbot Egenhard of the Cistercian monastery of Maulbronn, near Speyer. Egenhard declared therein that his abbey had taken on an “insufferable load of debts,” mostly from Jews whose loans included “the addition of oppressive usury.”⁸¹ This is quite obviously the vocabulary of resentment. As an example of the second line of thinking, Abbot Theoderich of Paulinzelle admitted that his house was “weighed down by such a burden

⁸¹ Aronius, 264, no.628. “*onera debitorum intollerabilia, quibus nostrum monasterium tenebatur, partim inter Iudeos cum accessione gravis usure*”

of debts” that it had to resort to extreme measures to overcome them.⁸² Likewise, Gertrude, the abbess of Quedlinburg, explained that, at the beginning of her term in that position (c.1241), her abbey “was burdened with many debts,” including a massive loan obligation with usury to the Jewish financier Jacob of Blankenburg.⁸³ Sometimes monastic authors pursued both avenues of complaint in the same document. In 1287, for instance, the abbot of Steingaden in Bavaria lamented that his monastery was “overwhelmed by the gravest load of debts” and that he was “forced to pay immoderate usuries to the Jews.” He also worried that this state of indebtedness would damage the monastery’s reputation and injure its legacy of good works.⁸⁴ Each of these monks gave the indication that the state of their monastery’s financial affairs had reached such a critical level that the monks could think about little else besides ridding their houses of debt.⁸⁵

To relieve the monasteries from these crushing obligations, those in charge of monastic finances had to make difficult decisions. When the loads were especially severe or their ability to redeem their pledges seemed to be in question, they found themselves reduced to two basic options. First, they could sell off some of their monastery’s assets in an effort to raise the capital necessary to bring their arrears into the black. This

⁸² *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Paulinzelle, 1068-1534*, ed. Ernst Anemüller (Jena: Fischer, 1905), 88, no.79. “gravita fuisset in tantis honeribus debitorum”

⁸³ Aronius, 230, no.532. “in electionis nostre principio multis esset abbatia debitis onerata”

⁸⁴ *Monumenta Steingadensia*: MB 6.545, no.63. “Ad futuram posteritatem idcirco rerum gestarum memoria est propaganda, ne litigandi materia consurgat, ex oblivione generata. Huius rationis causa [sic] sciant singuli et universi, cum gravissimo premeremur onere debitorum et usuras immoderatas Iudeis solvere cogere[mur] . . .”

⁸⁵ Such clerical worries over debts were not new to the thirteenth century. In the last days of his life (he died in December 1075), Archbishop Anno II of Cologne bound his counselors to rid the episcopacy from the debts it had incurred to Jews and Christians, in order that his successor might not be burdened by such debilitating obligations. *Vita Annonis Archiepiscopi Coloniensis* 3.11: MGH SS 11.502.

decision was a bitter one, since lands and other assets had often come from pious donations and were thus connected intimately to the identity and mission of the house in question. Some of these assets also constituted important sources of a monastery's income. For instance, Gertrude of Quedlinburg transferred her abbey's control over several tithes to Count Henry of Regenstein in exchange for the cash necessary to pay off her house's massive debts to Jews and other creditors.⁸⁶ While such actions potentially compromised the future financial health of these institutions, many monks viewed them, at least in the moment, as necessary. The chronicler of Marchthal Abbey expressed this sentiment when he detailed the successful efforts of Dietrich, prior of that institution, to relieve the house of its financial burden. Although Dietrich ultimately decided to sell off profitable vineyards, complete with wine-press, and several other properties, in order to "free the house entirely of debts and rents," the chronicler still declared that "it is safer to have a few things in peace and quiet than, having many things, to suffer the persistence of creditors. For he who needs many things is soiled in the swamp of usury among the Jews."⁸⁷ This is a striking metaphor, obviously bred of resentment and frustration at what the chronicler considered a vile economic practice.

Still, such efforts to relieve debt loads were not always met with universal approval among the monks of the troubled institution. At times brother monks could be quite unfriendly to the financial decisions of their superiors, especially if they seemed questionable for other reasons. The author of the *Chronicon montis sereni*, for example, described the desperate and unpopular measures taken by Dietrich, the prior of the

⁸⁶ Aronius, 230, no.532.

⁸⁷ *Historia Monasterii Marchtelanensis*, ch.2: MGH SS 24.680. "Tucius est enim pauca habere in pace et quiete quam cum multis rebus instantiam creditorum tolerare. Nam multis eget qui usurarum voragine inter Iudeos sordet." The "many things" seems to be a euphemism for luxury items.

Augustinian house of Lauterberg. Dietrich was a figure of some importance, having participated in the Fourth Lateran Council.⁸⁸ However, his financial decisions as prior brought his monastery into such serious financial straits that he was forced to begin jettisoning resources in order to pay the outstanding balances. The chronicle describes Dietrich as “overwhelmed by the heavy burden of debts with which he had bound himself.”⁸⁹ Even more troubling for the chronicler was the fact that he had incurred these debts without consulting his fellow canons. Facing multiple sources of pressure, Dietrich hatched a secret plan (again “without consulting the chapter”) with some of his close associates—the chronicler described this plan as “very foolish and criminal”—to sell off 24 manses to Count Frederick of Brena.⁹⁰ Ironically, these were the same properties that Rudolf, an earlier prior of Lauterberg, had acquired “with great difficulty” from the same count. In exchange for these lands, the count paid Dietrich 200 Marks, which the canon then used to pay off enormous debts to Jewish lenders.⁹¹ Naturally, when the canons of Lauterberg found out about the secret negotiations between the prior and the count, as well as the clandestine debts to Jews, they were quite upset.

In addition to working with secular authorities, as in the case of Dietrich of Lauterberg, some monasteries in difficult financial situations sought to offer their assets

⁸⁸ Paul B. Pixton, *The German Episcopacy and the Implementation of the Decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council: Watchmen on the Tower* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 191.

⁸⁹ *Chronicon montis sereni*: MGH SS 23.190: “Tidericus Sereni Montis prepositus gravi debitorum pondere, quod ipse sibi alligaverat, pressus.”

⁹⁰ Given the fact that monasteries often acquired land through gifts—some of them accompanying new monks or canons as they entered the monastery—it is perhaps understandable why Dietrich did not want to share his plan with his fellow canons. Ibid. “stulto nimis et noxio cum quibusdam suis familiaribus consilio inito”

⁹¹ Ibid. “24 mansos, quos Rodolfus prepositus a Friderico comite de Brene etsi difficulter admodum, tamen utiliter emerat in villa Niendorp, eidem comiti inconsulto capitulo obtulit redimendos hoc modo, ut ipsorum mansorum precio computato a ducentis marcis, quas Iudeis reddere tenebatur quasque ignorantibus fratribus mutuo acceperat, eum absolveret.”

to wealthier monasteries to raise necessary cash. The abbot of Michelsberg, for instance, sold two properties for twenty pounds to the Michelfeld Abbey to redeem church ornaments he had pledged to Jewish creditors.⁹² Similarly, in 1283, the influential Benedictine monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg bailed out the Abbey of Weltenburg. The monks of Weltenburg, it seems, had become desperate enough to pawn their sacred liturgical vestments to Jewish money-lenders in order to raise enough money to pay their tithes to the pope. Because “the chasm of usury wanted to swallow up those pledges entirely,” the monks “by a united decision and with the consent of all” made the decision to sell “a certain little farm . . . for two talents” to St. Emmeram, so the Abbey could redeem those vital possessions.⁹³ Abbot Conrad of Weltenburg sought to justify this action on the grounds that it was an “unsoiled transaction” and that the abbey had the option to repurchase the plot from the monks of St. Emmeram at a later date. In the measures they had to take to redeem their pledges, the monks of Weltenburg were certainly not alone.⁹⁴

⁹² Aronius, 254, no.594.

⁹³ *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Weltenburg*, ed. Matthias Thiel, QE, n.f. 14 (Munich: Beck, 1958), 138, no.28. “cum apud Judeos Ratispone vestes sacre propter decimam domini pape essent iam diucius obligate et vorago usure ipsa pignora vellet omnimodis absorbere, nos vero maius periculum precavere volentes *unanimi consilio et consensu omnium*, qui poterant et debebant commode interesse, quoddam prediolum ante nemus in Aurbach inferiori situm causa solucionis eorundem pignorum et fideussorum, qui una cum ipso pignore apud Judeos fuerunt obligati, *pura vendicione* vendidimus ecclesie sancti Emmerammi pro duobus talentis Ratisponensis monete hac condicione taliter interclusa, quatenus nos et monasterium nostrum post triennium, quandocumque nobis vel successoribus nostris se ad id obtulerit facultas, supradictum prediolum pro consimili pecunia habeamus facultatem liberam reemendi.” Emphasis added.

⁹⁴ Another example comes from the same year, 1283, when the Abbey of Otterberg, a Cistercian house in the Rhineland, sold controlling interest in a valuable piece of property for the relatively large sum of 116 pounds. The record of this sale notes that the Abbot used the entirety of the proceeds to pay off the immense debts the Abbey owed to Jewish money-lenders. This apparently did not relieve all of the monastery’s debts, however. The very next year, the prior of the Abbey arranged for the transfer of some fertile farmland near the village of Kirchheim, in exchange for another 54 pounds. The record explains again that the abbey used this money to pay off debt, although this time it notes that payments were made

As the cases of Dietrich of Lauterberg and Conrad of Weltenburg demonstrate, the monk or monks responsible for the finances of a monastery heavily in debt surely had a difficult and stressful job, even if their efforts to relieve debt ultimately proved successful. This stress occasionally led such monks to give up their demanding positions within the monastery. In 1259, the monastery of Reichersberg (a house of Augustinian canons) elected one Gerold as cellarer and, it appears, yoked him with the task of dealing with the house's substantial debt load, owed to both Jewish and Christian creditors. By 1263, explained the chronicler, Gerold had managed to reform the monastery's financial affairs and free it from many of its former debts. However, this burden so exhausted him that, after only four years of service, he retired from his position, claiming that he was not able to keep up with the required workload.⁹⁵

Failing the option to sell off assets, monasteries in severe debt could appeal to higher secular or ecclesiastical authorities for help in convincing, or coercing, the Jews to grant longer grace periods, reduce payments, or forgive debts entirely. Indeed, some monasteries brought a guarantor to the bargaining table when they first sought the loan, as in the aforementioned case from 1288 involving the monastery of Rohr and the Regensburg Jew Gnenlin, wherein Count Albert of Hals guaranteed the security of the loan.⁹⁶ Placing the institution at the mercy of a higher power was a sort of weapon of last resort for many monasteries; this process essentially functioned as the high medieval

to both Jewish and Christian creditors. *Die Urkunden des Zisterzienserklosters Otterberg*, ed. Dolch and Münch, 210 and 215, nos.369 and 377.

⁹⁵ *Chronici Magni Presbiteri Continuatio*: MGH SS 17.531-32.

⁹⁶ See n.71 above.

equivalent of Chapter 11 bankruptcy, since by pursuing this course the monks had to submit to the terms of the authority whose help they sought.

An example of such an appeal comes from the aforementioned case of Michelsberg Abbey, which was plundered several times in the 1250s and thus came into very difficult financial straits.⁹⁷ After pawning several sacred items to the Jews of Bamberg, the monks found themselves unable to redeem their pledges. After waiting some time for payment, the monastery's Jewish creditors went to local judges and obtained court permission to sell the pledged items. In desperation the monks called upon the aid of Uto, chancellor of Bamberg cathedral, to help them obtain their endangered property. Notably, Uto did not repudiate the debts; they were respected enough to remain binding. Instead, Uto and his assistants seized temporary control of the abbey's resources for ten years and sold off or otherwise managed a number of properties and other goods in order to collect the funds to redeem the pledges. Finally, Uto was able to pay off both the principal and the interest on the loans and obtain the monastery's items. Of course, the monastery rewarded Uto for his labors on their behalf by bestowing properties on him.⁹⁸

Monasteries that found themselves deeply in debt to Jewish creditors sought help even from the king or emperor at times, particularly toward the close of the period in question. For instance, in the year 1300 Emperor Albrecht I sent a letter to Ananias, one of the leaders of the Jews of the empire, declaring that he was releasing the monastery of Eberbach from the debts it owed to Jewish creditors. Albrecht noted that the release was

⁹⁷ See n.78 above.

⁹⁸ *Urkundenbuch des Abtes Andreas im Kloster Michelsberg*, vol.1, ed. C.A. Schweitzer, Bericht über das Wirken des historischen Vereins zu Bamberg 16 (Bamberg: J.M. Reindl, 1853), 76-77.

in effect from the time of the declaration, thus leaving Jewish lenders no option to collect even a part of the sums owed to them.⁹⁹ This example demonstrates the double-edged sword quality of the imperial privileges upon which the Jews relied so heavily. At the same time it seems to represent a sort of last-ditch effort by Ebersbach Abbey to gain release from their crushing debt load; the emperor, almost certainly, saw this as a reciprocal arrangement that would work to his advantage, although the source itself does not mention the terms which subsequently bound the monastery to the emperor.

In addition to obtaining loans from Jewish moneylenders directly, monasteries became involved in other ways with Jewish creditors and Christian debtors. Just as monasteries sought the help of others to get out from under their debt loads, so nobles and burghers called upon monasteries with some frequency to help relieve them from debt obligations. Donations were a major avenue through which this happened. It had, since at least the early Middle Ages, been a custom of laymen to donate lands and other goods to monasteries, in exchange for prayers offered on behalf of the layman and his family. With the burgeoning of the credit economy in the high Middle Ages and the consequent indebtedness of so many noble landowners, such customary donations often came to carry a double purpose. The persons who made donations, it appears, were often trying to cast off weighty debts in addition to performing their Christian duty by supporting and donating to the monasteries.¹⁰⁰ At the same time, the reform-minded monasteries of this era were striving for greater autonomy and more favorable positions

⁹⁹ Johann Friedrich Böhmer, ed., *Acta Imperii Selecta* (Aalen: Scientia, 1967), 402-03, no.551.

¹⁰⁰ Gifts with debt loads attached were given to church institutions other than monasteries. For instance, in June 1234, a canon of the cathedral of Worms bequeathed his possessions to the church of St. Wido in Speyer. The gift transferred to the church the obligation to make a payment due to the Jews of Speyer. Aronius, 204, no.464.

on the political and economic stage; so long as they were able to muster the money to take over the debt loads, they were only too happy to relieve the knights and nobles of portions of their estates, even if these were, in a sense, the “toxic assets” of the high Middle Ages.

A 1239 document from the monastery of Saint Nicholas, a house of Augustinian canons near Passau, displays this sort of transaction. Blaise, a local citizen of some note, conferred several properties on the abbey, as he said, “for the cure of my soul.”¹⁰¹ Included among these gifts were two vineyards that Blaise had pawned to Bibar, a Jewish financier. Blaise’s testament explained that the monastery could “pay off these vineyards for ten pounds at the house of the Jew Bibar, to whom I had bound my possessions.” Despite this problematic gift, Blaise felt that his donations would make up for his sins and character flaws.¹⁰² Similarly, a 1298 donation by one Reinboto of Swartzenburch to Schönthal Priory included pledges controlled by the Jews among other property transferred. Although the transfer document again contained the standard reason for making such a donation (i.e., “for our soul, and for the spiritual care and salvation of our progeny”), it appears the gift also relieved Reinboto of some onerous financial concerns.¹⁰³

Jewish creditors likely encouraged such transactions. After all, it was in their best interest to find a partner to pay outstanding loan balances if the original debtor was

¹⁰¹ This is the standard reason given for donations to monasteries. Another good example comes from Bohemia in 1228, when a baptized Jew named Stephen gave the monastery of Opatowicz some property in the region of Leitomischl in the hope that it would improve his chances for salvation. Ibid., 196, no.443.

¹⁰² *Monumenta San-Nicolaitana*, no.82: MB 4.282-83. “solverent vineas easdem pro decem libris . . . apud Iudeum nomine Bibar, cui easdem possessiones obligaveram”

¹⁰³ *Monumenta Monasterii Schönthal*, no.56: MB 26.48.

unable to do so. A source from the 1230s in Austria demonstrates this process at work. In January 1235, Poppo of Peggau, a minor noble, bequeathed properties to the monastery of Reichersberg. These properties were, at the time of the transaction, pawned to Teka, a Jew of some standing in this region of Christendom.¹⁰⁴ Poppo, it seems, was at the time 120 Viennese pounds in arrears. Ultimately, the monastery paid the debt to Teka and even gave 10 pounds to Poppo to complete the transaction.¹⁰⁵ One source notes that Teka himself acted as the “mediator and overseer” for the deal.¹⁰⁶ It appears that Teka, whose business dealings ranged far and wide, recognized Poppo’s inability to pay the debt and looked elsewhere for a more viable debtor, settling ultimately on the monastery.

3.5 Taxes and Rents

Jews in many locations throughout the empire brought in substantial sums of money from their various business dealings. Their wealth, as well as their connection to authorities through privileges, made them prime targets for taxation. Because of their wealth and economic reputation, Jews were also sought after as tenants for rental properties. Taxes, tithes, and rents thus constitute another important area of Jewish involvement in the economy of the high medieval empire, as well as an important sphere for economic and social interaction between Jews and monasteries.

¹⁰⁴ Teka is perhaps the most famous Austrian Jew of the high Middle Ages; at the very least, there are more sources about him than about any other Jew of Austria in this period. He was an official in the court of King Andrew II of Hungary and was involved in the brokering of a peace treaty in 1225 between Andrew and Duke Leopold VI of Austria. He also possessed large land holdings in Austria and thus constitutes one of the best examples of the well-placed Jews of this era. On his life and career, see Klaus Lohrmann, *Judenrecht und Judenpolitik im mittelalterlichen Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1990), 50-52 and Lohrmann’s more recent work, *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter* (Berlin: Philo, 2000), 32-34, 60-62.

¹⁰⁵ Brugger, *Regesten*, 1.24-26, nos.11, 12, 14.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.25, no.12. “Huius rei Techanus iudeus mediator et procurator fuit.”

Myriad records speak of taxes imposed on the Jews; they were levied for a variety of reasons, though a large proportion of them were a function of privilege relationships. Some of these privilege tax payments were merely *ad hoc* affairs. For example, when Swatopluk, duke of Bohemia, was held hostage by King Henry V in the first years of the twelfth century, the Jews of Bohemia, along with other privileged entities (monasteries, merchants, etc.), were required to contribute money toward his ransom.¹⁰⁷ In similar fashion, Frederick Barbarossa raised a coronation tax from the Jews of Goslar in 1155.¹⁰⁸

Still, although some taxes were special, one-time requirements, most taxes imposed on Jews by the authorities who granted their privileges demanded recurring, usually annual, payments. Authorities gave various justifications for levying such taxes. Perhaps most commonly, they insisted that Jews pay, sometimes dearly, for protection—the very thing guaranteed foremost by the privileges discussed in the previous chapter. The emperor, who gave the Jews of the empire their greatest guarantee of security, could be particularly demanding. An entry in the imperial tax register of the city of Dortmund from the reign of Emperor Frederick II gives some indication of the proportion of imperial tax paid by Jews to that imposed on the overall population. It notes that the Jews of Dortmund—not a large Jewish community in this period—paid 15 marks in tax in fiscal year 1241-42, while the residents of the same city—an Imperial Free City and important center of the profitable Hanseatic League—paid 100 marks during the same year.¹⁰⁹ While the Dortmund source does not necessarily represent the norm, it does leave the impression that Jews paid a great deal of tax to ensure their protection.

¹⁰⁷ Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum* 3.21: MGH SS 9.112.

¹⁰⁸ Aronius, 122, no.275.

¹⁰⁹ *Westfalia Judaica*, ed. Brilling and Richter, 1.36-37, no.12.

Despite the prevalence of privilege taxes, not all taxes, tithes, and rents imposed upon the Jews came via privilege arrangements. As this chapter has demonstrated, many Jews attained prominent economic positions in the empire, particularly in the real estate markets of important cities like Cologne, Trier, and Regensburg. Sometimes their efforts in the realm of property acquisition led to their assuming of rent or tax burdens on the properties they acquired. One of Solomon of Cologne's house purchases in the 1130s or 1140s, for example, came with an annual tax of 6 Groschen, which, it seems, had previously been the obligation of the property's Christian former owner. Since taxes like this were normal, one should be careful not to assume that Jews bore a special tax responsibility in all cases or that being Jewish somehow obligated them, universally, to pay higher taxes. Such may have been the case at times and in particular places in the empire of this period, but it does not seem always to have been standard practice.

Tax and rent relationships, like privilege relationships, were rarely static in this era, since such relationships could be used as leverage to secure better social or economic positions. The granters of Jewish privileges and/or holders of Jewish taxation privileges sometimes sold, traded, or gave away their taxation rights and rental incomes, along with the obligation to protect the Jews, either to other churchmen or to lay lords in order to establish relationships or strengthen ties of dependence. Control of Jewish privilege or Jewish tax thus came to constitute an innovative and potentially valuable form of capital. An example from mid-thirteenth century Cologne demonstrates this process at work. Conrad of Hochstaden, the archbishop of Cologne, issued a privilege to the Jews in March of 1250, extending physical protection in exchange for an annual payment of 25 Marks. Also under the terms of this arrangement, more Jews were free to immigrate into

the city, so long as they paid the annual tribute.¹¹⁰ Only three years later, this same Archbishop Conrad struck a deal with his vassals, Counts Walram and Otto of Nassau, in which he turned over the rights to this annual Jewish tribute, in addition to a number of other taxes, instead of granting them a money fief of 500 Marks.¹¹¹ In economic terms, the bishop entered into the privilege arrangement with the Jews in order to raise capital (i.e., the income from the annual protection tax), so that he might have a fief with which to bind his vassals. The document does not say whether the Counts assumed responsibility for the other terms of the privilege—that is, for protecting the Jews of Cologne. In fact, its absence from the agreement may illustrate the relative lack of emphasis placed on that obligation. In any case, it appears that the archbishop considered this privilege a fairly low-risk way to raise liquid capital, since the odds that he would need to protect the Jews were minimal, and the tax itself could be transferred easily.

Just as they were involved in other areas of the economy, monasteries participated in this exchange of tax privileges and rental incomes. As the examples of Conrad of Hochstaden and others illustrate, the right to collect taxes and rents from Jews was a stable, and in some cases substantial, source of income. Like any other institution, ecclesiastical or otherwise, monasteries required such income sources in order to function. A few examples should illustrate the point sufficiently. In the 1150s, Luzo, prior of the monastery of St. Andrew in Cologne, struck a deal with Archbishop Anno of Cologne under the terms of which Luzo received control of a house in the Jewish quarter of the

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 1.37-38, no.13.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 1.38-39, no.14.

city. The house brought Luzo and his monastery an income of 24 shillings per year.¹¹²

In another case, Archbishop Wichmann of Magdeburg gave the monastery of Seeburg the privilege to collect an annual tax of two marks from the Jews of Halle.¹¹³ Since

Wichmann was himself the founder of Seeburg Abbey, such a gift makes sense; he was merely transferring a portion of his own income to the institution he founded in order to place it on firm financial footing. In a final example, Conrad of Mergerstorf, an Austrian noble, bequeathed a tax privilege involving a Jew to the monastery of Klosterneuburg. The Jew, Henry, had been paying Conrad five pence annually; the collection of that tax now became the responsibility of the monastery.¹¹⁴

3.6 Neighborly Relations

The political and economic evidence presented thus far illustrate clearly that Jews and monks participated in the same political processes that characterized the empire, that they lived close to one another, and that they engaged in business with one another, particularly in the real estate and financial markets of the empire's cities. The vital question that remains unanswered concerns their social relationship. To ask it simply, how did they get along? Did they enjoy one another's company, did they barely tolerate the sight of one another, or did they, in their ambivalence, separate external relationships from internal attitudes? Unfortunately, the sources that reveal the nature of social

¹¹² Aronius, 68, no.163. The document does not say whether this sum came from rent or from taxes on the property. The canons of St. Andrew later lost control of this house, though Archbishop Hermann ultimately gave it back to the abbey as a gift.

¹¹³ Ibid., 144, no.319.

¹¹⁴ *Merkwürdiger Schicksale des Stiftes und der Stadt Klosterneuburg*, vol.2, ed. Maximilian Fischer (Vienna: L. Grund, 1815), 85, no.140. As was the case with many donations to monasteries, the document notes that Conrad did this "for the cure of his soul [*pro remedio anime sue*]."

interactions between Jews and monks are not nearly so plentiful as those that document economic ties between the two communities. Moreover, they rarely record the ordinary interactions that occurred between Jews and monks—or at least those monks in positions of leadership, since they were more likely than other monks to leave the cloister and meet up with Jews in the street and marketplace. Nevertheless, the sources that do exist contain important revelations, and this chapter, and indeed this entire section of the dissertation, will conclude, fittingly, with an examination of a few of these texts.

It is important to note at the outset of this discussion that the extraordinary interactions discussed in some of these sources—religious debate, intellectual exchange, and the like—were only possible because monks and Jews had ordinary interactions, that they engaged in negotiations, bargaining, and probably tense discussions at times, though perhaps also supped or drank together on occasion. Put another way, we must acknowledge that Jews and monks interacted regularly in ways that were fairly unremarkable because only with such an admission do the remarkable examples make sense. Indeed, in the few sources that do reveal social relations between monks and Jews, such interactions appear to be normative and even amiable. There were occasions, it seems, when Jews actually sought out conversation with Christian churchmen, including monks, and vice-versa. These exchanges consisted at times of religious debate, as in the well-studied episode involving Rupert of Deutz and Hermann of Scheda (formerly Judah of Cologne)¹¹⁵, yet they must also have included simple neighborly exchanges—chatting

¹¹⁵ An earlier dispute involved a learned Jew (a court physician of Conrad II) and Wazo, who later became the bishop of Lüttich. The Episcopal source that documents this dispute gives few details, mentioning only the credentials of the Jew and declaring Wazo the clear victor. Aronius, 64, no.151.

about the weather, the harvest, the market, or the current political situation in the manner of Tevye and the town constable in *Fiddler on the Roof*.

Several key sources describe the relationship between specific Jews and their Christian authorities as close. This seems to have been particularly, though not exclusively, the case in the late eleventh century, when Jews and church authorities were just beginning to form privilege relationships. Some of the amiable social relations documented by chroniclers and other authors were surely the result of the goodwill that such agreements engendered. Thietmar of Merseburg, for instance, described the mass attendance and strong emotions displayed by the Jews at the funeral of Walthard, Archbishop of Magdeburg, who, he declared, had been like “a father” to the Jews of that city.¹¹⁶ In similar fashion, the Jews of Cologne mourned the death of Anno, the archbishop of that city, in 1075. The author of the *Vita Annonis* noted that, on the morning after his death, a “clamor and uproar” issued forth from the synagogues as “each of the Jews proclaimed the uprightness of Anno and the integrity of his life.”¹¹⁷ Again, at the 1051 funeral of Archbishop Bardo of Mainz, the Jews of that city lined the streets to catch a glimpse of the funeral bier and, according to the author of Bardo’s *Vita*, cried out “Oh, pious father!” repeatedly as his body passed.¹¹⁸ At times, authorities were even accused of favoring Jews too much, as was the case with Albrecht, the archbishop of Magdeburg, in 1206.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* 6.45: MGH SS 3.827.

¹¹⁷ *Vita Annonis Archiepiscopi Coloniensis* 3.15: MGH SS 11.503. “Annonis probitatem et vitae sinceritatem singuli clamabant”

¹¹⁸ *Vita Bardonis maior*, ch.28: MGH SS 11.341.

¹¹⁹ Aronius, 165, no.372. This same Albrecht punished the residents of Halle in 1207 for the burning of Halle’s Jewish quarter and the expulsion of the Jews from the town. See Ibid., 165-66, no.373.

Monastic figures on occasion had similarly amiable relations with their Jewish neighbors. A description of Rudolph of St. Trond, the abbot of St. Pantaleon, for instance, noted the following: “With Jews he frequently had easy conversation, neither disputing nor reproaching, but softening the hardness of their heart by stroking and rubbing when it was needful; on account of this, he was trusted by them, such that even their women went to see and speak to him.”¹²⁰ The abbot, then, engaged his Jewish neighbors in religious discussions, though not, according to the source, in a condescending or belligerent way. It was he who requested of Rupert of Deutz a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew wherein the Jew argues against Christianity from the perspective of the Mosaic Law; this was intended for the training of younger monks who were not yet schooled sufficiently in the truths of Christian doctrine and the errors of the Jewish faith.¹²¹ Still, despite his interest and involvement in debate with Jews, he also appears to have had frequent, more mundane conversations with his Jewish friends; in any case, if we follow the source cited above, the relationship between the abbot and the Jews was marked by peace and trust, rather than contention and suspicion. Although it is difficult to know the extent to which we can take such a source as representative of relations, it does present a compelling bit of evidence to suggest that such interaction was normally mundane at worst and friendly at best.

¹²⁰ *Gesta abbatum Trudonensium* 11.16: MGH SS 10.304. “Cum Iudeis frequenter lene habebat colloquium, non disceptando neque exprobrando, sed duritiam cordis eorum palpatu et fricatione qua opus erat emolliendo; quam ob rem amabatur ab eis, ut etiam mulieres eorum irent videre eum et alloqui.”

¹²¹ See Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 246-47. Rupert produced this work in the spring of 1126. Rudolph, it appears, was not entirely satisfied with his effort. The critical edition of this work, known as the *Anulus sive Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum*, is Rhabanus Haacke, ed. in M.L. Arduini, *Ruperto di Deutz e la controversia tra Christiani ed Ebrei nel secolo XII* (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1979).

In the empire of this period, there were at least a few cases of monks who took enough interest in the study of the Old Testament that they sought to learn Hebrew from the Jewish neighbors, in imitation of St. Jerome. The experience of these monks parallels that of their contemporaries in Paris, Hugh and Andrew of St. Victor, or their English contemporary, Herbert of Bosham.¹²² While at the monastery of St. Vincent in Metz during the early part of his illustrious career, Sigebert of Gembloux appears to have pursued such a course of study with the local Jews. The Gembloux chronicler declared that he was “most beloved [*carissimus*]” of the Jews because he recognized the need to discern “the Hebrew truth [*Hebraicam veritatem*]” of the biblical text.¹²³

More than a century later, Lambert of Lüttich, a monk at St. Matthias Abbey in Trier, seems to have pursued the learning of Hebrew in a manner similar to that of Sigebert. The reference to this training occurs in the middle of Lambert’s own narrative about his writing of a work about the life and miracles of St. Matthias, the patron of his abbey. As Lambert described it in the introduction to this work, he desired to learn more about St. Matthias, but he was unable to find any Christian source describing the deeds of this early apostle and martyr. A priest named Theoderich, he explained, became enthralled with Lambert’s quest and introduced him to a certain Jewish friend, who had in his possession a book about some of the early Christian martyrs, Matthias included. At this point in his narrative, Lambert noted that he had, at some earlier point in his life,

¹²² Admittedly, Hugh of St. Victor was born in Germany, but he spent the largest part of his career in Paris. On the subject of Christian Hebraism in the twelfth century, see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), 102-06, 156-72; Michael A. Signer, “Polemics and Exegesis: The Varieties of Twelfth Century Christian Hebraism,” in *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Allison Coudert (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 21-32; Deborah L. Goodwin, “*Take Hold of the Robe of the Jew*”: *Herbert of Bosham’s Christian Hebraism* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

¹²³ *Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium*, ch.72: MGH SS 8.550. Sigebert himself had begun this chronicle and recorded the history of the monastery through the year 1048.

“learned Hebrew letters from the Jews,” whereupon he continued with the rest of his tale. When Theoderich took Lambert to this appointment, the Jew produced a fraudulent book. Since he knew some Hebrew, Lambert recognized the Jew’s attempt to deceive him immediately; he consequently became angry and rebuked the Jew for his deceit. Fearing for his safety because Lambert was a confidant of the local duke, the Jew then provided Lambert with the correct book.¹²⁴ While Lambert’s depiction of this Jew is not always friendly, it does demonstrate the kind of intellectual interaction between Jews and monks that was possible in this world. Given the close proximity of Jews and monasteries, one wonders if there existed more of this kind of contact than the documentary record reveals.

Another example of social relations between Jews and monks comes from Caesarius of Heisterbach’s *Dialogus Miraculorum*, a work the latter part of this dissertation will examine more closely. While the stories in this collection were intended to serve as material for monastic and public sermons, we may assume that the social atmosphere depicted in these stories was based on actual relations.¹²⁵ The relevant story proceeds as follows: at the time of the conflict between Philip of Swabia and King Otto IV (during the minority of Frederick II in the early years of the thirteenth century), the abbey of St. Goar was besieged by a noble named Warner of Bonlant. During the siege, one of the crossbowmen shot a bolt through a crucifix that had been placed in one of the abbey’s windows. The image began to bleed from the wound, a sight that frightened and

¹²⁴ *Ex inventione et miraculis S. Mathiae*: MGH SS 8.227. “Didiceram eo tempore a quodam ex Iudaeis litteras Hebraicas.”

¹²⁵ Ivan Marcus explains, “Despite the literary and imagined qualities of these narratives, they are placed into an historical setting which was real and which sets limits to the cultural imagination which invented or reshaped and adapted them.” Ivan G. Marcus, “Images of Jews in the *Exempla* of Caesarius of Heisterbach,” in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 248.

tamed the attackers to the point that their commander agreed to go on crusade. Later, Philip, abbot of the monastery of Otterburg, came to St. Goar to determine the truth of the tale. Caesarius narrated, “And when this story which I have related was told to him by everyone, a Jew *who by chance was present at that time*, drew the abbot aside and said, ‘Indeed, my lord, what you have heard is the absolute truth.’”¹²⁶ For Caesarius, the witness of this unbeliever was ultimate proof that the miracle had indeed taken place. For the purposes of this chapter, however, several features of this story are important. First, it is significant that a Jew was present at the abbey; this aspect of the tale coheres well with the evidence of proximity presented at the beginning of this chapter. Second, it is compelling to see that the Jew felt comfortable enough to speak directly to the visiting abbot. This seems to dovetail with the picture we have from other sources of amiable, normative relations between Jews and monks. Third, the fact that the Jew was able to testify in such a matter seems to fit with the evidence presented here of Jews serving as witnesses for property transactions and other matters.

Two other pieces of evidence suggest a very close—one might even say intimate—relationship between some monasteries and some Jews. While it would be difficult to say that the relationships portrayed in these sources were common, they nevertheless show how close such relationships could be in this period. The first example is, admittedly, problematic and potentially spurious. On a record of burials at Raitenhaslach Abbey in Bavaria for the year 1150 one finds two persons with the title “*der Iud.*” Both are indicated as being from the same village, Leren, and one is also

¹²⁶ DM 10.19: Strange 2.32. “Cui cum ab omnibus hoc quod praedictum est diceretur, Judaeus *qui tunc casu affuit*, Abbatem in partem traxit, dicens: Vere domine, verissimum est quod audistis.” Emphasis added.

called “*Ritter*.” The wife (*uxor*—the source is partly in Latin, partly in German) of one of the men is also listed.¹²⁷ Of course, without any corroborating evidence, it is impossible to know whether these titles indicate practicing Jews, converted Jews, or Christians who happened to have that appellation attached to their names. Nevertheless, the evidence presented in this chapter makes it plausible both that a Jew could be buried in a monastic cemetery and that a Jew could hold a title like “*Ritter*.”

The last piece of evidence comes from the Bavarian monastery of Rohr in the penultimate decade of the thirteenth century. It demonstrates, perhaps more effectively than any other document I have located, how close the relationship between monasteries and Jewish communities could be in the empire of this period. The Rohr cartulary contains two documents, both dated 25 July 1287 and issued by Christian authorities in Regensburg, that relate to a single case involving both the monastery and their Jewish neighbors. The authors of the first document were two burghers, Charles Prager and Ruger of Capella, who also served as “judges of the Jews [*iudices Iudeorum*]”: that is, locals who acted as legal liaisons to the city’s Jewish community. The second document came from the pen of Bishop Henry II of Regensburg. These records note that Gnenlin, a Jew who owned the house next to the abbey and had regular business dealings with the monks (including loans mentioned earlier in this chapter)¹²⁸, had approached Reimar, the prior of the monastery, with the proposition that the two households build a communal privy on the border of their respective properties. According to the proposition, both the Jews and the monks could make use of the facility. Bishop Henry, who appears to have

¹²⁷ *Monumenta Raitenhaselacensia*, no.112: MB 3.215. “1150. Friedrich der Iud von Leren Ritter, Elisabeth de Polheim uxor. Ulrich der Iud von Leren, Pruckberg und Holzing.”

¹²⁸ On the monastery’s debts to this Jew, see n.71 above. Gnenlin’s son lived in the house bordering the monastery at the time of this agreement. *Die Traditionen des Stiftes Rohr*: QE, n.f. 21.230, no.68.

been Gnenlin's close ally, lent his support to this plan. The document issued by Charles and Ruger, the "judges of the Jews," asserted that the prior of the monastery, together with the other monks, approved of the request. So long as the Jews agreed to clean and maintain the privy, stipulated the authors, they could share the use of the building with the monks.¹²⁹ In the second document, which contains nearly identical wording, the bishop acted as a second witness to the monastery's approval of the proposed facility.¹³⁰

Given the sorts of very private acts performed in such a structure, and given the assumptions about separation historians for the past two centuries have brought to the study of medieval Jewish-Christian relations, is it not extraordinary to discover that Jews and monks agreed, in very workaday fashion, to share their toilets with one another? Of course, in the absence of archaeological or textual evidence about the architecture of this facility, it is impossible to know its layout and thus ascertain how close the two parties might have gotten to each other when answering the call of nature. Still, no matter the design of the structure, it still seems quite significant that monks and Jews would agree to share its use. As it turns out, this is not the only case from this period that involved Jews, monasteries, and communal toilet facilities. In three documents from the 1320s and 1330s, Himmelspfort Abbey, a house of Cistercian nuns, also made agreements about communal privies with the Jews of Würzburg.¹³¹ Such sources certainly constitute compelling evidence of the closeness of Jewish-monastic relations in the German Empire

¹²⁹ Ibid., 230-231, no.68. The monastery also insisted that the runoff from their roof be allowed to flow into the same drainage ditch as that of the privy.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 231, no.69.

¹³¹ *Urkundenregesten zur Geschichte des Zisterzienserinnenklosters Himmelspforten, 1231-1400*, ed. Hermann Hoffman, QFW 14.166-67, 174-75, 186-87, nos.143, 154, and 165.

of the high Middle Ages. In simple terms, Jews and monks did business together, esteemed each other as friends, and, quite literally, “sat down” together.

3.7 Conclusion

The first three chapters of this dissertation have attempted to describe the social, political, economic, and legal environment wherein Jews and monasteries lived and interacted in the high medieval empire. The explicit argument thus far has been that space existed for such interaction, even to an extraordinary degree. The institution of the privilege, the real estate market, and the empire’s financial system constituted the most important catalysts for this interaction. Given this evidence, we can now state, with confidence, that Jews and monks were certainly not strangers; in fact, some Jews and monks had occasion to do business with each other on a near-daily basis. Through some extraordinary sources like the Rohr cartulary, we can even envision closer, friendlier relations between some Jews and some monks, although evidence for such is, admittedly, more scant.

Still, all of this is not to suggest that monks, in their varied interactions with Jews, ignored long-established and authoritative theological conceptions about Jews, many of which were unflattering at best. In fact, to comprehend the full scope of Jewish-monastic interaction, we must contemplate how the monks viewed the Jews theologically, or, in other words, what and how they thought about Jews while they pursued their cloistered lives of study, worship, and manual labor. Hence, in an effort to investigate all aspects of the monk-Jew relationship, this dissertation now turns to an exploration of the ideas and images of Jews found in monastic texts.

CHAPTER 4

THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 1: SOURCES, INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES, AND TROPES

4.1 Introduction

Despite the array of evidence presented in the first two chapters of this work, it is still true that the vast majority of “interactions” between monks and Jews took place in the textual environment.¹ This and the following two chapters explore the contact that monks had with Jews, or rather ideas about Jews, in the pages of the texts they read and wrote. Such interaction happened in two ways. First, monks obtained their ideas about Jews from the biblical, patristic, and liturgical texts that circulated in their monasteries. From these sources, they obtained not only general notions about historical and theological Jews but also strategies through which these notions could be interpreted. Second, after obtaining these ideas through a long process of study, prayer, and meditation, some monks produced their own texts that echoed, expanded upon, and occasionally modified the themes found in the source texts. Hence, to understand how monks processed and transmitted ideas about Jews, one must examine two kinds of evidence: first, the sources from which the monks obtained those ideas and second, the texts the monks themselves composed. Only a handful of the latter texts dealt

¹ On the transmission of ideas about Jews in medieval intellectual circles, Jeremy Cohen’s *Living letters of the Law* and Gilbert Dahan’s *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les Juifs au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1990) remain indispensable volumes.

specifically with Jews, but ideas about Jews still surfaced in other textual settings. This chapter will concern itself primarily with the process by which the monks obtained these ideas; in other words, it will investigate the monks' sources to get a sense of common interpretations of Jews that all monks, or at least the learned among them, would have known. The following two chapters will treat the transmission of these ideas into the monks' own writings.

Scholars have long assumed that the appearance of anti-Jewish arguments in Christian texts of the high Middle Ages arose in large part from actual contact between Christian authors and Jews.² While the evidence presented thus far indicates that such real interactions were commonplace in the Empire of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an exploration of monastic sources—not only looking at the texts produced in the monasteries but also comparing these productions with the works contained in monastic libraries—demonstrates that much, and perhaps most, of this discourse was part of a long-standing, internal Christian dialogue. While monks used this dialogue to help make sense of their surrounding circumstances—and while they at times referred to current events to help them elaborate on existing tropes—such ideas remained grounded in a long textual tradition that stretched back to St. Paul and the Gospel authors. High medieval monastic ideas about Jews were thus always partially derivative; even when contemporary concerns exerted influence on their formulation, they were never entirely new creations.

² See, for instance, David Timmer's analysis of Rupert's anti-Jewish theological assertions in *The Religious Significance of Judaism for Twelfth-Century Monastic Exegesis: A Study in the Thought of Rupert of Deutz, c.1070-1129* (Ph.D Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1983), 150, wherein he insists that Rupert's Liège works (a period when he likely had little or no contact with actual Jews) must have arisen at least from second-hand reports that Rupert heard from fellow monks who interacted with Jews.

This study of these monastic ideas thus rests on the contention that the appearance of Jews in the theological discourse did not always reflect or have anything to do with actual Jewish-monastic relations. Of course there were exceptions; these chapters will draw attention to some of these, and the final chapter of this work will treat the relationship between real and textual interactions in greater depth. Nevertheless, theological discourse in the monasteries remained aloof from real interaction for three major reasons. First, many of the important German monasteries of this period were located in rural regions, far away from the mostly-urban Jewish communities. This was the case for such prominent monasteries as Benediktbeuern, Tegernsee, St. Gall, Fulda, Admont, and many others. There were notable exceptions—St. Emmeram in Regensburg and Rupert’s abbey of Deutz, near Cologne, come readily to mind—and it is hard to ignore the evidence of real Jewish interaction in some of the products produced in these monasteries.³ Despite this, the majority of monastic texts that dealt with Jews came from monks who most likely had never met a real Jew. Second, as mentioned already, the monks, nuns, and cloistered canons who wrote about Jews drew on an exegetical and theological tradition that had not changed dramatically since the patristic era. The ideas about Jews conveyed by that tradition were certainly not monolithic or even consistent, but the monks respected the authority of the traditional texts so much that they did not often stray very far from it in their own writings. Third, the way the monks interacted with the texts they read, through the process known as *lectio divina*, meant that they imbibed and assimilated ideas from those texts in a particularly powerful way, albeit one that was divorced from real, social experience. In monastic writings, which were almost

³ Timmer, for instance, demonstrates this in his discussion of Rupert’s Matthew commentary, which was written after Rupert moved to Deutz from Liège. Ibid., 150-154.

invariably written for other monks, the theological maxims served the greater purpose of bringing the monk to God. This meant that even if a monk had actual contact—even friendly relations—with Jews, he was far less likely to refer to that experience in his writings than he was to use ideas about Jews, most of which he obtained from his study of biblical and patristic sources, to lead his audience to greater observance of the monastic life. In those cases when current events influenced these ideas and led the monks to look at Jews through fresh lenses, the contemporary circumstances that influenced them were not usually the sorts of mundane interactions detailed in the previous chapters. They were instead momentous and usually troubling events like the crusades and ritual murder accusations.

These chapters on the Jew of the monastic text attempt to answer a few fundamental questions. First, where, or rather from which texts, did the monks obtain their notions about Jews? Second, what exegetical and theological strategies did the monks obtain from their study of these texts that helped them to frame their own hermeneutic understanding of Jews? Third, what were the most important components of that understanding? In other words, what standard tropes or stock images did monks find in their sources and include in their own textual descriptions of Jews? These three questions beg yet another question that, in a sense, encapsulates this entire inquiry. That is, how did monastic ideas about Jews relate to monks' conceptions of their own lives, their work and profession, and their place in Christian society and salvation history? After all, as there exist only a small number of high medieval monastic texts written specifically about Jews, most of the discussion about Jews took place in works that were meant to educate other monks—sermons, letters, exegetical treatises, and theological

tractates that explored above all things proper monastic observance. As I explore the works that monks read and wrote—that is, the conceptions they imbibed, digested, and made fundamental parts of their very being—I will keep this central question in the forefront. By so doing, I hope to demonstrate how basic, and how fundamental, certain hermeneutic notions of Jews were to monastic self-identity.

4.2 Jews in Choir and Scriptorium: Monastic Sources

Before exploring how monks conceived of Jews in relation to themselves, one must attempt to discover where they obtained their ideas about Jews. To do this, one must inquire into the reading habits of medieval monks. Reading was, after all, a vital part of the monastic profession. Benedict's *Rule* required every brother to read a book from the monastic library each year during Lent, and they were to devote at least two hours per day, in both summer and winter, to what Benedict called "devout reading."⁴ Even more frequently than individual study, monks gathered together for the purpose of encountering sacred texts, in both didactic and liturgical settings. For monks' education, the *Rule* of Saint Benedict prescribed the reading of the *Conferences* of Cassian, various Lives of the Fathers, "or something else that will edify the hearers" between the evening meal and Compline. In yet another place, the *Rule* exhorted, "Let inspired books be read during the night offices: both the Old and the New Testaments and also the expositions of them which have been made by eminent orthodox and Catholic Fathers."⁵ Such reading occurred in winter and on Sundays during the lessons spaced between the chanting of

⁴ *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, ch.48: SC 182.598-602.

⁵ Ibid., ch.9: SC 182.512. "Codices autem legantur in uigiliis diuinae auctoritatis, tam ueteris testamenti quam noui, sed et expositiones earum, quae a nominatis et orthodoxis catholicis Patribus factae sunt."

liturgical texts, chiefly Psalms, during Matins. Of particular importance was the Sunday reading from the Gospels by the abbot himself.⁶ In addition, monks were also to read, or rather be read to, during their meals. Benedict felt so strongly that this should be a time of learning that he commanded his monks not to talk while at table. This emphasis on constant reading continued throughout the high Middle Ages. C.H. Lawrence notes, “Lists of books with passages marked for reading at mealtimes or in the chapter house, survive from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and the choice of literary fare displays an undisturbed adherence to the traditional programme of monastic study.”⁷

Given that reading was an integral activity in the monastic setting, the next step in this inquiry is to identify the texts the monks actually read. Extant library lists, which survive in significant numbers, are excellent resources for such a task.⁸ Still, one must be careful not to jump to conclusions too quickly when examining these important sources. Many monastic library lists from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, particularly those of prominent monasteries like Fulda, St. Gall, Benediktbeuern, St. Emmeram, Prüfening, and Michelsberg, are huge and varied, containing dozens or even hundreds of distinct works. It is doubtful that most of the monks of these houses ever laid eyes on many of these volumes, much less read them, despite Benedict’s prescription. They possessed them in order to preserve and copy them, or to give them as gifts to other houses or to secular or ecclesiastical authorities, not to utilize them on a regular basis.

⁶ Ibid., ch.11: SC 182.514-16.

⁷ C.H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed. (London: Longman, 2001), 142.

⁸ Thankfully, critical editions of monastic library lists exist for Germany and Austria. This section will draw heavily on the four-volume *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* (hereafter MBDS) and the five-volume *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs* (hereafter MBÖ).

This is not to say that monks—especially the lettered, intellectual ones—did not use the texts they held in their libraries. Sources written by monks who lived and worked in these monasteries show broad command of a variety of sources. Nevertheless, there were certainly texts that monks used more than others: works that the elite monks used constantly and that even the less scholarly brothers would have known. Just as scholars have identified the key texts in the repertoire of, for instance, cathedral school or university masters⁹ and mendicant preachers,¹⁰ it seems possible, and is indeed essential for the purposes of this chapter, to pinpoint some of the core texts of the monastic experience.

One may discover the identity of influential texts through various strands of evidence. Frequency of appearance on library lists, number of copies on specific lists, and quotes or other references to texts by medieval monastic authors all provide some clue about the identity of the texts that monks found most inspiring and used most commonly. In addition to such quantitative data, one should also apply qualitative analysis to this question by asking which texts spoke most directly to the monastic experience—the texts, in other words, that would have been used as aids to teach, prepare sermons, tackle theological questions, and, most importantly, perform the liturgy that gave structure and rhythm to monastic life. Texts in the monastic setting were used not

⁹ Particularly helpful is Lesley Smith's, *Masters of the Sacred Page: Manuscripts of Theology in the Latin West to 1274* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001). In the introduction to this work, Smith explains, "I have tried to put together a standard and typical set of books which a university theologian would have at his fingertips in the mid-to-late thirteenth century." Ibid., 32.

¹⁰ See, for instance, Neslihan Şenocak, "Circulation of Books in the Medieval Franciscan Order: Attitude, Methods, and Critics," *Journal of Religious History* 28,2 (2004): 146-161 and Joan Naughton, "Friars and their Books at Saint-Louis de Poissy, A Dominican Foundation for Nuns," *Scriptorium* 52,1 (1998): 83-102. On Mendicant education more generally, see M. Michèle Mulchahey, *"First the Bow is Bent in Study. . . ." Dominican Education before 1350* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998).

merely, or not even primarily, for carrying out intellectual inquiry or criticism; rather, they were used largely for practicing the monks' vocation. Unlike students in cathedral schools and universities, most monks did not spend the majority of their time poring over, debating, and synthesizing theological and philosophical works. There were of course exceptions¹¹, but high medieval monks, whether in Germany or elsewhere, put their intellectual abilities to other uses. The texts they considered the most authoritative, and thus the texts to which they would have been exposed most frequently, were those that informed them about their vocation, their individual and communal quest for union with God through prayer, worship, study, and meditation. As Leclercq notes, the liturgy—as opposed to the classroom or debate hall in the cathedral school or university—was the place where all of this came to a head. The liturgy constituted “the medium through which the Bible and the patristic tradition are received, and it is the liturgy that gives unity to all the manifestations of monastic culture.”¹² While it is important to acknowledge the common ground between the scholastic and monastic environments, it is also vital to recognize the unique liturgical and devotional basis of monastic life and study. With these guidelines in mind, I turn to the extant library lists in an effort to locate vital monastic texts; after identifying a few of these, I will explore what they have to say about Jews and how the conceptions found therein influenced the monks' own formulations.

The lists reveal, not at all surprisingly, that the Bible, or rather manuscripts of individual or grouped (e.g., the Pentateuch, the Gospels) biblical books were the most

¹¹ Rupert of Deutz, for instance, tried to engage his scholastic contemporaries in theological debates, with mixed success. See Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 135-220.

¹² Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 71.

important and basic texts held in monastic libraries. But monks did not read all biblical books equally; some texts—especially those that were vital for monastic liturgy—took precedence over others. It goes almost without saying that the Psalter was the most fundamental of all biblical books in the monastic setting since it formed the basis of the monks' daily liturgy.¹³ Monks not only chanted the Psalter but also spent their lives trying to comprehend it.¹⁴ The ability to recite the Psalter from memory was, in some cases, the factor that distinguished full monks from novices and lay brethren associated with the monastery.¹⁵ Not surprisingly, the Psalter in its various forms—glossed, unglossed, musically notated, etc.—is a ubiquitous item on the library lists. For example, one thirteenth-century library list from the Cistercian abbey of Wettingen noted that copies of the Psalter were deposited in both the infirmary and the chapter house, in

¹³ Barbara H. Rosenwein, in her article "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression," provides helpful tables that lay out the texts recited during the Cluniac liturgy. These tables underscore the absolute omnipresence of the Psalms in the lives of medieval monks. See *Ibid.*, 134-36, as well as Rosenwein and Lester K. Little, "Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities," *Past and Present* 63 (1974): 6-7. While the Cluniac monks no doubt had a much more elaborate liturgy than monks of other orders, the better part of monastic worship in every order consisted of Psalm texts.

¹⁴ Monks were commanded to seek understanding while they performed the liturgy; those who presided over monks were vitally concerned about the motivations for chanting the Psalms. Giles Constable discusses the relationship between the performance of the liturgy and the understanding of the text in his article "The Concern for Sincerity and Understanding in Liturgical Prayer, Especially in the Twelfth Century," *Classica et Mediaevalia: Studies in Honor of Joseph Szövérfy*, ed. Irene Vaslef and Helmut Buschhausen (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 17-30.

¹⁵ Milis, 105. See also Susan Boynton, "Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education," *Medieval Monastic Education*, ed. George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig (London: Leicester University Press, 2000), 8. Caesarius of Heisterbach told the story of an aging monk who prepared himself for death by increasing his devotion to the recitation of the Psalter: "When he reached old age and, due to the weakness of his body, could no longer function as prior, he exchanged the work of Martha for the solitude of Mary. He thus vowed to God that he would chant the Psalter in its entirety every day, and so, filled with virtues, he departed to the Lord, united with the assemblies of holy angels." DM 1.6: Strange 1.14-15. Yet another example of the monastic emphasis on the Psalter comes from Idung of Prüfening, whose Cistercian character in his *Dialogue* remarks that some monks make a habit of reciting the entire Psalter from memory while engaged in manual labor. Idung of Prüfening, *Dialogus duorum monachorum* 2.54, in *Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages: "Argumentum super quatuor questionibus" et "Dialogus duorum monachorum,"* ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1980), 149. There is an English translation of this text as well, in an edition entitled *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux*, trans. Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan, Cistercian Fathers Series 33 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1977).

addition to the library, presumably so the monks could read, or be read to, from the Psalter when they were eating and even when they were ill.¹⁶ Beyond the text of the Psalter itself, several commentaries on that vital book, some from the patristic era and some composed later, show up on the library lists, at times in large numbers.¹⁷

One other biblical book—the Song of Songs—rivalled the Psalter’s importance for monks of the high Middle Ages. As part of his intimate study of monastic culture, Leclercq argues for the centrality of the Canticle to monastic life, calling it “the book which was most read and most frequently commented in the medieval cloister.”¹⁸ From the Canticle, says Leclercq, monks obtained the vocabulary and substance of their spirituality: the *quaerere Deum*, with its accompanying emotions of love and desire. The library lists appear to support Leclercq’s assertion. Not only does the Canticle itself, whether in its glossed or unglossed form, appear with great regularity, but commentaries on the Canticle constitute some of the most popular items.

While it is no revelation to state that monks used the Psalter and the Canticle with great frequency, the way the monks understood, internalized, and applied these texts remains an open question. Since theirs was a world dependent on authority, monks turned to patristic and early medieval works, which were often boiled down and organized into reference works like the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Bible, for the proper

¹⁶ MBDS 1.415-16. No other book on the list is noted for its location in the monastery.

¹⁷ Marcia Colish explains, “The Book of Psalms was unquestionably the book of the Old Testament most beloved by patristic and medieval exegetes. Seen as a guide to the Christian life and as a prophecy of Christ and his church, the Psalms received extended attention from Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine, and Cassiodorus and from their Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon successors. After the ninth century, monastic writers continued to display a sustained interest in the text.” Marcia L. Colish, “*Psalterium Scholasticorum*: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis,” *Speculum* 67 (1992): 531.

¹⁸ Leclercq, 84.

interpretation of biblical texts and for the proper understanding of theological points. So important was the patristic educational, theological, and exegetical legacy in particular to high medieval monastic culture that Leclercq has declared high medieval monasticism to be “the prolongation of patristic culture in another age and in another civilization.”¹⁹ He continues, “The monastic Middle Ages is essentially patristic because it is thoroughly penetrated by ancient sources and, under their influence, centered on the great realities which are at the heart of Christianity and give it its life.”²⁰ In no aspect of monastic life was that influence more profound than in the monks’ reading of scripture.

Over the course of the patristic and early medieval eras, thanks largely to the work of Carolingian monastic compilers, particular patristic commentaries came to be tied intimately to their corresponding biblical books; these came to be considered the authoritative interpretations of said biblical texts, or at least foundational starting points for further commentary. Since the Psalter and the Canticle were so important for monastic education and observance, one would expect to find commentaries on these texts in monastic libraries, perhaps in larger numbers than most other works. An examination of the library lists shows this to be the case. While one must not be too hasty to assume that the interpretations of scripture found in these ubiquitous commentaries were the explanations adopted by monks, a comparison of the commentaries with high medieval monastic writings demonstrates their obvious influence.

For both the Psalter and the Canticle, the commentary that appears with greatest frequency on the library lists is the *Glossa Ordinaria*; all told, both the *Gloss* on the

¹⁹ Ibid., 106.

²⁰ Ibid., 107.

Psalter and the *Gloss* on the Canticle appear on more than twenty extant lists.²¹ Some lists mention multiple copies of these works. Several scholars, including Beryl Smalley²², Margaret Gibson²³, Christopher de Hamel²⁴, Karlfried Fröhlich²⁵, Mark Zier²⁶, Michael Signer²⁷, and, most recently and thoroughly, Lesley Smith²⁸, have brought to light the provenance and transmission of this important text. Their work has shown that the substance of the *Gloss* is patristic; that is, most of the glosses—or at least the marginal ones—come from the writings of the church fathers, although they were modified in

²¹ For the Psalms *Gloss*: MBDS 1.19-20, 1.88, 1.411, 1.415, 3.57, 3.75, 3.184, 3.212-13, 3.360, 3.362, 4.151, 4.426, 4.581, 4.581, 4.616, 4.733, 4.750, 4.938; MBÖ 1.21, 3.24, 3.82, 4.70, 5.16. For the Canticle *Gloss*: MBDS 1.19, 1.32-33, 1.212, 1.412, 3.75, 3.358, 3.362, 3.365, 4.401, 4.420, 4.581, 4.938, 4.1001, 4.1019; MBÖ 1.11, 1.21, 1.28, 1.98-99, 1.108, 3.92, 3.100. Some of these lists indicate that the monastery held a copy or multiple copies of the entire glossed Bible (usually *Biblia glosa*); most list the glossed Psalter (*psalterium glosatum*) and the glossed Canticle (*canticum glosatum*) as separate items, since the complete Bible was a fairly recent compilation. Most libraries that held these works also possessed other glossed biblical books, the most common of which were the Gospel of Matthew, the Epistles of Paul, and the Apocalypse. Lesley Smith does point out that there is some distinction between glossed biblical books and the *Glossa Ordinaria* proper, but she also admits that this distinction is still unclear. Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 2-4, 12-13

²² Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 46-66.

²³ Margaret T. Gibson, "The Place of the *Glossa ordinaria* in Medieval Exegesis," in *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 5-28 and "The Twelfth Century Glossed Bible," *Studia Patristica* 23, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 232-244.

²⁴ Christopher F.R. de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1984).

²⁵ Karlfried Fröhlich, "An Extraordinary Achievement: The *Glossa Ordinaria* in Print," in *The Bible as Book: The First Printed Editions*, ed. Paul Saenger and Kimberly Van Kampen (New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, 1999), 15-21.

²⁶ Mark Zier, "Peter Lombard and the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Bible," in *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 629-641 and "The Development of the *Glossa Ordinaria* to the Bible in the Thirteenth Century: The Evidence from the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris," in *La Bibbia del XIII secolo: storia del testo, storia dell'esegesi: Convegno della Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latina (SISMEL) Firenze, 1-2 giugno 2001*, ed. Giuseppe Cremonesi and Francesco Santi (Florence: SISMEL edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004), 155-184.

²⁷ Michael Signer, "The *Glossa Ordinaria* and the Transmission of Medieval Anti-Judaism," in *A Distinct Voice*, ed. Brown and Stoneman, 591-605.

²⁸ Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*.

many cases by Carolingian scholars.²⁹ The relationship between text and commentary that led to the creation of this unique text was centuries in the making.³⁰ Specific patristic texts came to be tied inseparably to the exegesis of specific biblical passages from at least the early Carolingian period, though it only reached a more or less standardized form in the early twelfth century.³¹ Scholars have shown that Master Anselm and his brother Ralph at the cathedral school of Laon directed the compilation and editing of the first fully glossed (i.e., both marginal and interlinear) biblical texts, and students associated with Anselm's circle—Gilbert of Auxerre and Alberic of Reims among them—seem to have continued their work.³² However, for a biblical text as important as the Psalter to the practice of the church, the association between specific passages and specific commentaries was already established tradition long before the text passed through the school in twelfth-century Laon. This is why one finds references to glossed Psalters on library lists as early as the ninth century. In any case, German monasteries were circulating copies of the *Glossa Ordinaria* with regularity by the

²⁹ Ibid., 42-44.

³⁰ On this point, John Van Engen explains that the “Gloss rested upon much older tradition, and down to the end of the Middle Ages all clergymen took that interpretive construct for granted in their reading of the Bible.” Van Engen, “‘God is No Respector of Persons’: Sacred Texts and Social Realities,” in *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson*, ed. Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward (London: Hambledon, 1992), 244.

³¹ On the sources for the *Gloss*, see E. Ann Matter, “The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. 1, ed. Irena Backus (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 83-111.

³² Lesley Smith attributes the glossing of specific biblical books to specific editors—the Psalms, Pauline Epistles, and some of the Gospels to Anselm, other Gospels to Ralph, much of the Pentateuch to Gilbert, etc. Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, 32-33.

second half of the twelfth century, only a few decades after they came into vogue in the key cathedral schools of France.³³

It is necessary to draw attention to two other characteristics of the *Glossa Ordinaria* before embarking on extended analysis of this text. First, this was not exclusively a cathedral school text. Although scholars have traditionally examined the *Gloss* with the assumption that it belonged primarily to that context—probably because of its provenance in and transmission through that environment—the evidence from the aforementioned monastic library lists shows clearly that monks possessed, read, and taught from this text in the monasteries at an early date.³⁴ Second, due to their intuitive pedagogical layout, glossed biblical books were almost certainly among the most used teaching texts of the high Middle Ages, both in the cathedral schools and in the monasteries. When a schoolmaster or an abbot needed to deliver a sermon or teach a lesson on a specific scriptural text, the *Gloss* was almost certainly one of the main texts to

³³ In 1162, for instance, Gotfrid, abbot of the monastery of Prüfening, gifted the house of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, perhaps the most influential house in the entire Bavarian region, a collection of codices. In addition to a book of sermons, the Meditations of Anselm, and a treatise on the mass, this collection included several glossed Biblical books: Job, the Gospels of Luke, Mark, and John, Tobias, the Apocalypse, and the Psalter. In fact, the collection contained three separate works on the Psalter. Gotfrid also sent a Psalter with corresponding hymns (one of the most common editions of the Psalter in the monastic setting) and a book of short glosses on the Psalter. MBDS 4.151. The medieval library lists of the monastery of Wessobrunn, in the diocese of Augsburg, also demonstrate well the influx and use of glossed Psalters in the twelfth century. A book list from the late eleventh century lists only a plain (i.e., unglossed) Psalter among the holdings of the monastery. A list from around 1180, however, shows that the monastery had by that point acquired a glossed Psalter, to go along with three other copies of the work, one with a hymnal attached to it. MBDS 3.184-5. A book list dating around 1221 from the same monastery (after a fire had destroyed part of the monastery's collection) includes both a glossed Matthew and a collection of glosses on the entire Bible (*Collectio glosarum in vetus et novum testamentum*), which was most likely the standard glossed text in several volumes. MBDS 3.186-7. The 1240 list for the same monastery shows four glossed copies of the Pauline epistles. MBDS 3.189.

³⁴ In her admirable recent study, Lesley Smith unfortunately pays little attention to the transmission of the *Gloss* into the German monasteries. Her cursory glance at a few library lists leads her to conclude that the evidence “does not suggest that German religious communities were awash with Glossed books.” Such a conclusion furthers her argument that “the presence of masters of theology” was vital “for the production and distribution of the Glossed book.” Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, 173, 180. While the evidence presented above does not necessarily prove German houses to be “awash” with these volumes, it does demonstrate that such texts were widely distributed within German monastic networks.

which he would turn for information. Hence, glossed biblical books, and especially the glosses on high-use texts like the Psalter and the Canticle, provide a unique window to the theological knowledge of high medieval monks. In fact, this text is ostensibly far more vital for this task than the other commentaries on these books found frequently in monastic libraries, since the glosses on the Psalms and Canticle consisted largely of excerpted and paraphrased sections of those other commentaries. Abbots and other monastic teachers surely would have turned to the *Gloss* far more commonly and readily than they would have consulted the longer, more detailed commentaries.³⁵

That is not to say that one should ignore the presence and influence of other commentaries. It is important to recognize and make use of the evidence in these other texts, since at least some monks—particularly the monks who wrote their own works on theological topics—would have read these in addition to the *Gloss*. For the Psalter, two other texts appear to have been particularly important: the *Enarrationes* on the Psalms by Augustine and the *Expositio* of the Psalter by Cassiodorus. These were also the two texts from which the vast majority of the *Gloss* on the Psalms was derived.³⁶ Augustine's sermons are found on almost as many high medieval German monastic library lists as the

³⁵ Unfortunately, with the exception of the *Gloss* on the Song of Songs (ed. Mary Dove, CM 170), this vital text still lacks a critical edition. All citations for the glossed Psalter here are from the Rusch edition (Strasbourg, 1480-81), reprinted four volumes in facsimile by Brepols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992) with an introduction by Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson. To quote Michael Signer: "This facsimile, printed in four volumes, provides researchers with a common base text until critical editions can be produced." Signer, "The *Glossa ordinaria* and Medieval Anti-Judaism," in *A Distinct Voice*, ed. Brown and Stoneman, 602, n.23. Lesley Smith echoes these sentiments, noting that the facsimile edition "was intended to give scholars a uniform base text to work from, and the Rusch edition does approximate to the text found in twelfth-century manuscripts." Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, 13.

³⁶ Lesley Smith comments: "References to the two authors do not, as one might imagine, alternate, with the glossator reaching first for the one and then the other. Rather, the marginal glosses at least seem to be very much integrated paraphrases and re-workings of their ideas, though the interlinear glosses are more cut-and-paste, and much more clearly taken from Augustine. It is often difficult with the marginal glosses to work out which the original source was—Cassiodorus or Augustine. Some are closer to one author than the author [sic], but other seem only loosely related to the commentary of either. More often, the gloss is a combination of both." Ibid., 48.

Gloss: nineteen, to be exact, though it was also loaned between monasteries on a regular basis.³⁷ While Cassiodorus's text did not circulate as widely, it does appear on the library lists of such important abbeys as St. Gall, Reichenau, and St. Emmeram.³⁸ Although it is partially derivative of Augustine's text, it contains some formulations that diverge in significant ways from Augustine's interpretations and thus shows that the patristic legacy was not a unified one.

Patristic and medieval commentaries on the Song of Songs were even more plentiful than the aforementioned Psalm commentaries in the monastic libraries of Germany in the high Middle Ages. Monasteries both great and small possessed copies of Cantic commentaries by Origen³⁹ and Bede,⁴⁰ which were also the principal sources for the *Gloss* on this text.⁴¹ In addition, the commentary of the Carolingian scholar Haimo of Auxerre circulated almost as commonly as the patristic works on this biblical book.⁴²

³⁷ MBDS 1.19, 1.74, 1.211, 1.218, 1.263, 1.295, 3.182, 3.188, 3.211, 3.361-2, 3.368, 4.85, 4.144, 4.401, 4.726, 4.913; MBÖ 1.513; 3.18, 4.68, 5.16, 5.56. There are examples of German monks from this era quoting these commentaries in their own written works. Idung of Prüfening, for instance, made direct use of Augustine's *Enarrationes* in his *Dialogus duorum monachorum*. Idung of Prüfening, *Dialogus* 2.37 : Huygens, 141.

³⁸ MBDS 1.84, 1.265, 3.367, 4.144; MBÖ 5.16.

³⁹ MBDS 3.75, 3.182, 3.186, 3.189, 3.211, vol. 3.361, 3.364, 4.401, 4.402, 4.418, 4.425, 4.434, 4.656; MBÖ 1.21, 1.111, 1.131, 3.82, 3.84, 3.105, 4.70. Origen actually wrote two works on the Cantic, a commentary and a set of homilies. Of the two, the homiletic work was the one that circulated most widely in the high Middle Ages. It was often attributed to Jerome, since he had translated Origen's homilies on the Cantic into Latin. See E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 35, although Matter also argues that, in addition to the wide circulation of Origen's homilies, his commentary "was anything but scarce in medieval Europe."

⁴⁰ MBDS 1.75, 1.84, 3.361, 3.364, 4.144, 4.155, 4.418, 4.726; MBÖ 1.514, 5.36.

⁴¹ Smith draws particular attention to the complexity of the *Gloss* on the Cantic. She notes, "In essence, the Gloss is drawn from Bede, with some additions by Origen, though [other scholars] show how many florilegia and re-workings of Gregory, as well as previous glosses, were already available to the glossator. The Song is a good example of the difficulty of source criticism at work in at least one book of the Gloss, since Bede, Gregory and Origen were all obvious sources for the glossator to have used; but the pathways along which they could have reached him are multifarious." Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, 49.

⁴² MBDS 3.75, 4.426, 4.431, 4.650.

Several prominent monks wrote their own commentaries on the Canticle during the high Middle Ages, and some of these texts made it into circulation very quickly. Bernard of Clairvaux's sermons on the Canticle constituted one of the most influential texts of the entire high medieval period; many German monasteries had obtained their own copies of these sermons by the middle of the twelfth century, some perhaps while Bernard was still alive.⁴³ Several German monks likewise took up the task of interpreting and writing on the Canticle, most notably Rupert of Deutz, Honorius Augustodunensis, Philip of Harveng, Wolbero of Cologne, and Williram of Ebersberg, though the last of these relied heavily on the earlier commentary of Haimo of Auxerre. Rupert's⁴⁴ and Honorius's⁴⁵ commentaries, in particular, circulated extensively in the monastic library networks of the high Middle Ages. That these monks devoted so much to the task of commenting on the Song of Songs gives some indication how central this text was to the monastic project. Because these texts—both the patristic and Carolingian commentaries found in the libraries and the texts written or compiled by high medieval German monks—were so common and so representative of monastic thought, evidence found therein ought to be considered when searching for monastic attitudes and hermeneutical tropes, no matter the specific subject. Accordingly, this study will make use of such evidence.

The library lists from German and Austrian monasteries reveal the presence of many other works upon which scholars of medieval Christian ideas about Jews have expounded. Works by Anselm of Bec, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter the Lombard, Peter

⁴³ MBDS 1.396, 1.406, 1.415, 3.145, 3.186, 3.189, 3.212, 4.156, 4.427, 4.432-33, 4.657; MBÖ 1.33, 1.126, 1.130, 1.514, 3.92, 5.17.

⁴⁴ MBDS 3.75, 4.418-19, 4.425, 4.430, 4.434, 4.1019; MBÖ 1.98, 1.105, 1.126, 1.514, 4.69, 5.57.

⁴⁵ MBDS 3.75, 3.189, 3.212, 4.426, 4.432, 4.616, 4.1020; MBÖ 1.106, 4.71, 5.57.

Abelard, and Peter Comestor—all of which have been mined for their ideas about Jews—make multiple appearances.⁴⁶ Most of the discussion of these texts has taken place within studies that focus largely on cathedral schools, but the regular appearance of such works in monastic libraries suggests that monks engaged many of the same questions as their more famous scholastic brethren. Indeed, scholars have begun to narrow the gap between the intellectual worlds of cathedral school and monastery in the high Middle Ages, questioning in the process such conventional and long-held notions as LeClercq’s argument for a separate “monastic theology” alongside the “scholastic.”⁴⁷ Still, this chapter does not seek to replicate or even reiterate in great detail the work of these other scholars. Rather, it attempts to comprehend how ideas about Jews surfaced in the fundamental religious formulations of the monastery, gleaned in scriptorium and choir. Hence, it will highlight some of exegetical strategies and ideas about Jews from the aforementioned Psalm and Canticle commentaries as a preamble to exploring the works of German monks from this era itself. It does this with the acknowledgement that monks had access to many other texts. This choice of texts necessarily limits what would

⁴⁶ On Anselm: Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 167-179, although Anna Abulafia argues against Anselm’s anti-Judaism in her article “St Anselm and Those Outside the Church,” in *Faith and Identity: Christian Political Experience*, ed. David Loades and Katherine Walsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 11-37. On Hugh: Rebecca Moore, *Jews and Christians in the Life and Thought of Hugh of St. Victor* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998). On Rupert: Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 241-248, Timmer, *The Religious Significance of Judaism for Twelfth-Century Monastic Exegesis*, and Abulafia, “The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas Concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Iudeus,” *Jewish History* 7 (1993): 43-63. On Honorius: Michael A. Signer, “The *Speculum Ecclesiae* by Honorius Augustodunensis on Jews and Judaism: Preaching at Regensburg in the Twelfth Century,” *Crossroads of Medieval Civilization: The City of Regensburg and its Intellectual Milieu*, ed. Edelgard E. DuBruck and Karl Heinz Goller (Detroit: Michigan Consortium for Medieval and Early Modern Studies, 1984), 121-137.

⁴⁷ Van Engen, for instance, explains, “Scholarly monks also interacted boldly with the new schools, critically at times but with a presumed equality and even as those who knew better. The new religious refer critically to Benedictines studying law and medicine at the schools.” Van Engen, “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered,” 301.

otherwise be an unwieldy investigation, but it is also made in the attempt to investigate the heart of the monastic experience.

4.3 Exegetical Methods and the Jews in Monastic Sources

The ideas about Jews that issued from patristic and Carolingian sources like the aforementioned commentaries—to be imbibed and expanded on by high medieval monks and other commentators—would not have existed without the presence of certain exegetical strategies, also propounded in the monks' sources, that determined the way the biblical text was read. These methods were not unique to the monasteries, at least not for the most part. However, the point of the exegesis in the monasteries differed significantly from that performed in other venues. This section will first explore the exegetical methods bequeathed to the high medieval monks by the church fathers. After highlighting these methods, which were held in common among monks and other churchmen in the high Middle Ages, it will proceed to illuminate the purpose of the exegesis as it was advanced in the monasteries.

Patristic commentators and their medieval monastic imitators employed two main exegetical strategies that together defined their understanding of both biblical and contemporary Jews. The first and most obvious exegetical strategy was to read the Old Testament christologically and prophetically. This did not entail a complete rejection of the literal or historical sense of scripture; monastic exegetes were very concerned with grammar⁴⁸, and they certainly accepted the creation, the exodus, and the vicissitudes of ancient Israel as actual, historical events. Monks were, after all, prolific writers of historical works that usually began with biblical events before treating more recent

⁴⁸ See Leclercq, 17-19.

occurrences. Nevertheless, monks considered it vitally important to read all things in the Old Testament as prophetic references to the life and mission of Christ, and to the church he founded and left in the hands of his apostles.

In order to interpret the Old Testament prophetically, Christian interpreters read it through the lens of the New Testament. Put simply, they tried to demonstrate how the Old Testament text—whether the Psalms, the Pentateuch, the prophets, or other books—paralleled, or rather prophesied of, events from the life of Christ and his apostles, as well as the history of the early Christian church.⁴⁹ As Jean LeClercq explains, “For the Middle Ages as well as for the patristic era, the Old and the New Testament taken as a whole tell the same story of the same people of God. The story told by the Old Testament is not the history of Israel, it is already the history of the Church which begins with Israel.”⁵⁰ For the commentators and their monastic readers, the parallels between the two Testaments were of prime importance.

The most common parallel or prophetic prefiguring between the Old and New Testaments was the association of a wide variety of narrative circumstances and specific language with the life, and especially the passion, of Christ. This was particularly the case for the Psalms. Whereas the Jews in the ancient and rabbinic contexts read the Psalms as exhortations for both collective Israel and individual Jews (for whom David, the author of the Psalms, was a key example) in their quest for a proper relationship with

⁴⁹ Jeremy Cohen offers an insightful recounting of the Old Testament texts that were interpreted as prefiguring the passion in *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big Screen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 37-53. Included in Cohen’s discussion is an analysis of Psalm 22, the opening words of which are the same as those placed by the Gospel authors in the mouth of the dying Jesus. On the incorporation of anti-Jewish ideas into this method of *lectio continua*, or coherent reading of the Bible, see Michael Signer, “The *Glossa Ordinaria* and the Transmission of Medieval Anti-Judaism,” in *A Distinct Voice*, ed. Brown and Stoneman, 591-93.

⁵⁰ Leclercq, 80.

God, Christian commentators believed their primary purpose was to prefigure the life, mission, and personality of Jesus. Since the passion was the most powerful moment in the narrative of Jesus's life, it constituted the event most commonly prefigured in the language of the Psalms. Although the Canticle of Canticles contained less language that identified it readily with the passion, exegetes occasionally found passion language in that text as well.⁵¹ Since most of the events in the life of Christ involved interactions with Jews (as Jesus was a Jew living among other Jews), the Psalms and other Old Testament texts were seen to prophesy of the deeds and attitudes of Jews associated with Christ.

Even though the events of the life of Jesus were the most common inspiration for this parallel exegesis, they were certainly not the only historical episodes involving Jews that were prefigured by the Old Testament. Exegetes of every period held as especially important the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 AD—the ultimate proof of the withdrawal of God's favor from the Jewish people. The awareness of this seminal event in salvation history may have been due at least partially to the monks' exposure to the works of Josephus, which make appearances on many monastic library lists.⁵² In any case, patristic commentators and their high medieval imitators found this event in the language of the Psalms and other biblical books. One example comes from the *Glossa Ordinaria* for Psalm 34:8 ("let the net which he hath hidden catch him: and into that very snare let them fall"). An interlinear gloss explained the phrase "he hath hidden" as a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. Another gloss noted that a snare was hidden

⁵¹ See, for instance, Haimo of Auxerre's commentary on Song 8:5, wherein he noted that the defilement of the synagogue referred to in the verse came because the Jews cursed their descendants during the passion. PL 117.353b.

⁵² MBDS 1.81, 3.186, 3.189, 3.212, 3.359, 4.157, 4.425, 4.432, 4.732; MBÖ 1.25, 3.82.

“in the same way that they [i.e., the Jews] were captured by Titus and Vespasian without warning.” Similar associations appeared in many other texts.⁵³ Overall, the method of reading the Old Testament text as a prophecy of future events produced many of the stock images of Jews that comprised a vital part of the medieval monks’ theological lexicon.

The second strategy, which went hand in hand with and arose to some extent from the first, was to reject the legacy of ancient Israel, at least insofar as it applied to contemporary Jews. Monks considered all the promises made to the ancient Hebrews invalid for their Jewish contemporaries; in other words, they refused to go along with the literal reading of the Old Testament that, in the eyes of Christian exegetes at least, marked Jewish exegesis.⁵⁴ They insisted that these promises, as well as the laws upon which the promises were contingent, should instead be read allegorically or morally, applicable to and comprehended by only those who had accepted the higher law that Jesus offered to his followers. In addition to interpreting the tenets of the ancient Jewish covenant as allegory, exegetes often read specific biblical words, images, and stories as allegorical references to Jews. In the Psalm commentaries, for instance, animal imagery—especially that of animals perceived as ravenous or dangerous—was frequently

⁵³ See, for instance, Amnon Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy and the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 90-91. Linder discusses the standard medieval interpretation of several Psalms as references to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD.

⁵⁴ On the interplay between the Christian and Jewish exegetical traditions, particularly as it concerned the literal sense of scripture, see Signer, “God’s Love for Israel: Apologetic and Hermeneutical Strategies in Twelfth-Century Biblical Exegesis,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 123-49; Henri De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, vol.2: *The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. E.M. Macierowski (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 41-82; Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 83-195.

associated with Jews. Exegetes equated dogs, wolves, lions, and even unicorns with Jews, particularly (though not exclusively) those Jews who murdered Jesus.⁵⁵

Even more common in the monastic setting was the moral or homiletic interpretation, since the monks' chief concerns were proper behavior and proper observance. Because they had lost their claim on God's promises through apostasy, Jews became for their Christian interpreters examples of what not to do: a didactic tool for instructing novices and senior monks alike. Monks made such examples of both biblical Jews and post-biblical, even contemporary, Jews, since in the minds of many of these conservative exegetes the Jew existed in stasis, unchanged from his apostate, New Testament self. Seen through this lens, the present Jew was the same Jew who killed Christ, persecuted the early church, forfeited his former covenant, and suffered the destruction of the temple. The actual Jews the monks knew—those with whom they shared space in the community and with whom they interacted in the streets and marketplaces—were irrelevant to this discussion. The hermeneutic proved more powerful than the actual, at least on the pages read and written within cloistered walls.

Nevertheless, despite their rejection of the Jewish claim to the Old Testament covenant, monastic authors and their patristic sources still had to grapple with and ultimately acknowledge the Jews' place in salvation history.⁵⁶ They could not reject the Jews outright and indeed went to great lengths to try to explain which parts of the ancient covenant were now defunct, which parts had been given to the Christians, and which

⁵⁵ See, for example, EP 21.17: CC 97.198-200, wherein Cassiodorus compared the Jews to the "dogs" described in Ps. 21:17.

⁵⁶ For a good summary of this problem, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 392-94.

parts would apply to Jews in the future.⁵⁷ The resulting ambivalence, some of which will be highlighted in the following chapter, existed for three main reasons. First and most obviously, Jews were still around, living in Christian society; they thus constituted a living anachronism. This is not to say that the monks always took into account their interactions with real, living Jews while they were writing theology; the internal Christian dialogue that informed their ideas about Jews was too dominant in their intellectual world to allow for that very often. Nevertheless, it was a *theological fact* that the Jews had not been destroyed or assimilated after their apostasy, and there had to be a corresponding theological explanation for their persistence. This led many Christian thinkers to accept Augustine's doctrine of Jewish witness, which itself was a definite theological compromise.⁵⁸ Still, some were not satisfied with its explanation for the purpose of Jewish existence in Christian society, and this opinion was certainly not the only explanation available.⁵⁹ Second, Christianity began in a Jewish context, and all of the early Christians, including Jesus, Mary, and the apostles, were Jews. Both patristic commentators and high medieval exegetes brought this up with regularity, though

⁵⁷ David Timmer comments on the exegesis of Rupert of Deutz are instructive: "The challenge which Rupert faces in this exegesis is to maintain the coherence of the larger context while making the distinction between the words which apply to Israel and those which apply to the more distant future." Timmer, *The Religious Significance of Judaism for Twelfth-Century Monastic Exegesis*, 177. Leviticus, with its exhaustive layout of the tenets of the Law of Moses, presented a particular challenge to Christian exegetes. See John Van Engen, "Ralph of Flaix: The Book of Leviticus Interpreted as Christian Community," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 150-70.

⁵⁸ On the formation and substance of this influential doctrine, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 23-65.

⁵⁹ I do not necessarily follow Cohen in his insistence that this doctrine became the core tenet of the Christian position on the Jews through much of the Middle Ages. Augustine's Psalms commentary was the key text wherein it was developed, and, as the examples cited here demonstrate, that text contained an inconsistent variety of ideas about Jews, some of which at least partially contradicted this teaching. Cassiodorus only mentioned it once or twice, and obliquely at that. So the textual legacy of this doctrine was itself ambivalent and muddy. Still, there is little doubt that it became part of the mental furniture Christians used when confronting questions about Jews. I think, however, that one needs to view Jewish witness as one of many doctrinal options theologians had at their disposal when writing about Jews.

without establishing a consensus on its theological meaning. The third reason, which will be dealt with in much greater detail both in the next chapter and in the last chapter of this work, was that scripture and many influential theological figures promised that the Jews would convert to Christianity at the end of the world, even in spite of their current apostate condition. These exegetical conundrums by turns frustrated the exegetes and blunted their otherwise antithetical, condemning stances toward Jews.

Much of what has been written here about exegetical methods applies much more to interpretation of the Psalms than it does to the Song of Songs. Due to its unique nature, the Canticle had an exegetical tradition that was, to some extent at least, *sui generis*. While exegetes of the Song of Songs did bring some of the same methods to that text as they did to other texts, a long commentary tradition on the Canticle stretching back to Origen in the third century determined much of the later exegetical method. Because of the text's erotic content, it could not be read literally. In fact, Christian scholars, monastic or otherwise, worried about what might happen if their students came to that text too early, unprepared to grapple with the divine meaning of potentially shocking material in the text. Put simply, reading the Song of Songs involved no small amount of spiritual risk. This risk made all the more necessary a reliance on the methods worked out by earlier, authoritative authors. The carnal peril involved in reading the Canticle also made it a particularly fertile ground for drawing distinctions between Christians and Jews, since the Jews were perceived as excessively carnal.

Because of the Canticle's nature and content, exegetes from ancient times had found it necessary to read it as an allegory, and many allegorical interpretations of that text took on a mystical quality as it became the core biblical inspiration for mystical

contemplation in the high Middle Ages. In the exegetical tradition of the Cantic, there existed two basic allegorical paths; the erotic dialogue between the bridegroom and his bride could be read as an allegory either of the relationship between Christ and the church (and, on the microcosmic level, the relationship between Christ and the individual believer) or of the relationship between Christ and Mary. The first of these was the interpretation preferred by most of the early exegetes—Origen, Bede, and Haimo. The latter was at least partially an innovation of the high Middle Ages, although the earlier interpretation did not disappear in this later period.⁶⁰ Sometimes high medieval exegetes moved between the various interpretations in a single commentary. The exegetes brought Jews into their interpretations of this text in a variety of ways, sometimes resembling the methods described above and sometimes through exegetical paths germane only to the interpretation of this unique book.

Monastic authors shared these exegetical methods in common with authors outside of the monastic sphere—cathedral school and university scholars and other Christian writers. However, the framework in which monks employed these exegetical strategies set monastic exegetes apart from their contemporaries. Put simply, the purpose of scriptural study and exegesis in the monastic setting—encapsulated by the term *lectio divina*—was different from the purpose schoolmen had in mind when they pursued the same activities. As Mary Edsall puts it, “While monastic communities were clearly textual communities, defined by what they read, they were to a greater degree

⁶⁰ Ann W. Astell, *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 15-16.

hermeneutic communities, set apart from others by the way that they read.”⁶¹ One must understand not only the exegetical strategies employed by monks but also the purpose of monastic exegesis in order to comprehend how Jews fit into the intellectual world of the monasteries.

Lectio divina was the process by which a monk used a text to unite himself with God. Leclercq remarks that “the *lectio divina*, which begins with grammar, terminates in compunction, in desire of heaven.”⁶² It involved four steps, which corresponded to some extent with the four senses of scripture. First, the monk needed to read the text (*lectio*) with his entire mental and physical effort; he held and felt the book, pronounced the words out loud, and heard them with his ears. Leclercq describes monastic reading as “an activity which . . . requires the participation of the whole body and the whole mind.”⁶³ The product of this reading was correspondingly “more than a visual memory of the written words.”⁶⁴ This step coincided with the literal and, to some extent, the allegorical senses of scripture, since the monk started with grammar and narrative (the literal) and tried made sense of its symbolic meaning (the allegorical). This then led the monk to *meditatio*—as Leclercq describes it, an “exercise in total memorization.”⁶⁵

⁶¹ Mary Agnes Edsall, *Reading Like a Monk: Lectio Divina, Religious Literature, and Lay Devotion* (Ph.D Dissertation, Columbia University, 2000), 1. Edsall borrows these notions of “textual community” and “hermeneutic community” from Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983), 405. Edsall argues that *lectio divina* became more of a devotional practice in the monasteries of the twelfth century, whereas it had been more of an intellectual exercise previous to that. The impetus for this change was the introduction and growing popularity of scholastic methods in twelfth-century Christendom. According to Edsall, monks in this period changed their approach to scripture reading to distinguish the monastic from the scholastic.

⁶² Leclercq, 72.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

During the *meditatio*, the words became fixed firmly in the mind, memorized permanently, inseparable from the person of the monk.⁶⁶ As this was an exercise in applying and becoming, it corresponded to the moral or tropological sense of scripture. The third step in this process was prayer, *oratio*, wherein the monk drew near to God with the knowledge he had gained through reading and meditation. *Lectio divina* thus unified him with God; the primary context wherein this occurred was the daily liturgy. The final step was *contemplatio*, a lasting rumination on the nature of God, a foretaste of heaven that corresponded to the anagogical sense of scripture.⁶⁷

This discussion of *lectio divina* is relevant to this discussion of monastic ideas about Jews because it demonstrates how profoundly internal and fundamental to monastic life was the whole process of monastic scriptural reading and exegesis, of which the ideas about Jews were a product. Monks read scripture, and especially the Psalter and the Canticle, because through the process of *lectio divina* these texts taught them to understand the mission, nature, and inner life of Christ. Understanding precedes imitation, and, as the ultimate example of the proper monastic life, Jesus had to be first understood and then imitated. Moreover, monastic reading was a penitential activity, especially when performed as a community during liturgical services. Jews figured both into the monastic imitation of Christ, because they were a vital part of the Gospel narrative (and, by extension, christological readings of Old Testament texts like the

⁶⁶ In her seminal work on medieval memory, Mary Carruthers discusses the memorial function of *lectio divina*. She notes that this process was so powerful that, to some extent at least, the medieval self became “constructed out of bits and pieces of the great authors of the past.” Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 224. Carruthers goes on to note that this idea does not “exclude a conception of individuality, for every person had domesticated and familiarized these *communes loci*, these pieces of public memory.” Ibid.

⁶⁷ Edsall, 9.

Psalms) and into monastic penance, because they constituted the chief counter-example to the penitential, disciplined life that was so vital to monastic observance.

Finally, monks read texts to understand their place in salvation history. Monks considered themselves the true heirs of salvation, the contemporary manifestation of “the chosen people.” This aspect of monastic life included a strong eschatological element, since the monks deemed it their responsibility to usher in the second coming of Christ. It also inspired a comparison, though not necessarily a positive one, between the monks and the chosen peoples of past ages, including the ancient Israelites. As Leclercq explains, monks identified the monastery itself as Jerusalem, though their Jerusalem was a spiritual state of being rather than a carnal, geographic location.⁶⁸ Monks read the scriptures with this legacy, their prominent position as the inheritors of this legacy, and this sacred spatial identification in mind.

All of this is to say that when high medieval monks inserted comments about Jews in their writings, they did so from the core of their education and observance in order to instruct other monks. As C.H. Lawrence explains, “The literary products of the cloister, whether they were theology in the form of Biblical exegesis, or hagiography, or even history, were designed primarily to provide food for meditation and inspiration for conduct.”⁶⁹ Monks internalized these conceptions through a life-long process of reading, meditating, praying, and contemplating, and those who had capacity and occasion to

⁶⁸ Leclercq writes, “St. Bernard defines the monk as a dweller in Jerusalem: *monachus et Ierosolymita*. Not that he must be bodily in the city where Jesus died, on the mountain where, it is said, He is supposed to return. For the monk, this might be anywhere. It is particularly in a place where, far from the world and from sin, one draws close to God, the angels, and the saints who surround Him. . . . The monastery is then a Jerusalem in anticipation, a place of waiting and desire, of preparation for that holy city toward which we look with joy.” Leclercq, 55-56.

⁶⁹ Lawrence, 138. Lawrence draws a stark comparison between the monastic and the scholastic purposes for writing, stating, “The object of the scholastic treatise, on the other hand, and of the debates that underlay it, was to advance inquiry and speculation.”

write did so in order to teach other monks how to follow the same process. Comments about Jews inserted by monastic authors into the texts they wrote were thus never superficial or nonchalant. Rather, they issued from the fundamental monastic values that *lectio divina* engendered.

4.4 Tropes in Monastic Sources

From the application of these exegetical methods to the biblical text sprang a number of notions about Jews that crystallized into common tropes or stock images over time. These tropes will be explored in greater depth in the following two chapters, but they must first be identified. Other scholars—Amos Funkenstein and Michael Signer among them—have identified the key anti-Jewish tropes of the high medieval intellectual world.⁷⁰ I will parse them out a bit differently than these scholars, in a way more in keeping with the way they were understood and used in the monastic milieu.⁷¹ The monks of this period encountered each of these tropes in the *Glossa Ordinaria* and in the other authoritative texts found commonly in their libraries. While these monastic commentators used the *Gloss* and other exegetical works as their starting point, they sometimes departed from the interpretation of the authoritative commentaries and took these ideas in original directions that spoke to the values and experiences of the monastery.

Perhaps more often than any other trope, patristic commentators and the *Glossa Ordinaria* highlighted the Jews' role in the betrayal, condemnation, and crucifixion of

⁷⁰ See especially Funkenstein's article "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 2 (1971): 373-82.

⁷¹ Moreover, I will avoid as much as possible the term "anti-Judaism" or its adjectival form "anti-Jewish." Not all aspects of these tropes or images were negative. To call them simply "anti-Jewish" is, in my opinion, to discount the nuances of the monks' understanding of the Jew.

Christ. The image of the Jew as Christ killer originated, of course, in the Gospel narratives, but commentators and theologians of the patristic and medieval eras expanded on the base narrative, describing in some detail the thought processes of Christ's Jewish tormentors and the legacy of guilt that tainted subsequent generations of Jews, among other associated issues. Largely because of this image of the deicidal Jew, Christian authors also cast Jews as persistent enemies of Christianity and, more specifically, of the institutions of church and monastery. The idea that later generations of Jews were still guilty for the crucifixion enacted by their ancestors did not remain an exclusive product of the educated elite. This trope seems to have become a standard belief among the general Christian population, as evidenced in the crusaders' justifications for killing Jews in northern France and the Rhineland during the First Crusade.

Alongside the Christ killer trope, Christian authors from the New Testament era on emphasized the apostasy of the Jews. Although they traced the seeds of this apostate condition back to the Old Testament era, the commentators agreed that this apostasy reached full fruition after the Jews rejected the messianic claims of Jesus. This trope thus stems at least partially from the aforementioned trope of the deicidal Jew. The apostasy of the Jews manifested itself in a number of ways, and Christian authors in the patristic and medieval eras developed this trope along several interpretive lines. The most basic emphases, however, were the blindness and carnality of the Jews. Because of their blindness, the Jews of Jesus's generation failed to recognize his divinity, and those of subsequent generations continued to interpret scripture in incorrect ways. According to Christian commentators, the Jews' carnality led them to interpret doctrines in unfittingly carnal ways and to adhere to such defunct rites and practices as circumcision and Sabbath

worship. Although God had cursed them with the destruction of their temple and their scattered condition, Jews continued to refuse his efforts to bring them back into his fold. All of this discussion of Jewish apostasy led to frequent comparisons between Jews and Christians, often via the personified images of *Synagoga* and *Ecclesia*. Such developments also gave rise to the Christian tendency to lay claim to appellations otherwise claimed by or applied to Jews, particularly such Old Testament titles as “Israel,” “Zion,” “children of Abraham,” and even “synagogue” and “Jews.” Along with imbuing these titles with Christian meaning, Christian writers applied to Jews many labels that belonged to their Old Testament enemies—“Philistines,” “Ammonites,” “Edomites,” “Moabites,” and the like.

The third major trope found in the *Glossa Ordinaria* and in other patristic and medieval exegetical works is the Jew of the *eschaton*. Indeed, from the New Testament onward, Christian authors speculated in various ways about the fate of the Jews at the end of the world. Consensus opinion held that the Jews would convert to Christianity in large numbers shortly before the second coming of Christ. However, this trope was complicated by two factors. First, Christian authors acknowledged that Jews held a strong belief in a Messiah who would come to deliver them from their exiled condition. Some Christian writers, most notably Augustine, speculated on the impact this belief would have at the end of the world. After all, if the Jews were expecting their own Messiah and encountered the one they had rejected, how would they be able to reconcile their fundamental belief with this experience? This problem seems to have influenced the development of the Christian understanding of the Antichrist, and particularly speculation on the Jews’ future relationship with that malevolent eschatological figure.

The close connection between the Jews and the Antichrist did not surface in the literature to any great extent until the tenth century, but it became a prominent aspect of this trope thereafter, thus muddling its otherwise positive nature. Second, the optimistic idea of the mass conversion of the Jews was juxtaposed—often within the same text—with the more pejorative tropes described above. Christians were thus forced either to reconcile the idea of a sudden, mass conversion of Jews with the images of the deicidal Christ-killer and the carnal, blind, apostate Jew or—and this was far more common—to hold contradictory opinions at the same time. The sources the monks consulted—the aforementioned commentaries and the *Glossa Ordinaria*—contained almost no attempts to reconcile the two images. This mostly positive trope thus stood side-by-side with stark images of Jewish wickedness.

4.5 The Apostate Jew in the Received Tradition

Monks in the German monasteries of the high Middle Ages thus encountered in the *Glossa Ordinaria* and other authoritative biblical commentaries a well-formed set of ideas about Jews. Three basic tropes encompassed most of this tradition: the Christ killer Jew, the apostate Jew, and the eschatological Jew. Before examining the ways monks processed and extended these tropes—the project of the next two chapters—it seems appropriate to review the information the monks would have confronted in these works that circulated so widely in the monasteries. Rather than describe each of these images at length, this section will limit its discussion to the trope of the apostate Jew. The goal here is not to be comprehensive but rather to provide a sample of the monks' reading material by sketching out this one trope as it existed in the sources the monks consulted. Discussion of the other tropes—and further discussion of the trope explored here—will

come in the next two chapters, both of which address the reception and adaptation of these images in the monasteries of high medieval Germany.

The notion that Jews had apostatized from their ancient covenant and the related assertion that the covenant status had fallen on Christians were fundamental tenets of Christian theology from the New Testament period on. Paul, for instance, proclaimed that Christians could claim an identity as “the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise.”⁷² By the patristic era, the notions of Jewish apostasy and Christian ascension to chosen status had become highly developed. As specific biblical commentaries from patristic writers were linked to specific biblical passages during the early Middle Ages, culminating in the compilation of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, these ideas became even more fixed in the Christian theological tradition. As discussed above, there were three basic components to this trope. First and most fundamentally, the idea of the Jews’ apostasy rested on a comparison between post-biblical Jews and Christians—the *Ecclesia/Synagoga* binary that was essential to the Christian understanding of salvation history. In laying out this dichotomy, the authors of these authoritative sources insisted that the covenants and special titles that formerly belonged to Jews had passed to the Christians and that Jews were thus worthy only of pejorative titles that had formerly belonged to their enemies. Second, Christian commentators labeled the Jews as “carnal,” due to their perceived, excessive focus on the temporal elements of the law of Moses and their continued adherence to defunct religious practices. Third, the same commentators described the Jews as blind, an attribute that explained their rejection of Christ and their frequent misinterpretation of scripture, among other things.

⁷² Galatians 3:29.

Following in the footsteps of New Testament texts like the Epistle to the Hebrews, the authors of the authoritative commentaries on the Psalms and Canticle drew sharp distinctions between the Jews and the Christians, often in the forms of the personified *Ecclesia* and *Synagoga*. Exegesis on the Canticle was particularly replete with such comparisons. This is not surprising considering the bride in the Canticle text was most often read as representation of the church. The church, of course, arose from the synagogue, but the two entities went in separate directions thereafter. The *Gloss* on Song 3:1-4 (“On my bed . . . I held him and I shall not let go.”) clarified, “While the preachers from Judea are praying, behold the Gentiles, inspired by the holy spirit, have arrived at the knowledge of their salvation and, having found this, they hold it with firm love.”⁷³ Haimo of Auxerre expressed this dichotomy more fully in his commentary on Canticle 2:13 (“The fig tree hath put forth her green figs: the vines in flower yield their sweet smell.”). The “fig tree” in the verse, he asserted, signifies *Synagoga*, since her figs are “immature, unripe, and inedible” yet they nevertheless “fall easily” to the ground “at a gust of wind.”⁷⁴ *Synagoga*, in other words, produces nothing that can nourish the spiritual needs of mankind; her works and doctrines fail in every case to reach fullness, since they are based on outmoded and apostate notions. *Ecclesia*, on the other hand, is signified by the phrase “the vines in flower yield their sweet smell.” She emerged after *Synagoga* rejected Christ and continued to insist on observance of the old law, including circumcision and literal Sabbath worship. By throwing off the trappings of the law,

⁷³ GO Song 3:1 (marginal): CM 170.195. “Orantibus predicatoribus de Iudea ecce gentilitas diuino spiritu afflata ad agnitionem suae salutis aduenit et inuentam firmo amore tenet”

⁷⁴ Haimo of Auxerre, *Commentarium in Cantica Canticorum*, ch.2: PL 117.306c: “Ficus Synagogam significat, grossi autem dicuntur primitivae et immaturae ficus, inhabiles ad edendum, qui ad pulsum venti facile cadunt.”

Ecclesia was able to join with Christ, the bridegroom, in taking the gospel (i.e., “the flowers of virtue and the odor of correct belief”) “through the breadth of the earth.” Hence, the bridegroom in the verse commands, “Arise, my love, my beautiful one, and come.”⁷⁵

Such visions of triumphant *Ecclesia* and fallen *Synagoga* were accompanied from New Testament times on by detailed discussions of the fate of God’s covenant with Israel. Such speculation was necessary because the Old Testament text—and the Psalms in particular—contained language and titles germane to the ancient covenant between God and the Jews. Such specific language posed a challenge to Christian commentators, since Christians had partially or completely jettisoned much of this terminology as part of their break from the Jews in the centuries after Christ. Since the Jews’ participation in the murder of Christ had rendered their former promises void, and since the Jews themselves persisted in an apostate condition, the exhortations to “Israel,” “synagogue,” and “Judaea” constituted, from the Christian viewpoint, scriptural anachronisms. In the Psalter, however, these terms were an integral part of the numerous exhortations to follow God and live a good life. Simply to reject them as no longer valid would have been to declare much of the sacred text useless. Therefore, these commentators, and, in turn, the monks who read and meditated upon these commentaries during their frequent interaction with the Psalter, sought to imbue these terms with Christian meaning.

The authoritative Psalm commentaries are replete with notions about transferred promises. For example, Augustine devoted a great deal of effort to this subject in his

⁷⁵ Ibid.: PL 117.306d: “multitudo Ecclesiarum per latitudinem orbis diffusa est, quae flores virtutum et odorem bonae opinionis late de se spargerent. ‘Surge, propera, amica mea, speciosa mea, et veni.’”

commentary on Psalms 44 and 45. This exegesis is representative of his early thinking on the arguments he developed later and most fully in *De Civitate Dei*:

The Old Testament had promised a land; there was even a different reward or promise for those subject to the law than for those subject to grace: the land of the Canaanites for the Jews subject to the law, the kingdom of heaven for the Christians subject to grace. Accordingly, that which pertained to those who were subject to the law—the kingdom, that land—passed away; the kingdom of heaven that pertains to those subject to grace does not pass away.⁷⁶

Although the Jews had become enemies of their God and lingered still in apostasy, God's promises persisted, albeit in different form, among the Gentile Christians.

Cassiodorus located the transfer of God's promises in a number of Psalm passages that lent themselves easily to allegorical interpretation. His interpretation of Psalm 17:13 ("At the brightness that was before him the clouds passed, hail and coals of fire") is a good example. The "clouds," he remarked, were the "preachers of divine words" who passed from the Jews to the Gentiles when "the Jews' obstinacy ceased to merit the message which had come for their instruction."⁷⁷ The "hail" represented God's rebuke of the Jews, and the "coals of fire" were the "flames of love" kindled in the hearts of believing Gentiles. In another section of his Psalm commentary, Cassiodorus explored the universal ramifications of the biblical Jews' exclusive claim to God's favor. They did not attain their victories, he said, by virtue of their own strength and cunning, but rather through God's help. Therefore, he remarked, the ancient Hebrews' remarkable triumphs serve as a lesson to all mankind: "So, when the history of the Hebrews is related, there is

⁷⁶ EIP 44.8: CC 38.500. "Primum enim Testamentum terram promiserat; et aliud praemium fuit uel promissio sub lege positorum, aliud sub gratia: terra Chananaeorum Iudaeis sub lege positus, regnum caelorum christianis sub gratia positus. Itaque quod pertinebat ad eos qui sub lege positi erant, regnum, terra illa trasiit; regnum caelorum quod pertinet sub gratia positus, non transit." See also 44.17, 45.6, and 45.10: CC 38.505-06, 521-22, 524-25.

⁷⁷ EP 17.13: CC 97.156-57. "*Nubes* . . . praedicatores diuini uerbi intellegendi sunt. . . . quando duritia non meruit Iudaeorum, quod ad ipsos uenerat instruendos."

exhibited teaching that is beneficial for humanity.”⁷⁸ Although he explained later in the same section that the Jews had previously been God’s only chosen people, he implied that such a status was temporary and that, by choosing them, God intended to instruct the rest of the world through their example. Moreover, God intended for the later harvest far to exceed the earlier one.⁷⁹ The *Gloss* absorbed the sentiments of both Augustine and Cassiodorus, as evidenced in its interlinear comment on Psalm 46:5: “He hath chosen for us his inheritance the beauty of Jacob which he hath loved.” Concerning the phrase “for us,” the glossator remarked, “Even if he came to the Jews.”⁸⁰

In the process of asserting that the promises and covenants had been transferred from the Jews to the Christians, the authors of these authoritative commentaries also laid claim to titles like “Israel,” “Zion,”⁸¹ “Jacob,”⁸² “sons [or children] of Abraham,”⁸³ “Judah,”⁸⁴ “Judea,”⁸⁵ “Ephraim,”⁸⁶ and, surprisingly, “synagogue.”⁸⁷ They also claimed

⁷⁸ EP 43.4: CC 97.393. “Sic dum Hebraeorum actus exponitur, humano generi proficua doctrina praestatur.”

⁷⁹ This harvest imagery comes from Cassiodorus’s allegorical interpretation of Psalm 64. EP 64.13: CC 97.569.

⁸⁰ GO Psalm 46:5 (interlinear).

⁸¹ EIP 47.3: CC 38.540; EP 2.7, 47.12, and 77.68: CC 97.43, 97.429, 98.730; GO Psalm 2:6 (interlinear), 49:2 (marginal), 47:12 (marginal), and 50:20 (marginal).

⁸² See EP 13.7 and 77.21: CC 97.131, 98.717, as well as GO Psalm 19:2 (marginal).

⁸³ See EIP 46.11: CC 38.535; EP 46.10 and 68.37: CC 97.424, 97.622; GO Psalm 46:10 (marginal).

⁸⁴ See EIP 47.11 and 75.1: CC 38.547-48, 39.1036-37; EP 47.12, 68.36, and 77.68: CC 97.429, 97.621, 98.729-30; GO Psalm 15:7 (interlinear).

⁸⁵ EIP 68.2.20 and 96.2: CC 39.929, 39.1355; EP 75.2: CC 98.691-92; GO Psalms 45:3 (marginal) and 47:12 (interlinear).

⁸⁶ EP 79.3: CC 98.741.

⁸⁷ EIP 73.1 and 82.1: CC 39.1004, 39.1140; EP 49.1: CC 97.440-41; GO Psalm 49:1 (interlinear and marginal), although Cassiodorus, in EP 7.8: CC 97.83 interpreted the same word as “a gathering of wicked men, not an assembly of devout minds, for if all the Jewish people had believed in Him, they certainly

“Jerusalem” as a Christian city, or rather a Christian concept, as Augustine conceived of it in *De Civitate Dei*.⁸⁸ This term was a very powerful one for the monks of the high Middle Ages, who located spiritual Jerusalem inside the walls of their own monasteries.⁸⁹ It was also important for other churchmen of the same era, who, in addition to their efforts to seize the actual city during the crusades, sought to realize the heavenly Jerusalem spiritually, aesthetically, and architecturally in their cloisters and cathedrals.⁹⁰

This project of redefining biblical titles is especially apparent in Augustine’s Psalms commentary. While interpreting the Psalms, he took great pains to explain how “Israel,” “synagogue,” “Zion,” and even “Jew” were properly Christian terms, since the Jews had rejected all claims to such holy titles with their rejection of Christ as the Messiah. The rejection of the birthright—allegorized in the Jacob and Esau narrative, among other texts—was paramount to Augustine’s understanding of the place of the Jews. Cassiodorus largely followed Augustine’s lead on this score, although he was often even more adamant in arguing for the Christian meaning of these terms. The *Glossa ordinaria* paraphrased the ideas of both earlier exegetes.

would have accepted Him with faithful hearts.” Latin text: “*Synagoga* hic collectionem significat improborum, non religiosarum mentium coetum. Nam si in eum credidisset uniuersa Iudaeorum plebs, deuotis mentibus utique suscepisset.”

⁸⁸ See EIP 64.1, 73.7, 86.6, 111.1, 115.9, and 124.3: CC 39.822-23, 39.1010, 39.1203-04, 40.1626, 40.1656, 40.1837. Also GO Psalms 21:17 and 47:9.

⁸⁹ Leclercq, 54-56.

⁹⁰ On the relationship between the Crusades and the theological conception of Jerusalem in this era, see Amnon Linder, *Raising Arms*. Linder’s main contention is that Christian liturgy was influenced heavily by the crusade movement. Comments about the sacred characteristics of Jerusalem became quite vehement in this era, as did the prayers uttered for the liberation and maintenance of Jerusalem.

Of all these terms, “Israel” was the one whose meaning the patristic commentators explored most fully, as well as the one they co-opted most commonly.⁹¹ Augustine pronounced the Christian claim to “Israel” emphatically in his commentary on Psalm 40:14: “Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel from eternity to eternity.” Concerning the God of Israel described in that verse, he declared, “He is indeed the God of Israel, our God, the God of Jacob, the God of the younger son, the God of the younger people.” The younger people were, of course, the Christians: “Let no one say this line refers to the Jews; I am not Israel. It would be better to say that the Jews are not Israel.”⁹² Cassiodorus extended Augustine’s argument, contending that Israel should be properly understood as “the universal Church gathered from all parts of the world.”⁹³ Building in a different way on Augustine’s commentary to Psalm 40:14, the *Gloss* commentator pointed out another reason for the Christian claim to the title “Israel.” In the interlinear gloss to the word *Israel*, he stated adamantly, “It is we [i.e., the Christians] who are the younger son.” This was, of course, another reference to the Jacob and Esau narrative. Jacob, also called Israel, was the younger brother of Esau; therefore, taking this popular Old Testament narrative as a type, the relative ages of the two religions gave Christians legitimate claim to the title “Israel.” As proof of this claim, the *Gloss* on Psalm 40:14 explained, “In time the elder brother served [the younger.]”⁹⁴ As this prophecy, in the

⁹¹ Modern scholars have also explored at length the meaning of this term in its ancient and medieval contexts. See especially Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l’empire Romain (135-424)* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1964).

⁹² EIP 40.14: CC 38.459. “Ille est enim Deus Israel, Deus noster, Deus Iacob, Deus minoris filii, Deus minoris populi. Nemo dicat: De Iudaeis hoc dixit, non sum ego Israel. Magis Iudaei non sunt Israel.”

⁹³ EP 13.7: CC 97.131. “uniuersalem Ecclesiam de cunctis mundi partibus aggregatam”

⁹⁴ GO Psalms 40:14.

opinion of the commentators, had come to pass, the Christians had become Israel in every sense of the word.

To support the idea of a general Jewish apostasy and to explain in part the reasons for the Jews' rejection of Jesus, the authoritative commentaries focused a great deal of attention on negative Jewish attributes. "Carnality" was perhaps the most common characteristic Christian authors attributed to Jews from early Christianity through the Middle Ages. This accusation involved a variety of perceived violations of God's commandments and was connected fundamentally to the Jews' perceived place in salvation history. Christian authors from New Testament times forward declared that the Jews' excessive focus on the carnal prevented them from acknowledging the divinity of Christ. They asserted, moreover, that their carnality persisted from that time until the present, preventing them from understanding scripture correctly and forcing them to stagnate in the observance of a defunct Law. Commentaries on both the Psalms and the Canticle advanced a great deal of criticism of Jewish carnality. In his exegesis on Song 1:5, for instance, Origen juxtaposed the church and the synagogue and noted that the church is able to condemn the Jews because they are "devoted to flesh and blood."⁹⁵ In his Psalm commentary, Augustine commented on Jewish carnality again and again as part of his description of the dichotomy between the Jewish kingdom of the Old Testament, which he called a carnal kingdom, and the church, which he labeled a spiritual kingdom.⁹⁶ Because the Jews placed far too much emphasis on material things, he said, God turned away from them and endowed the Christians with the power the Jews

⁹⁵ Origen, *Homiliae in Canticum Canticorum* 1: PL 23.1126c: "Judaeos carni et sanguini deditos."

⁹⁶ EIP 33.1.6: CC 38.277-78.

possessed formerly.⁹⁷ Augustine and the other commentators criticized in particular the Jewish leaders' fear that the Romans would take away their kingdom unless they quelled the potential rebellion inspired by Jesus.⁹⁸ Moreover, they enjoyed the irony of the Jews' subsequent loss of the land they had tried to save by allying with the Romans against Jesus.⁹⁹

This carnal attitude, explained the patristic commentators, led to many mistaken theological notions, even about the most foundational doctrines. For instance, Augustine accused the Jews of having carnal notions about God himself, which notions arose from an improper reading of the creation narrative. Concerning the description of God resting on the seventh day of creation, he explained, "He was not tired when he rested, nor did he cease in any way to work."¹⁰⁰ Such were the apostate thoughts of unrighteous Jewish interpreters "who perceived the things of God carnally and did not understand that God works quietly; he always works, and he is always quiet."¹⁰¹ Augustine also ascribed an improper, sensual view of the afterlife to the Jews, using the story of the Sadducees asking Jesus about marriage in the resurrection (Matthew 22:29-30) as evidence for such an apostate vision. He concluded his observations on that topic by remarking, "They

⁹⁷ Ibid. Augustine used the examples of David and Abimelech from Psalm 33:1 ("For David, when he changed his countenance before Abimelech, who dismissed him, and he went his way") as a type for God turning away (i.e., "changing his countenance") from the Jews.

⁹⁸ Augustine, for instance, drew reference to the words of Caiaphas found in John 11:50: "it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." EIP 40.1: CC 38.447-49. On the Jews' attempt to save their carnal kingdom by persecuting Christ, see also EIP 55.2, 55.17, 73.3, and 115.9: CC 39.677-79, 690-91, 1007; 40.1656.

⁹⁹ EIP 52.9 and 62.18: CC 39.644-45, 805-06.

¹⁰⁰ EIP 92.1: CC 39.1290. "Non enim fatigatus est, ut requiesceret, aut modo non operatur."

¹⁰¹ Ibid. "Iudaeis, qui carnaliter sentiebant de Deo, nec intellegebant quia Deus cum quiete operatur, et semper operatur, et semper quietus est."

hope indeed for a resurrection, but they hope that they will be resurrected to such pleasures of the body as they love here.”¹⁰²

Much of this criticism of Jewish materialism centered on the Jews’ continued adherence to the law of Moses, which was seen by the commentators as a bankrupt, carnal system which led the Jews to boast of their righteousness when in fact they drifted further and further from salvation. The *Gloss* juxtaposed carnal *Synagoga* with spiritual *Ecclesia*, declaring that “the more she [i.e., the church] is inflamed with love of the bridegroom, the more weary she grows of the love of temporal things.”¹⁰³ Augustine explained that the Jews behaved “as if they could justify themselves by the works of the law, and for that reason they fell.”¹⁰⁴ The main problem with the law, Augustine declared, was that it caused the Jews to set up a defunct standard of righteousness in which they then gloried to their own destruction. The Jews’ excessively carnal understanding of the law stripped it of all its divinity and rendered it a man-made creation.¹⁰⁵ Because of their pride in this law, however, they “desired to be mountains through their own righteousness”¹⁰⁶ without looking to God for guidance or grace. Augustine lamented further, “What kind of people desire to establish their own righteousness? Those who, when they have done well, ascribe it to themselves but, when they have done badly, ascribe it to God. They are completely perverse. They will straighten out only when they

¹⁰² EIP 43.16: CC 38.487. “Nam et ipsi resurrectionem sperant, sed ad tales uoluptates corporis se sperant resurrecturos, quales hic amant.” See also Ibid., 65.1: CC 39.838-39.

¹⁰³ GO Song 2:5 (marginal): CM 170.151. “Quanto ad amorem sponsi accendit tanto ab amore temporalium lassescit.”

¹⁰⁴ EIP 65.5: CC 39.842. “Iudaeorum, quasi se ex operibus legis iustificantium, et ideo cadentium”

¹⁰⁵ EIP 30.2.6: CC 38.194-95.

¹⁰⁶ EIP 124.6: CC 40.1840. “qui per iustitiam suam montes esse uoluerunt”

have rejected this conception.”¹⁰⁷ In order to free themselves from apostasy, remarked these commentators, the Jews needed to release themselves from the strictures of the law.

Unfortunately, declared these exegetes, because of the Jews’ continued trust in the law, they remained far too concerned about their now defunct and altogether too carnal religious trappings, despite the fact that many of these had ceased to exist in the Diaspora. Their priests, their prophets, their sacrifices, and, most significantly, their temple had all disappeared; why then, asked the commentators, could the Jews not see that their entire conception of salvation had been fulfilled and replaced? Using the parable of the spoiled vineyard to interpret Psalm 79 (“Why hast thou broken down the hedge thereof, so that all they who pass by the way do pluck it?”), Cassiodorus explained that the psalmist “wonders why this vineyard, which derives its origin from the Jewish people, has had its wall destroyed, that is, why the Lord’s protection has been taken away.”¹⁰⁸ More specifically, noted Augustine, “All things that existed previously have been overturned. Nowhere does there exist a priest, nowhere an altar of the Jews, nowhere a sacrifice, nowhere a temple.”¹⁰⁹ The Jews should thus admit that Christ replaced the carnal Jewish rites with sacraments that offered real salvation. The *Gloss* on Song 1:2 (“Smelling sweet of the best ointments. Thy name is oil poured out.”) explained that the “ointments” represented the commandments and sacraments instituted by Jesus, which “[surpass] all

¹⁰⁷ EIP 142.5: CC 40.2063. “Qui ero uolunt constituere iustitiam suam? Qui quod bene fecerint, sibi imputant, quod male, Deo: omnino peruersi. Denique recti erunt, cum hoc ipsum conuerterint.”

¹⁰⁸ EP 79.13: CC 98.744. “Istius uineae quae a iudaico populo ducit originem, miratur cur fuerit euersa munitio, hoc est, Domini subtracta defensio.”

¹⁰⁹ EIP 73.11: CC 39.1012. “Euersa sunt omnia quae primo erant: nusquam sacerdos, nusquam altare Iudaeorum, nusquam uictima, nusquam templum.”

the anointings of the old law in effect and in nature.”¹¹⁰ Following the same line of thinking, the *Gloss* contrasted the sacraments and the temple, using a quote from Paul to explain that the temple came from those who “have a form of righteousness but deny the power thereof.”¹¹¹

The patristic commentators derided not only the Jews’ religious trappings but also many of the commandments that the Jews considered essential parts of the law, even though Christ’s fulfillment of the law had changed their meaning dramatically. Jewish observance of the Sabbath and circumcision were singled out for particular criticism. Concerning the Sabbath, Augustine declared that “the Jews at present celebrate this day carnally, with a certain sluggish and dissolute and wanton leisure. They make themselves free to pursue frivolities; although God commanded Sabbath observance, they spend the Sabbath on those activities that God forbids.” The proper observance of the Sabbath, he explained, is an inward observance, a rest from all wrongdoing.¹¹² Augustine also followed Paul’s understanding of circumcision as an inward, spiritual commandment. The Jews’ continued observance of the fleshly aspect of that commandment removed them still further from grace. God’s glory, explained the *Gloss* on the Psalms, is “not engendered in circumcision . . . but in spiritual things.”¹¹³ The *Gloss* on the Canticle echoed this sentiment, noting that “carnal Jews do not have . . . knowledge of

¹¹⁰ GO Song 1:2 (interlinear): CM 170.91. “precedit effectu et natura omnes unctiones ueteris legis”

¹¹¹ GO Psalm 47:10 (interlinear). The Pauline passage is 2 Timothy 3:5.

¹¹² EIP 91.2: CC 39.1280. “hunc in praesenti tempore otio quodam corporaliter languido et fluxo et luxurioso celebrant Iudaei. Vacant enim ad nugas; et cum Deus praeceperit sabbatum, illi in his quae Deus prohibet exercent sabbatum.”

¹¹³ GO Psalm 44:14 (marginal).

circumcision” like the church (i.e., “the bride” in the Canticum) does.¹¹⁴ Because of their carnal understanding, remarked the commentators, Jews have missed the spiritual meaning of all of their observances; if they comprehended the spiritual, they would discontinue or change radically the way they practiced their faith. In other words, they would become Christians.¹¹⁵

Along with variations on the word “carnal,” the adjective associated most commonly with the Jews in the Psalm and Canticum commentaries was “blind.” This appellation related to many aspects of the Jewish character and belief system as it was perceived by patristic and medieval writers. Examples abound in the authoritative commentaries, especially those of the Psalter, that circulated ubiquitously in the monasteries. Paralleling the Jews’ mocking of Christ with the Old Testament story of the boys who mocked the prophet Elisha’s baldness, for instance, Augustine remarked that “blindness fell upon part of Israel”¹¹⁶ such that they rejected and crucified the Lord. In the same section, Augustine called the Jews “vain, stupid, irrational people.”¹¹⁷ According to the *Gloss*, blindness arose at least partially from customs that fixed the Jews into unrighteous patterns of life and thus prevented them from recognizing Christ. Using a paraphrase of Augustine to interpret Psalm 21:21 (“Deliver, O God my soul from the sword: my only one from the hand of the dog”), the *Gloss* remarked that the “hand of the dog” represented “the power of the Jews, who, *because of blind custom*, bark without

¹¹⁴ GO Song 7:5 (interlinear): CM 170.363. “scientia circumcisionis . . . non habent Iudei carnei”

¹¹⁵ For more examples of this kind of criticism, see EP 80.4: CC 98.750, where Cassiodorus explained that Jews have unknowingly and unwittingly testified of Christian theological truth while pursuing a defunct practice. See also GO Psalm 27:2 (marginal) where the glossator noted that the Jews continued to pray facing Jerusalem, although one should properly pray facing heaven, whence aid comes.

¹¹⁶ EIP 46.3: CC 38.530. “caecitas ex parte Israel facta est”

¹¹⁷ EIP 46.3: CC 38.531. “uani et hebetes et insensati”

discretion.”¹¹⁸ Cassiodorus commented frequently on Jewish blindness, even comparing the Jews on one occasion to the people who attempted to build the tower of Babel; God has kept the Jews divided and in darkness, he explained, so that they cannot realize their full wickedness, just as the wicked tower-builders were not able to achieve their ultimate design once their languages were corrupted.¹¹⁹

One of the main results of Jewish blindness was their inability to interpret scripture correctly, and the patristic commentators occasionally issued direct challenges to the Jews to justify their improper interpretations of scripture. For example, in his commentary on Psalm 44:8 (“God, thy God hath anointed thee”) Augustine explained that the passage means “Oh you who are God, your God has anointed you,” and he begged the Jews to explain how God could anoint God, unless the anointed God was Christ. He asked, “Who, therefore, is the God anointed by God? Let the Jews tell us that. These are their scriptures as well as ours.”¹²⁰ The commentators also accompanied such challenges with warnings to the Jews, as in the *Gloss* on Psalm 28:8 (“the Lord shall shake the desert”), wherein the glossator equated the “desert” with the Jews and the “shaking” with the proper understanding of scripture that God would bring to light.¹²¹ Jews should thus beware and adopt correct beliefs, lest God “shake” them.

¹¹⁸ GO Psalm 21:21, emphasis added.

¹¹⁹ EP 54.10: CC 97.491.

¹²⁰ EIP 44.19: CC 38.506. “O tu Deus, unxit te Deus tuus. . . . Ergo quis est Deus unctus a Deo? Dicant nobis Iudaei. Scripturae istae communes sunt.”

¹²¹ GO Psalm 28:8. See also EP 54.21: CC 97.495, where Cassiodorus informed the Jews of the punishments that awaited their obstinacy.

4.6 Conclusion

Monks in German monasteries in the high Middle Ages encountered a robust, well-defined set of ideas about Jews in the authoritative exegetical texts that circulated ubiquitously in the monastic milieux. These ideas were focused into several broad rubrics or tropes: the deicidal Jew of Christ's passion, the inimical and apostate Jew of the diaspora, and the ambivalent but ultimately converted Jew of the *eschaton*. Many authors working in the monastic environment simply echoed the sentiments expressed in the *Gloss* and the other patristic commentaries. This chapter will conclude by looking at one example of such repetition in a high medieval monastic source before turning to original monastic adaptation of these tropes in the next chapter.

In her well-circulated vision of *Ecclesia* and *Synagoga* from the first book of *Scivias*, Hildegard of Bingen repeated many of the elements of the apostate Jew described above with little modification from the way they were presented in the patristic tradition. Chief among the characteristics of *Synagoga* are blindness and carnality: she stands eyeless, yet she still retains an unyielding focus on the carnal and temporal. Hildegard noted that the personified Synagogue pales in comparison to the Church, whom she described as a bride who “blooms with the splendid virtues with which she was endowed by the Son of God.”¹²² Pitiful Synagogue stands “marveling at Church, because she recognizes that she is not fortified with such virtues as she foresees in her; for Church is surrounded by angelic protectors, so that the devil may not cast her down and tear her to

¹²² Hildegard, *Scivias* 1.5.2: CM 43.94. “quae a Filio Dei dotata in praeclaris uirtutibus uiget”

pieces, while Synagogue lies in sin, abandoned by God.”¹²³ Moreover, Synagogue is clothed in black “from her navel to her feet,” since her person has been stained by generations of sin: “For from the time of her greatest strength to the end of her time she was defiled by the violation of the Law and by transgression of the covenant of her ancestors, because she despised divine precepts in many ways and pursued the pleasures of her flesh.”¹²⁴ Carnality thus resulted from willfully abandoning the true meaning of the Law, interpreting its precepts as governing the carnal instead of the spiritual. Synagogue was given something divine, but she chose to take that great gift and make of it something carnal. She and her Jews thus followed and continued to follow “Adam, who at first accepted God’s commandment, but afterwards fell into death because of his transgression.”¹²⁵ At another point in the *Scivias*, Hildegard commented in similar fashion on the “people who deny the true faith and follow the temporal instead of the eternal.” These “pagans, Jews and false Christians” push their carnal desires to the point that they reach “the depths of sin.”¹²⁶ Their carnality is thus a degenerative condition; it does not remain satisfied with mere carnal readings of scripture but instead influences behavior in destructive ways. Those who focus on the carnal are in the utmost danger of losing their souls.

¹²³ Ibid., 1.5.3: CM 43.95. “Haec synagoga admirabantur de ecclesia, quoniam se his uirtutibus ita munitam non cognouit sicut illam praeuidit: quia ecclesia angelicis praesidiis circumdata est ne eam diabolus dilaniet et deiciat, cum synagoga a Deo deserta in uitiiis iaceat.”

¹²⁴ Ibid., 1.5.4: CM 43.95. “ipsam ab umbilico usque ad pedes nigram: quod est a fortitudine suae dilatationis usque ad consummationem suae extensionis in praeuaricatione legis et in transgressionem testamenti partum suorum sordidam, quia multis modis diuina praecepta neglexit et uoluptatem carnis suae secuta est.”

¹²⁵ Ibid., 1.5.6: CM 43.97. “Adam qui primum iussionem Dei percepit, sed postea in transgressionem suam in mortem cecidit.”

¹²⁶ Ibid., 3.10.30: CM 43A.570. “pagani, Iudaei ac falsi Christiani . . . in profundum peccatorum”

In addition to her carnality, Synagogue also displays a blindness that Hildegard described in some detail:

“That same image has no eyes, and she places her hands under her armpits: for the synagogue did not gaze on the true light, since she held the Only-Begotten of God in contempt; hence, she also hid the works of justice under the apathy of her indolence, not pushing away sloth from herself but concealing them heedlessly as if they were not there.”¹²⁷

This blindness was not forced upon the Synagogue; it was self-imposed, the by-product of a willful obstinacy (shown by the hands in the armpits) combined with simple laziness. The Jews, in other words, did not make the necessary effort to know God or understand his mysteries, preferring instead to take the easy but incorrect route of superficial, carnal interpretation. Although God gave her bountiful opportunities—in the form of “divine precept and divine visitation”¹²⁸—the Synagogue “did not explore its depths, because she abhorred it more than she loved it, neglecting to offer sacrifices and the incense of devout prayers to God.”¹²⁹ Speaking figuratively, the Jews blindfolded themselves or put out their own eyes because it was easier to do that than to contemplate God as He is.

The distinguishing features of the Synagogue as described by Hildegard—the unfavorable contrast with the church as well as carnality and blindness—were the most common features of apostate Judaism propounded by monks in this period. As with the other tropes, these were not original or unique to the monks of the high Middle Ages. The patristic and early medieval sources upon which the monks supped contained such

¹²⁷ Ibid., 1.5.5: CM 43.96. “Sed eadem imago oculos non habet, manus uero suas sub ascellas suas ponit: quia synagoga in ueram lucem non aspexit, cum Vnigenitum Dei in despectu habuit, unde et opera iustitiae sub taedio pigritiae suae torporem a se non proiciens tegit, sed ea uelut non sint neglegenter abscondit.”

¹²⁸ Ibid. “diuino praecepto et diuina inspectione”

¹²⁹ Ibid. “eam interius non tetigit, quia eam potius abhorruit quam diligeret, sacrificial et incensum deuotarum orationum Deo offerre neglegens.”

images as well. Monks' respect for these sources led them in many cases simply to adopt the ideas found therein as their own, with little modification. However, some monks took up the tropes from the *Gloss* and other commentaries in a more active fashion, at times pressing, rethinking, or extending these notions in original ways that spoke to their contemporary concerns and to the unique concerns of the monastery. The following chapter will employ several examples of twelfth- and thirteenth-century German monastic authors to show this process at work.

CHAPTER 5

THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 2: ABSORPTION AND INNOVATION

5.1 Introduction

As the previous chapter illustrates, German monks of the high Middle Ages possessed and used the *Glossa Ordinaria* and other authoritative exegetical sources like the aforementioned Psalm and Canticle commentaries. From these texts, the monks obtained the standard ideas and tropes about Jews that were formed in the ancient and patristic periods and developed further by Carolingian scholars. This chapter explores what the monks did with these ideas after absorbing them. Did they simply accept them and pass them along in more or less the same form as they received them, or did they modify and shape them to suit their own particular circumstances? Asked another way, what original contributions did German monks make to ideas about Jews in this period?

Scholars have long described the medieval monastic intellectual milieu as conservative and unoriginal, at least relative to cathedral schools and universities.¹ Even

¹ R.W. Southern, for instance, characterizes monastic authors as “enemies who opposed the whole method and programme of the schools.” Monks, remarks Southern, “had been brought up to believe that the pursuit of truth was essentially a religious enterprise, and that the monastic life provided the most suitable environment for those who aimed at understanding the mysteries of God and the universe. They thought that the mysterious operations of God were not suitable for analytical treatment, and that the secular atmosphere of the new schools . . . was totally inappropriate for the sacred area of the ways of God, which required long exercise of prayer and discipline in the religious—and that meant the monastic—life.” R.W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol.2: *The Heroic Age* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 7. Southern’s portrayal of monastic attitudes is not necessarily inaccurate, but it does fail

prolific and influential monastic authors like Honorius Augustodunensis and Rupert of Deutz have often been viewed in this light.² Examinations of Christian ideas about Jews in particular have tended to find most innovative thinking not among monks but rather among scholars in other venues. While there is no doubt that monks relied heavily on those texts they considered authoritative, approaching their works with the assumption that they merely repeated the ideas of their patristic sources limits one's ability to comprehend their context and appreciate their concerns. The monastic environment, as this chapter will show, was hardly one of stasis or stagnation. Monks both participated and took the lead in many of the ecclesiastical and intellectual movements of the high Middle Ages, including the important reform efforts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.³ It stands to reason that they also participated as innovators in the development of ideas about Jews, since these ideas were often bound up closely with other theological issues of importance to monks.

Innovation certainly characterized high medieval monastic writings on the trope explored in the last chapter. While many monastic authors simply echoed, like Hildegard in *Scivias*, the basic components of the apostate Jew image as they found them in the patristic works they consulted, some monks reshaped that trope to suit contemporary concerns. Perhaps most commonly, they used descriptions of Jewish apostasy—and

to take into account the notion that the monastic intellectual environment might be original in ways that differed from the schools.

² Southern notes of Rupert that "his works were based on traditional religious life and thought, and his claim that the works of the new masters of the schools represented a serious challenge to this tradition was not without substance." Ibid.

³ As John Van Engen contends, "Black Monks also predominated in the momentous movement of church reform. They provided nearly all the popes until 1120 and crucial centers of reform in particular dioceses (such as St. Blasien in Constance and Saint-Laurent and Saint-Hubert in Liège), as well as many leading canonists and theologians." Van Engen, "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered," 283.

particularly the related notions of Jewish carnality and Jewish blindness—as counter-examples of righteous behavior to instruct their fellow monks in proper monastic observance. Application of these ideas was not necessarily unique to high medieval monks, but their writings in this vein do depart from other traditions in addressing their immediate circumstances. Other monastic authors modified the trope in other ways to fit their concerns. An excellent example of this reshaping comes from the *Dialogus duorum monachorum*, a text composed by Idung of Prüfening in the middle of the twelfth century. So far as scholars have been able to discern, Idung spent part of his career as a Cluniac and part as a Cistercian and thus had an intimate knowledge of both orders of monks. His *Dialogus* argued subtly for the superiority of the Cistercian lifestyle but did so without completely disqualifying the Cluniac observance. In the text, his two characters, the Cluniac and the Cistercian, take turns spelling out the strengths of their respective orders while criticizing, sometimes with fervor, the practices of the other order. Both monks accuse the other order of following Jewish practices, each in an effort to convince his dialogue partner to see the error of his order’s ways. The Cistercian, for instance, accuses the Cluniac of adopting incorrect interpretations of scripture by referring to a scene in the Gospel of Matthew wherein Jesus accuses the Jews of “not knowing the scriptures.”⁴ After quoting the verse, the Cistercian declares, “Feeling for your welfare, it is proper for me to say to you—and charity compels me to say it—‘Brother, you err, not knowing the scriptures.’”⁵ In another instance, the Cistercian criticizes the Cluniac for excessive materialism. To do this, he provides a quote from Jerome: “Either we reject gold along

⁴ Matthew 22:29.

⁵ Idung of Prüfening, *Dialogus duorum monachorum* 1.6: Huygens, 94. “Idipsum [a reference to the quoted verse] liceat michi, salva pace tua, tibi dicere, caritate compellente: eras, frater, scripturas ignorans.”

with other superstitions of the Jews, or if the gold is pleasing, the Jews must also be pleasing.”⁶ He then follows this up with a quote from Bernard of Clairvaux: “Say to the poor [i.e., to the monks]: if you are indeed poor, what is gold doing in your holy place?”⁷ The author’s juxtaposition of these two quotes served to accuse the Cluniacs of being excessively carnal like the Jews.

Later on in the same work, both the Cluniac and the Cistercian accuse the other of “judaizing,” a term that had a variety of meanings during the high Middle Ages.⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux, for instance, used the verb “judaize” as a euphemism for the practice of usury, but that was by no means the only usage of this evocative term.⁹ In Idung’s *Dialogue*, the Cluniac first accuses the Cistercian of “judaizing” in his insistence that the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* be taken at the letter. He remarks, “For you Cistercians judaize against the Rule by following the letter that kills. Accordingly, you observe which authorities adhere carefully to the absolute letter so that you may defend your judaizing through their words.”¹⁰ In other words, the Cistercians compound their wrongdoing by bending the words of the church fathers to fit their purposes, just as the Jews bend the words of scripture to fit theirs. The Cistercian, having been thus accused of judaizing, retorts in like manner, charging the Cluniac with behaving in a Jewish

⁶ Ibid., 1.37: Huygens, 106. “Aut repudiemus aurum cum ceteris supersticionibus Iudeorum, aut si aurum placet, placeant et Iudei”

⁷ Ibid. “Dicite pauperes, sit amen pauperes, in sancto quid facit aurum?”

⁸ On the exegetical use of this term, see Sean Eisen Murphy, “Concern about Judaizing in Academic Treatises on the Law, c.1130-c.1230,” *Speculum* 82 (2007): 560-594.

⁹ Bernard, *Epistola* 363: SBO 8.316.

¹⁰ Idung, *Dialogus duorum monachorum* 3.15: Huygens, 160. “Vos Cistercienses quia iudaizatis, in Regula sequentes occidentem litteram, idcirco auctoritates ad puram litteram pertinentes diligenter notatis, ut per eas vestrum iudaismum defendatis.”

manner. He declares, “Through Jewish modes of speech that are odious to Christians, he tempts us to turn aside from the truth of the Rule.”¹¹ The Cluniac’s error, however, goes beyond making false accusation and obscuring proper monastic practice. He is himself guilty of the very charge he levels against the Cistercian. To point this out, the Cistercian queries, “Why therefore do you judaize by following the letter that kills in abstaining from meat? Eat meat, lest you judaize; and abstain from the carnal desires which wage war against the soul!”¹² So, according to the Cistercian, the Cluniacs act like Jews by focusing too much on the carnal aspects of their observance.

These excerpts from Idung’s *Dialogue* demonstrate in stark fashion the monastic use of the apostate Jew trope as a didactic tool to instruct fellow monks in the proper monastic observance. The Jew—in this case as in others—becomes the anti-monk, the foil to the observant monk. When the Cistercian accuses the Cluniac (and vice-versa) of “judaizing”—acting like a Jew in other words—he attacks foundational aspects of his monastic practice. The term “judaizing,” however, was flexible enough to be employed by both the Cistercian and the Cluniac against the observance of the rival order; each had recourse to this common trope to make his case for the appropriate monastic life.

More generally, Idung’s text illustrates how monks borrowed or co-opted the ideas about Jews they found in the *Glossa Ordinaria* and other authoritative commentaries to address their contemporary concerns. Idung did not modify the tropes of the blind Jew and the carnal Jew in any significant way, apart from the use of the word “judaize,” a term that other monks of Idung’s era also employed. The innovation in

¹¹ Ibid. “per iudaicas voces christianis odibiles temptat nos avertere a regulari veritate.”

¹² Ibid. “Quare ergo tu iudaizas sequendo occidentem litteram in abstinencia carnum? Comede carnes ne iudaizes, et abstine a carnalibus desideris, quae militant adversus animam!” The last phrase is a direct quote from 1 Peter 2:11.

Idung's text is in the form rather than the content. Idung borrowed ubiquitous assumptions about Jews and used them to address contemporary monastic concerns. Idung was not alone in this exercise. Many high medieval monastic authors employed standard images of Jews in similar ways, while still others pushed these tropes into new, innovative territories.

With these considerations and this initial example in mind, this chapter will pursue two lines of argument. First, although monks were heavily reliant on the accepted exegetical tradition—given shape in the aforementioned stock images of Jews—they actively processed and expanded on these tropes. This processing and expanding addressed in important ways the concerns of the monks during this vital period of change, reform, and definition. Second, an examination of the monks' treatment of these tropes reveals the lack of uniformity or homogeneity in their ideas about Jews. Although the patristic sources from which they drew were also variable, these variations became more pronounced in the high medieval monastic environment. These ideas functioned as part of a spectrum, some parts of which condemned Jews in the harshest of terms and other parts of which gave them the benefit of the doubt. The rest of this chapter will pay special attention to the two tropes that represent the poles of this spectrum—Jews as deicidal and fratricidal Christ-killers on the one side, and Jews as essential players in the *eschaton* on the other. While this discussion will entail a brief laying out of these tropes as they existed in the monks' sources, it will place greater emphasis on the ways the monks of the high Middle Ages modified these images to address contemporary concerns and events.

5.2 Jew as Christ-Killer and Enemy of Christianity

Nearly every monastic author who wrote about Jews in this period referenced the role of the Jews in the life of Christ, and especially in his condemnation and crucifixion. As Rachel Fulton and others have described in rich detail, this era witnessed an intensification of devotion to the human, suffering Christ alongside an increase in devotion to his mother as co-sufferer.¹³ This increase in devotion to Christ's human experience naturally led to increased contemplation of the crucifixion. In keeping with this trend, Christian authors expanded and elaborated on the narrative of the condemnation and crucifixion found in the gospels, including the role the Jews played in the Passion. In his valuable study of passion literature, Thomas Bestul explains this trend: "The attention to the specifically Jewish role in the Passion is . . . best regarded as a rapid intensification of a process that had been under way for some centuries, an intensification full noticeable in certain texts dating from about the third quarter of the twelfth century."¹⁴ Monks were uniquely positioned as innovators of this intellectual trend, since the values that most animated their lives dovetailed closely with contemplation of the suffering Christ and elaboration of the crucifixion narrative. Put another way, high medieval monastic contemplations of the Passion spoke in profound ways to the most fundamental aspect of monastic devotion: imitation of the life of Christ.

In his seminal work on monastic culture, Jean Leclercq borrows from medieval monastic sources to describe the essence of the monastic life with such metaphors as "the

¹³ See especially Rachel Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

¹⁴ Thomas H. Bestul, *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 70.

heavenly Jerusalem,”¹⁵ the “ascent into heaven,”¹⁶ the “*vita angelica*,”¹⁷ and, most apparent given the title of his work, “the desire for God.” All of these terms get at the same fundamental monastic concern: the point of the monk’s existence was to unite, or rather reunite, himself with Christ. This is essentially the same desire that would eventually be borrowed by the Mendicants and Modern Devout and labeled *imitatio Christi*. Indeed, such a desire was already being articulated by monastic reformers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. As part of his discussion of the spiritual ideals of that reform, Giles Constable explains, “The most important elements in the formation of this ideal . . . were spiritual liberty, inwardness of interiority, *and the search for a life modeled on the Gospels and specifically on the human life of Christ.*”¹⁸

This desire to be united with God led monks not only to the imitation of Christ’s example but also to their intense contemplation of his life and particularly his passion. The Christological reading of the Old Testament, and especially of the Psalms, that the monks encountered in the authoritative commentaries gave them the substance for such contemplation, which they in turn poured out onto the pages of their own writings. Since by the high Middle Ages the Jews were considered the main antagonists, the real villains, of the crucifixion narrative¹⁹ and other episodes from Christ’s life, monks envisioned them as such when they contemplated, read about, and wrote on the crucifixion in their biblical commentaries, theological treatises, chronicles, and sermons. As monks sought

¹⁵ Leclercq, 54.

¹⁶ Ibid., 56.

¹⁷ Ibid., 57.

¹⁸ Constable, 261. Emphasis added.

¹⁹ On the chronology of assigning guilt for the crucifixion to the Jews, see Cohen, *Christ Killers*, 73-92 and Bestul, 69-110.

to emulate the life of Christ, they pictured their own Jewish tormentors mocking them on their own personal crosses or castigating them as they pursued their lives of simplicity and silent contemplation. The effect was tactile and even visceral; it distressed the many monks who engaged in such reflection and begat tears of true devotion and divine imitation.²⁰

The contemplation of the Jews' role in the passion went beyond mere consideration of them as characters in the narrative; patristic and medieval monastic exegetes commented at length on persistent Jewish guilt for the murder of Christ. Indeed, one of the great questions that arose in the exegetical treatment of the passion, whether in patristic or medieval monastic sources, was whether the Jews killed Jesus knowingly or out of ignorance. The answer to that question had a dramatic impact on other issues, including the question of the Jewish place in Christian society. Jeremy Cohen, whose recent monograph *Christ Killers* covers the history of this charge, explains, "When medieval Christians wrestled with the question of where the Jews belong in . . . a Christian world, the general conviction that the Jews killed Christ and the particular understanding of their motivations proved most relevant."²¹ Patristic and medieval monastic exegetes used the scriptural texts about the passion—both the crucifixion narrative in the Gospels and other texts, like the Psalms, that prefigured it—to expound on Jewish culpability. That this constituted the major justification for the murder of Jews during the First Crusade massacres in the Rhineland and elsewhere may have made this debate even more proximate.

²⁰ On monastic tears, see LeClercq, 58-59.

²¹ Cohen, *Christ Killers*, 83.

The sources found in monastic libraries—including the *Glossa Ordinaria* and the other Psalm and Canticle commentaries discussed previously—established the textual base from which the monks pursued their expansion and elaboration on the Passion narrative and the role of the Jews therein. The Psalm commentaries that circulated so ubiquitously in the monasteries were particularly replete with such imagery. Reading the Gospel narrative back into the Psalm text, the commentators cast Jews as the antagonists of the final days of Christ’s life and assigned them the blame for his crucifixion. This issue aroused a great deal of indignation and heated rhetoric in all three sources. The *Gloss*, for instance, asserted that the Jews were guilty of “treachery”²² and “the flaunting of justice”²³ because of their role in murdering Christ. Moreover, they produced “false testimonies”²⁴ to ensure the success of their plots, then “rejoiced wickedly”²⁵ when they thought their plans had succeeded. Cassiodorus described the Jews as “deep in the malice of their plot, and violent in their seditions” against Christ.²⁶ He also referred to “the treacherous Jews, who prattled on, fully intoxicated, about the death of the Lord, just as if their plot had been achieved.”²⁷ The mocking of the Lord while he was in his agony constituted excellent proof of Jewish guilt and obstinacy.²⁸ Even Augustine, who was usually more even-handed than Cassiodorus in his treatment of the Jews, wrote

²² GO Psalm 16:6 (marginal) and 23:8 (marginal). “Treachery” (*perfidia*) was, not surprisingly, one of the most common words associated with the Jews and the crucifixion. See also EP 16.1: CC 97.142-43.

²³ GO Psalm 17:6 (marginal).

²⁴ GO Psalm 37:13 (interlinear).

²⁵ GO Psalm 34:15 (marginal).

²⁶ EP 68.15: CC 97.613. “profundus erat malignitate consilii, et seditionibus turbulentus.”

²⁷ EP 68.13: CC 97.611-12. “Iudaeis . . . perfidis, qui, quasi impleta cogitatione sua, de nece Domini temulentissime garriebant.”

²⁸ See EP 34.16: CC 97.312, GO Psalm 43:15 (interlinear), and EIP 46.7: CC 38.532-33.

unequivocally about the Jews' guilt for the crucifixion. He warned his audience, "Beware, lest you be captured by the snare of the devil in their banquets. The Jews were feeding on slop of this sort when they crucified the Lord. . . . When they saw him hanging on the cross they mocked him, because their hearts were insatiable."²⁹ Furthermore, they showed little remorse after Christ's death, for they proceeded to hunt down and kill his followers.³⁰

Augustine also explained that the Jews tried to hide their guilt by blaming the crucifixion on the Romans. He remarked that they "wanted to absolve themselves of the killing of the Lord. For this reason, as the gospel tells, they delivered him up to the judge, so that it would not look like they murdered him."³¹ Despite these efforts, their guilt was obvious. Evidence for it lay in their words when they demanded of Pilate that Jesus be crucified. "They did not draw sword or make an attack against him to kill him; so how did they kill him?" asked Augustine before answering his own question: "*Their teeth are weapons and arrows, and their tongue is a sharp sword.* Do not pay attention to the weaponless hands, but watch the armed mouth; thenceforth advanced the sword by which Christ was killed."³² An interlinear gloss in the *Glossa Ordinaria* for the same verse echoed Augustine's sentiment: "Let not the Jews justify themselves if their hands are

²⁹ EIP 100.9: CC 39.1414. "Caue ne capiaris in epulis eorum laqueo diaboli. Cibis talibus pascebantur Iudaei, quando crucifixerunt Dominum . . . cum uiderent eum pendentem in cruce, insultantes, quia insatiabiles corde erant." The animal nature of the verb "pascebantur" comes across strongly in this passage.

³⁰ EIP 108.19: CC 40.1594-95.

³¹ EIP 56.12: CC 39.702. "uolentibus excusare se ab interfecione Domini. Nam propterea eum, sicut loquitur euangelium, iudici tradiderunt, ne ipsi eum occidissee uiderentur.

³² Ibid. "Qui gladium non strinxerunt, qui impetum in eum non fecerunt ad occidendum, unde occiderunt? *Dentes eorum arma et sagittae, et lingua eorum gladius acutus.* Noli adtendere inermes manus, se dos armatum; inde gladius processit quo Christus occideretur."

unarmed. The mouth is armed.”³³ This “armed Jew” certainly constituted a potent image that some high medieval monks saw fit to develop.

The fact that Jesus was himself a Jew and that the Jews were essentially murdering their own flesh and blood when they killed him was, for the Psalm commentators, both the most heinous aspect of the Jews’ participation in the crucifixion and the most damning evidence of their guilt. All three Psalm commentaries stressed Jesus’s Jewish blood. Cassiodorus, for instance, remarking on the word “generation” in Psalm 76:9, explained that it should be interpreted as “the Jewish people whom He deigned even to call brothers because of the consanguinity of the flesh. What a glorious promise, what a saving intimation, if only they had deserved to realize what was discharged to them in this singular offering.”³⁴ Concerning Psalm 37:17 (“My friends and my neighbors have drawn near, and stood against me”), Augustine wrote, “The Jews were Christ’s neighbors because they were his kinsmen, and they drew near to him when they crucified him.”³⁵ The *Gloss* on the Psalms reiterated these sentiments and pointed out Jesus’s Jewish blood on more than one occasion.³⁶

According to the monks’ sources, the guilt for the crucifixion of Christ extended beyond the lives of the actual Jews who carried out the act itself. To one extent or another, the commentators on the Psalms and Canticle all held that the culpability of the crucifiers remained in effect in the Jewish community that continued to exist within

³³ GO Psalm 56:5 (interlinear).

³⁴ EP 76.9: CC 98.702. “*A generatione, iudaica scilicet, quos carnis cognatione etiam fratres appellare dignatus est. O promissio gloriosa! O praeceptio salutaris, si agnoscere meruissent quod eis singulari munere praestabatur!*”

³⁵ EIP 37.17: CC 38.394.

³⁶ Cf. GO Psalms 15:7 (interlinear), 37:12 (interlinear), and 47:2 (marginal).

Christendom. The main textual basis for this sentiment was the scene from the Gospel of Matthew wherein the Jewish mob, standing before Pilate and demanding that Christ be crucified, shouted, “His blood be upon us and upon our children.”³⁷ The *Gloss* on the Canticle expressed the same sentiment in a pair of glosses on Song 8:5. A marginal gloss referred to “the sin of the cross—bringing death to you, o Synagogue.”³⁸ An interlinear gloss on the same verse was more explicit, declaring that “by that same tree” the Jews were “blinded inwardly, so that [they] said *his blood be upon us and upon our children*.”³⁹ The commentators held that certain Old Testament scriptures prophesied of that very scene, and they took the opportunity presented by such passages to reflect on the persistence of Jewish guilt. Psalm 58:3 (“Deliver me from them that work iniquity, and save me from bloody men”) was especially potent in this regard. Pointing to the Jews of the Passion narrative, Augustine remarked, “They were men of blood, for when the crime of shedding Christ’s blood was cast before them, they responded by offering it to their posterity to drink.” The descendants must have quaffed it, opined Augustine, because they continued to persecute Christ’s followers after his death and resurrection.⁴⁰ Augustine even noted that Jewish persecution of Christians continued in his day; the guilt for the crucifixion remained, by extension, a vital Jewish characteristic.⁴¹ A *Gloss* on Psalm 34:8 noted that the Jews continued to drag about the chains of their sins in

³⁷ Matthew 27:25.

³⁸ GO Song 8:5 (marginal): CM 170.391. “peccato crucis tibi letali, o synagoga”

³⁹ GO Song 8:5 (interlinear): CM 170.391. “in illa arbore interius excecata fuit . . . ex quo dixit *sanguis eius super nos et super filios nostros*”

⁴⁰ EIP 58.1.5; CC 39.732. “erant viri sanguinum, quibus cum iam obiceretur crimen sanguinis Christi, responderunt, propinantes posteris suis.” Augustine did not charge Jews exclusively for being “bloody men.” He explained that the Gentile kingdoms also proceeded to persecute Christians.

⁴¹ EIP 52.4; CC 39.640.

retribution for the way they captured Christ.⁴² Of the patristic sources read by high medieval monks, Cassiodorus was perhaps the most ready to insist on continued culpability. He warned contemporary Jews to abandon their wickedness, lest they suffer “the vengeance they deserve.”⁴³ Still, he considered the prospects for contemporary Jews bleak, since they “are pierced by their own wickednesses, in the same way that they determined to impale the Lord with nails on the cross.”⁴⁴ That, coupled with the enduring curse accepted so readily by their forebears, rendered their standing before God desperate, since they had done nothing since the crucifixion to remove the stain of Christ’s blood.⁴⁵ All told, the Psalm and Canticle commentaries that circulated in the monasteries of high medieval Germany set a strong precedent for the monks’ writings about the Jews’ role in and relationship to the crucifixion of Christ.

Following in the footsteps of the patristic commentators whose words they assimilated, nearly every high medieval monk, nun, or cloistered canon who wrote about Jews included some detail about their betrayal, condemnation, and murder of Jesus. Since the humanity and passion of Christ became the source of intense contemplation in the high medieval period, this focus on that part of the biblical narrative is not terribly surprising.⁴⁶ It is at least partially due to this greater focus on the suffering Christ that depictions of the Jews of the passion became increasingly elaborate during this period.

⁴² GO Psalm 34:8 (interlinear): “Croniculis peccatorum suorum constringatur tractantes quomodo caperent christum.”

⁴³ EP 7.1: CC 97.89. “meritas ultiones”

⁴⁴ EP 9.16: CC 97.102. “ita sint malis suis affixi, quemadmodum in cruce clavis Dominum infigere decreuerunt.”

⁴⁵ See, for instance, EP 17.41: CC 97.165.

⁴⁶ In addition to Fulton’s *From Judgment to Passion*, see the discussion in R.W. Southern’s classic *The Making of the Middle Ages*, 232-40.

Monks in the monasteries of Germany participated frequently as followers, and occasionally as innovators, of this intellectual trend. Some monastic authors went beyond merely noting the Jewish role in the crucifixion and made original contributions to the idea of persistent Jewish guilt.

One of the best examples of monastic mediation and elaboration on the Jews' role in the crucifixion appears in the *Stimulus amoris* of Ekbert of Schönau, the brother of the famous mystic Elizabeth of Schönau, for whom Ekbert served as scribe. Ekbert wrote this work in the 1160s or 1170s while he served as abbot of Schönau, a Rhineland abbey close enough to Cologne and other Jewish communities to assume some amount of contact between its monks and Jews. Thomas Bestul, whose aforementioned monograph offers the most thorough study of Ekbert's text, explains that the *Stimulus amoris* extended significantly the role played by the Jews in the passion narrative.⁴⁷ The purpose of Ekbert's treatise, like other works in the growing corpus of literature devoted to the suffering and humanity of Christ, seems to have been to inspire emotional meditation in Ekbert's fellow monks. This purpose may be discerned from some of Ekbert's comments that relate to the monastic life. For instance, while contemplating the early career of Jesus, he remarked that Jesus went out into the wilderness that he might serve as an example of "the solitary life" the monks were trying to imitate.⁴⁸ While reading and meditating, monks would have responded emotionally not only to the pitiful figure of the

⁴⁷ Bestul explains that "the eleventh-century [an obvious error, since it comes from the second half of the twelfth century] *Stimulus amoris* of Ekbert of Schönau is the earliest Passion treatise that we know of in which the role of the Jews is noticeably emphasized." Bestul, 79.

⁴⁸ Ekbert of Schönau, *Stimulus amoris*: PL 158.751A: "De baptismo in desertum in Spiritu fortitudinis egressus es, ut et vitae solitariae in te non deesset exemplum."

suffering but willing Christ⁴⁹, but also with anger at his Jewish tormentors. In the process, they would have sought to imitate his example of obedience and endurance.

It is worth quoting Ekbert's depiction of the crucifixion at length, since it so demonstrative of the process of absorption of and expansion on the common images found in the monks' source material. Addressing Christ in contemplation, he declared:

You were presented to the council of the high priests, the ones who contrived against you, and, as you revealed truth, the council pronounced your death, as if you were deemed guilty of blasphemy. Most beloved lord Jesus, how great were the indignities you endured in that place at the hands of your own people? Your honored face, on which the angels desire to look, which fills the heavens with joy, which all the rich among the people entreat, the foul ones soiled with the spittle of their lips, struck with blasphemous hands, and concealed in mockery with a veil, and they buffeted you, the lord of all creation, as if you were a worthless slave. Moreover, at this point, they delivered your soul to be devoured by an uncircumcised dog. That is, they led you before Pilate the governor, demanding that you, who had not known sin, be executed by the torture of the cross and giving pride of place to a murderer over you, a wolf over the Lamb, dirt over gold. O shameful and unhappy turn of events! And indeed that wicked man [i.e., Pilate] well knew that this was done against you because of hatred, yet he nevertheless did not withhold reckless hands from you but filled your soul unjustifiably with bitterness. . . . In all these things, the wickedness of the treacherous Jews was not satisfied.⁵⁰

In this text, Ekbert brought together many of the elements of the Christ killer trope that were found in such abundance in the aforementioned patristic sources and expanded on them in ways intended to inspire a strong emotional response. Most

⁴⁹ As with many of this period's texts on the passion, Ekbert emphasized repeatedly the voluntary nature of Christ's sacrifice. Ekbert depicted Jesus, above all, as unflappable in the face of his torments.

⁵⁰ Ibid.: PL 158.754a-c. "Concilio malignantium adversus te pontificum praesentatus es, et veritatem, prout oportuit, confessus, quasi de blasphemia adjudicatus es morti. Amantissime Domine Jesu, quanta illic indigna a propria gente pertulisti? Vultum tuum honorabilem, in quem desiderant angeli prospicere, qui omnes coelos adimplet laetitia, quem deprecantur omnes divites plebis, polluti labii sui sputis inquinaverunt, sacrilegis minibus ceciderunt, velo operuerunt in derisionem, et te Dominum universae creaturae, tanquam servum contemptibilem, colaphizaverunt. Adhuc autem et animam tuam incircumciso cani deglutiendam tradiderunt. Vincitum siquidem ante faciem Pilati praesidis te perduxerunt, postulantes supplicio crucis perimi te qui peccatum non noveras; et virum homicidam donari sibi, lupum Agno, auro lutum praeponentes. O indignum et infelix concambium! Et quidem non ignorabat impius ille per invidiam hoc fieri in te, nec tamen abstinuit a te temerarias manus, sed replevit amaritudine animam sine causa. . . . In omnibus his non est perfidorum Judaeorum satiata impietas."

obviously, he pointed out that Jesus and his Jewish murderers shared the same lineage, a fact discussed at length in the patristic sources, but Ekbert's take on Jewish guilt went well beyond that observation. The acidity, even outright hostility, of the language is particularly striking; this emotional tenor constitutes perhaps the most significant modification of the Gospel account and highlights more than any other feature Ekbert's firm belief in the Jews' wicked intent. Ekbert described the Jews as "foul ones" (*polluti*) and emphasized the premeditated nature of their plot against Jesus. He lingered on their brutal treatment of Jesus, laying stress on such words as "spittle" (*sputis*), "blasphemous" (*sacrilegis*), "mockery" (*derisionem*), and "buffeted" (*colaphizaverunt*). Although they were the ones worthy of punishment, the Jews were the ones who insisted that Christ be subjected to "torture" (*supplicio*) fitting for the lowest form of life. Essentially, hinted Ekbert, the Jews inverted the cosmic order of things when they, the guilty ones, condemned a sinless man to the basest form of punishment. Although he did not deal with the persistence of Jewish guilt beyond the crucifixion, Ekbert did insist that the Jews were motivated by "hatred" (*invidiam*) and that they were in league with Pilate, that "uncircumcised dog" (*incircumciso cani*), to an extent described neither in the Gospels nor in the authoritative commentaries. Moreover, he described their lust for Christ's blood as insatiable. This text thus demonstrates some of the features of the evolution of this trope in the writings of high medieval monks.

Other monastic commentators trod the same path as Ekbert in absorbing and enhancing the Christ killer trope. Renier of St. Laurent in Liège, for instance, echoed Augustine's comments about the Jews using their tongues as weapons. As part of his exhortation to his fellow monks to imitate the example of Christ, he remarked, "He was

wounded twice, since he was crucified both at the third hour by the tongues of the Jews and at the sixth hour by the hands of the soliders.”⁵¹ The works of Hildegard of Bingen also display absorption of this trope. As part of her vision of the Pillar of the Trinity in *Scivias*, she treated the issue of Jewish culpability for the Passion in some detail:

Meanwhile there came a time of raging hearts, for the Jews, causing a commotion, sought to stir up many schisms against the Son of God, that, in the midst of that great tempest, they might murder him. And when they carried out all their malice even as they desired, then, in that sudden and violent storm, there was carried out a murder such as never happened before and will never happen again.⁵²

According to Hildegard, the Jews who crucified Jesus were not passive participants; rather, they were the willful, unyielding perpetrators of the greatest crime in human history, and their punishment—that is, their removal from God’s grace—was meted out in perfect justice. Hildegard expressed the same kind of sentiment elsewhere in *Scivias*, specifically in the description of her vision of the personified Synagogue. Of the appearance of the Synagogue, she noted that “her feet are blood-red, and around her feet is a cloud of purest whiteness; because at her zenith she killed the Prophet of Prophets, whereupon she herself slipped and fell to the ground.”⁵³ In other words, the Synagogue is marked irrevocably by Christ’s blood, into which she fell when she put him to death. Her blood-red feet stand as a witness of her irreconcilable guilt.

⁵¹ Renier of St. Laurent, *Lacrymarum libelli tres* 3.3: PL 204.175c. “bis percussus sit, quoniam et linguis Judaeorum crucifixus est hora tertia, et manibus militum hora sexta.”

⁵² Hildegard, *Scivias* 3.7.7: CM 43A.468. “Interea uenit tempus insanorum cordium, ita quod Iudaei tumultum facientes exquirebant suscitantes multa schismata contra Filium Dei, ut in hac magna tempestate occiderent eum. Et dum ita implerent omnem malignitatem suam ut desiderauerunt, tunc in hoc praecipiti et maximo tonitruo peractum est tam grande homicidium quale antea non fuit nec postea futurum erit.”

⁵³ Hildegard, *Scivias* 1.5.4: CM 43.95. “Et in pedibus sanguinea, circa pedes suos candidissimam et purissimam nubem habet: quoniam in consummatione sua prophetam prophetarum occidit, ubi et ipsa lapsa corruit.”

Like Hildegard, other monastic authors went beyond enhancing the Gospel narrative and addressed the issue of lingering Jewish guilt in greater detail. Rupert of Deutz, for example, wrote on more than one occasion about Jewish guilt for the crucifixion, insisting, as Van Engen points out, “that the Jews’ failure to receive Christ as the Son of God sprang from active rejection, from proud and stubborn resistance to God’s ways and teachings.”⁵⁴ Moreover, Rupert insisted that Christ’s blood continued to cover the hands of the Jews. For Rupert, the fact that Jews did the same things to early Christians as they had done to Jesus himself constituted important evidence of continued Jewish guilt. He remarked, “What manner of men were those whom I sent to you, some of whom you murdered and crucified, some of whom you scourged in your synagogues and persecuted from city to city? For the truth does not cease to prosecute their guilty conscience, but their accusatory thoughts always surround them.”⁵⁵ In another text, Rupert exclaimed that “up to today [the Jews] curse Christ in their synagogues,” their current hatred a legacy of their ancestors.⁵⁶ While not every monastic author was as explicit as Rupert, most monastic authors who write about Jews hinted, at least to some extent, at continued Jewish guilt for the crucifixion.

The ritual murder and host desecration accusations leveled against the Jews beginning in the middle of the twelfth century—with a heavy increase in frequency in the second half of the thirteenth century—served to cement in the minds of some monastic

⁵⁴ Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 244.

⁵⁵ Rupert, *In Osee prophetam commentarium*, ch. 10: PL 168.170a. “quales fuerunt illi quos misi ad vos, ex quibus occidistis, et crucifixistis, ex quibus flagellastis in synagogis vestries, et persecuti estis de civitate in civitatem?”

⁵⁶ Rupert, *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*, ch. 7: CM 9.391. “usque hodie maledicunt Christum in synagogis suis”

authors the certainty that contemporary Jews retained guilt for the crucifixion of Christ. These events also informed some of the monks' most passionate elaboration on this trope. After all, reasoned these monastic authors, if Jews were still willing to attack the body of Christ, in either its transubstantiated form or in its members (i.e., Christian people, especially children), then they remained just as willing as their ancestors to perpetrate the actual crucifixion. A German monastic chronicler from the second half of the thirteenth century narrated a story that demonstrates this attitude quite effectively. After introducing this tale by castigating the Jews for crucifying Christ and performing many subsequent wicked deeds, the chronicler told of a Christian weaver who moved to Cologne in the middle of the thirteenth century and rented a house from a Christian landlord in the Jewish quarter of that city. He and his family dwelt in the house for a year, during which time, explained the chronicler, they lived too far from a Christian church to attend liturgical services very often, despite their desire to do so.⁵⁷ Craving some outlet for worship, the weaver hired a painter and asked him to produce a picture of the crucifixion, complete with images of Mary and John at the foot of the cross. Worried that the icon might be damaged, he also secured a cloth to cover the painting and a box in which to place it. This painting became the object of his sincere devotions during the time he spent in that house, and, according to the chronicler, God rewarded him for his piety with wealth enough to move his family to a Christian neighborhood. He was not able to take all of his possessions with him immediately, so the sacred image remained in the other house, still secured in its coverings. At this point, a Jew moved to Cologne and,

⁵⁷ The author's explanation that the weaver lived too far from a church to attend is puzzling, since the Jewish quarter of Cologne lay in the neighborhood of the church of St. Lawrence. See Matthias Schmandt, "Cologne, Jewish Centre on the Rhine," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cluse, 369-70. The chronicler either did not know the topography of Cologne very well, or he simply ignored it in order to make his point.

encouraged by the city's other Jews, worked out a rental agreement with the Christian owner of the weaver's former house. Shortly thereafter, the Jews held a gathering in the house, ostensibly to celebrate the arrival of their new Jewish neighbor. During the party, some of the Jews found the box containing the painting, and, upon opening it and viewing the crucifixion scene, the discoverer "gazed at it with hostile eyes, then spit upon it and began to shout with a loud voice: 'Fellow Jews, come and see this traitor, who, having expelled you from your land, scattered you as wanderers throughout the whole earth.'"⁵⁸ After narrating this scene, the chronicler described in great detail the Jews' desecration of the image. In his mind, these acts highlighted the Jews' willingness to crucify Christ afresh. He remarked, "Christ is mocked by the Jews on the cross a second time, he is spit upon a second time, he is given over to punches and blows a second time."⁵⁹ In some respects, claimed the chronicler, the Jews went even further in their blasphemy on this occasion than they did during the real crucifixion of Christ. He noted in particular the part taken by the Jewish women in the desecration of the painting:

Even the Jewish women, although they did not dare to take part in the first crucifixion, in this second one devoted themselves to the task with such violence that they spit upon the image more repulsively, beat upon it with blows more furiously, and ripped it with nails more fiercely than ever did their fathers previously, during the real crucifixion.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae* 4.36: MGH SS 25.322. "Tovis oculis eam respiciens, conspuat eam et altis vocibus clamare cepit: 'Accedite,' inquit, 'Iudei, et conspiciate illum proditorem, qui vos de terra vestra expulsos in universum orbem exules dispersit.'"

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* "Christus in cruce a Iudeis iterum irridetur, iterum conspuatur, iterum pugnibus et alapis ceditur."

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* "Ipse mulieres Iudee, quod in prima crucifixione facere non audebant, in ista secunda tam proterve ibi operabantur, ut turpius ymaginem illam conspuerent, furiosius pugnibus tunderent, seivius unguibus dilacerarent, quam umquam patres eorum in illum verum Crucifixum prius fecissent."

If even the Jewish women outdid their perfidious forefathers in violence to the body of Christ, then it was beyond doubt that all Jews remained guilty and continued to stand condemned before God for the crucifixion.

While not all monks went so far as this monastic chronicler, as Rupert of Deutz, or, for that matter, as Cassiodorus in their insistence on continued Jewish guilt for the crucifixion, the notion that the blood of Christ still stained the hands of the Jews found striking resonance in the German monasteries of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Furthermore, this was one of the dominant images of Jews that transcended the walls of the cloister throughout this period. It was certainly present in the late eleventh century, when, as Guibert of Nogent narrated, crusaders used it as inspiration to fuel the slaughter of Jews in northern France, the Rhineland, and other regions of Christendom. It also fed the ritual murder and host desecration accusations of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it remained on the minds of the perpetrators of the Rintfleisch and Armleder massacres more than two centuries after the First Crusade. Whether the ideas of Jews that flourished in the monasteries had an effect on these broader events is an important question, though one whose answer is difficult to provide. Suffice it to say that the Christ killer trope was one of the dominant images that defined Jews for Christians throughout this period.

The assigning of guilt for the murder of Christ to the Jews led to the broader conception of Jews as everlasting enemies of Christianity. In the sources they consulted and the works they wrote themselves, monastic readers and writers found the origin of the inimical Jew in the crucifixion scene, though they also asserted that the Jews had remained enemies of Christianity to the present. The notion of the Jew as the enemy of

Christendom led Christian authors to manufacture ideas about the intimate connections between Jews and other “enemies,” including the devil himself. Since monks often identified themselves as soldiers or warriors and the earth, or mortal life, as a battlefield, such an association makes even greater sense. As Barbara Rosenwein explains, “Only in the monastery, the place where the holiest Christian life was followed, could the kingdom of the devil be impeded and the kingdom of heaven helped to expand. And therefore, with their liturgy striking the blows, the [monks] fought the devil for God.”⁶¹ Every warrior needs a nemesis, and, for the monks of this era, the Jews were one of the main targets who filled that role.

As with the issue of Jewish guilt for the crucifixion, monks gleaned their conception of Jews as enemies from the authoritative commentaries they used to understand the biblical text. Particularly fertile were the commentaries on the Psalter, since that biblical text contains many words that lent themselves to such interpretation. Variations of the word *inimici* (“enemies”) appear more than seventy times in the Psalter. Similar words like *mali* (“the wicked”), *iniquitatem operantes* (“workers of iniquity”), and *persequentes* (“persecutors”, though usually in verbal form) likewise appear with great regularity. Although these words yielded a variety of interpretations, patristic and high medieval commentators determined frequently that the “enemies” referred to in the Psalms text were, in fact, the Jews.

The most common identification of Jews as enemies occurred in exegesis that also referenced the Passion of Christ. In the eyes of the Psalm commentators and their high

⁶¹ Rosenwein, “Feudal War and Monastic Peace,” 145. Rosenwein goes on to suggest that this militant conception of monks was initially a product of the transition in early Christianity from martyrdom to the monastic life but that it received further impetus with the Peace of God movement, since monks began to develop militant rhetoric and define enemies around that time. See *Ibid.*, 149-50.

medieval imitators, Jews were enemies foremost because they crucified the Lord. A verse like Psalm 16:9 was particularly ripe for this interpretation: “[Protect me] from the face of the wicked who have afflicted me. My enemies have surrounded my soul.” Both the *Gloss* and the other Psalm commentators took the “enemies” in this verse to be Jews. In his remarks on this verse, Augustine envisioned the Jewish tormentors standing around the cross, sneering “Hail, King of the Jews.”⁶² Cassiodorus explained that the “face of the wicked . . . signifies the demons who incited and drove the Jewish people with headlong ardor to murder the Lord.”⁶³ Moreover, “the word *surrounded* itself conveys the truth of the gospel narrative, when a frenzied mob with swords and clubs surrounded him.”⁶⁴ The *Gloss* noted simply, in an interlinear comment, that the “enemies” referred to in the verse were “the Jews.”⁶⁵ This unadorned, unequivocal reference seems to indicate that by the twelfth century when the interlinear glosses were composed, the interpretation of that verse had become hardened and obvious.

High medieval monastic authors also drew the connection between the passion and the conception of Jews as enemies. Like Augustine, monks envisioned Christ surrounded by his enemies, who tormented and abused him ceaselessly, though they often pushed these images much further than did the earlier commentators. In his *Canticle* commentary, Rupert of Deutz drew parallels between the “lily among thorns” from Song 2:2, the ram in the thicket from the Akedah narrative, and Christ among his Jewish

⁶² EIP 16.9: CC 38.93.

⁶³ EP 16.9: CC 97.146-47. “*A facie impiorum, daemones significant, qui excitatum populum Iudaeorum in necem Domini ardore praecipiti compulerunt.*”

⁶⁴ Ibid.: CC 97.147. “*Nam et ipsum uerbum circumdederunt euangelicae narrationis exprimit ueritatem, quando cum gladiis et fustibus eum insanorum turba circumdedit.*”

⁶⁵ GO Psalm 16:9 (interlinear).

tormentors during the passion.⁶⁶ Wolbero of Cologne interpreted the same verse in the same manner, although he dwelt a bit longer than Rupert on the enormity of the Jews' malice and unbelief.⁶⁷ This contemplation of a Passion scene complete with evil, mocking Jewish tormentors inspired some monastic authors to warn their fellow monks to expect similar treatment from their contemporary Jewish enemies. This elaboration on the basic trope made such contemplation intensely personal. In his commentary on the same passage (Song 2:2), Honorius Augustodunensis warned his readers—his fellow monks, in other words—that enemies “will prick you with the many thorns of tortures (*cruciatuum*),” just as Christ himself had been “pricked and tormented . . . among the Jews.”⁶⁸ Such comments were not merely a textual exercise; monks incorporated the imagery of the inimical Jew of the Passion scene into their meditation. One vision recorded in the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Caesarius of Heisterbach demonstrates the power of this imagery to those who lived in the cloister. Caesarius recounted that during one particular Holy Week, a nun named Richmud was meditating on the crucifixion. Shortly after beginning this exercise, “she was soon carried off into a cold and spacious building, wherein she saw the Savior standing barefoot and, as it were, imprisoned, surrounded by a multitude of Jews. He stood with downcast face, clothed only with a loose-fitting tunic, and with hands hanging down.”⁶⁹ Caesarius went on to explain that

⁶⁶ Rupert, *Commentaria in cantica canticorum* 1.2.2: CM 26.36-37.

⁶⁷ Wolbero of Cologne, *Commentaria super canticum canticorum Salomonis* 2.2: PL 195.1094d-1095a.

⁶⁸ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Expositio in cantica canticorum* 2.2: PL 172.382d. “Et sicut ego fui lilium inter spinas, videlicet inter Judaeos me pungentes et lacerantes, sic eris tu Ecclesia amica mea inter gentes filias Babylonis, id est confusionis, quae te multis spinis cruciatuum pungent, et multis poenis lacerabunt.”

⁶⁹ DM 8.9: Strange 2.89. “mox per spiritum in domum quondam amplam et hyemalem rapta est, in qua Salvatorem stantem vidit nudipedem et quasi captivum, et circa illum multitudinem Judaeorum. Stabat enim demisso vultu, sola tunica indutus, atque discinctus, manibus etiam demissis.”

such visions led those who received them to “tears and contrition,” since they were able to picture Christ’s torment in stark detail.⁷⁰

The crucifixion scene thus remained the starting point for thinking of Jews as enemies throughout the period in question. For those monks who narrated ritual murder charges, a crime so horrendous as the one recounted in their tales was possible only for those who had reached the utmost depths of wickedness by murdering their God. Before launching into a murder account, one monastic chronicler declared that he could not keep silent about the Jews’ wickedness, since “those things which [the Jews] carried out against our Savior always return to mind.”⁷¹ In other words, because Jews crucified Jesus, it was not hard to believe them capable of murdering Christian children as well.

As the previous example illustrates, the image of Jew as enemy did not pertain only to their role in the death of Christ, even if that was the first and best exhibit of their inimical identity. Monastic depictions of the inimical Jew extended far beyond the crucifixion narrative. According to the high medieval monks and their sources, Jewish animosity grew with the rise of the church in the years and centuries after the life of Christ. In his commentary on the Song of Songs, Honorius Augustodunensis asserted that the Jews fought against the emerging church at every step of the way: “For they killed Christ, they stoned Stephen, killed each James, flogged some, and persecuted others.”⁷² Addressing his fellow monks, Honorius also referred to the Jews as “the

⁷⁰ DM 8.10: Strange 2.89. “lacrimis et contritione”

⁷¹ *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae* 4.38: MGH SS 25.324. “ea que in Salvatore nostro egerunt semper ad mentem redeant.”

⁷² Honorius Augustodunensis, *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum* on Song 1:5: PL 172.369b. “Nam Christum occiderunt, Stephanum lapidaverunt, utrumque Jacobum interfecerunt, alios flagellaverunt, alios persecuti sunt.”

enemies of your religion [*religio*].”⁷³ The word *religio*, of course, was a term that referred to the monastic life, so, by employing that term, Honorius identified Jews specifically as the enemies of that lifestyle. In the same vein, the Premonstratensian canon Anselm of Havelberg placed persecution at the hands of Jews at the head of a long list of tribulations endured by Christians over the centuries.⁷⁴ Ultimately, “the enemies of Christ” simply became a kind of alternate name for Jews in some monastic sources⁷⁵; it was a title that evoked both an intellectual and an emotional response, since it both drew to mind historical instances of Jewish anti-Christian persecution and propounded the notion of a persistent threat.

Images of Jews as “enemies” abounded in both the monks’ sources and their own written works, but they were not the only “enemies” identified therein. Rather, they were viewed as one of a closely-related group of enemies of Christ and his followers. As many monastic exegetes perceived it, Jews and other enemies, including present threats like Muslims and heretics, had been and continued to be working together in the service of the devil to oppose Christ and his church. Such commentary constituted an elaboration on ideas propounded in earlier sources. These sources—including the *Gloss* and other authoritative biblical commentaries—drew connections between Jews and other enemies of Christianity, and the monks who read them expanded on these ideas in ways that addressed contemporary concerns.

Foremost among these other enemies was the devil. A significant number of interlinear comments in the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Psalms, for example, identified

⁷³ Honorius, *Speculum Ecclesiae*: PL 172.874c. “inimicis vestrae religionis”

⁷⁴ Anselm of Havelberg, *Liber de ordine canonicorum regularium*, ch.4: PL 188.1095.

⁷⁵ See, for instance, the *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*, 4.36: MGH SS 25.322.

words like *inimicus* and *malus* as references to the devil.⁷⁶ Augustine and Cassiodorus likewise used their discussions of “enemies” to expound upon the nature of the great adversary.⁷⁷ However, these commentaries frequently accompanied references to the devil with comments about those who assist in his evil works. The Jews featured prominently in such commentary. Sometimes these connections were blatant and unequivocal. Cassiodorus remarked concerning Psalm 58:2 (“Deliver me from my enemies, O my God”) that the words of the Psalm were actually the words of Christ who “begs with obvious humility that the devil *or his agents the Jews* be turned away from Him.”⁷⁸ Other times, the connections were drawn more subtly, particularly in the *Glossa Ordinaria*. As a composite work, the *Gloss* juxtaposed a number of interpretations to the same verse or even to a phrase within a verse; though the connection was more nuanced, such juxtaposition still served to connect the devil with the Jews. A good example can be found in the *Gloss* on Psalm 21: 21-22. The verses themselves read, “Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword: my only one from the hand of the dog. Save me from the lion’s mouth; and my lowness from the horns of the unicorns.” Various glosses (some paraphrases of Augustine or Cassiodorus and some, it seems, original to the gloss compiler) identified the lion as the devil and both the dog and the unicorn as the Jews. The layout of the *Gloss* placed both “enemies” next to each other on the written page.

⁷⁶ Within the glosses on the first sixteen Psalms, there exist at least seven such identifications in the interlinear glosses alone. GO Psalms 7:7, 9:4, 9:7, 12:5, 14:4, 16:12, and 16:13 (all interlinear).

⁷⁷ See, among many others, EP 58.4: CC 97.521 and EIP 29.2.11: CC 38.182.

⁷⁸ EP 58.2: CC 97.520. “diabolum, uel ministros eius Iudaeos auerti a se proposita humilitate deprecatur.” Emphasis added.

Taken together, as the monks would have encountered them on the page of the book, these glosses suggested an unholy, inimical alliance between the devil and the Jews.⁷⁹

High medieval monks continued this trend of placing the Jews and the devil in the same malevolent camp, though their descriptions elaborated on and strengthened the connections drawn by these earlier commentators. In his *Speculum Ecclesiae*, for example, Honorius Augustodunensis frequently linked up the Jews with the ultimate enemy, even asserting at one point that “the Jewish people are subjugated in slavery to the devil.”⁸⁰ The same author remarked that the Jews’ act of condemning of Jesus to death was done “through the counsel of the devil, the king of darkness.”⁸¹ In the same vein, Caesarius of Heisterbach, as part of his introduction to the topic of demons, made a list of the allies of the devil; fallen angels and Jews constituted for him the primary examples of diabolical confederates. Caesarius summed up his observations by noting that “the devil . . . is the first to be allied with wicked men.”⁸² Since he named the Jews as the devil’s main mortal allies, he also implied that Jews were the quintessential example of “wicked men.”

Both high medieval monks and the authors of their sources grouped together other “enemies” with both the Jews and the devil. For example, the authoritative Psalm commentaries at various times interpreted “enemies” as heretics, pagans, Judas Iscariot, the Antichrist, and even unbelieving but nevertheless practicing Christians, and all three commentators drew both explicit and subtle connections between these figures, the devil,

⁷⁹ GO Psalm 21:21-22.

⁸⁰ Honorius, *Speculum Ecclesiae*: PL 172.838C. “populus Judaicus a diaboli servitio subjugatur.”

⁸¹ Ibid.: PL 172.925C. “per consilium diaboli Regis tenebrarum a Judaeis morti addicitur.”

⁸² DM 5.1: Strange 1.276. “diabolus . . . primus cum hominibus malis . . . sociatur”

and the Jews. Even personal vices, which were also identified frequently as *inimici*, were often connected in some way to the Jews. After all, Jews were held up as the chief example of both pride, the most dangerous of all the vices, and carnality, another deadly enemy of observant Christians and especially of monks.⁸³

A few examples should suffice to demonstrate the high medieval monks' absorption and extension of the perceived links between the Jews, the devil, and other enemies of Christ and Christendom. In his description of the crucifixion narrative, Ekbert of Schönau used some of the same imagery employed by the Psalm commentators to describe the Jewish enemies of Jesus; in the process, he also extended these earlier accounts by depicting a close relationship between the Jews and Judas Iscariot, the arch-traitor. He remarked, "You revealed clearly how ready your spirit was for the Passion, good Jesus, when you hurried voluntarily to meet those bloody men coming along with your betrayer, seeking your soul in the night with lanterns, with axes, and with arms, and you revealed yourself by the sign which they received from the leader of the scandalous act."⁸⁴ Judas thus became, for Ekbert, the leader of a bloodthirsty Jewish mob, inspired by the devil and intent on putting Jesus to death with impunity.⁸⁵ This is another example of the expansion of the Gospel narrative that characterized high medieval reflections on

⁸³ Caesarius identified the chief enemies of monasticism as "the flesh, the world and the devil." Together, these constitute a "threefold enemy." DM 4.96; Strange 1.264. "hostem triplicem, carnem scilicet, mundum et diabolum"

⁸⁴ Ekbert, *Stimulus amoris*: PL 158.753b. "Quam promptus enim fuerit spiritus tuus, bone Jesu, ad passionem, evidenter ostendisti, quando venientibus una cum proditore tuo viris sanguinum, quaerentibus animam tuam cum laternis, facibus, et armis per noctem, ultro occurristi, et signo quod a duce flagitii acceperant teipsum manifestasti."

⁸⁵ Later in the same passage, he refers to Judas and the mob as "Belial," one of the principal demons of hell in the Christian tradition. Ibid.: PL 158.753c.

the life and passion of Christ.⁸⁶ As they meditated on this story while reading or listening to Ekbert's treatment, monks would have felt in visceral ways the malice of their Jewish enemies. In his *Dialogus Miraculorum*, Caesarius of Heisterbach also drew associations between various enemies of Christ, though his list included perceived contemporary foes. He remarked, "Know this at least, that even to this day Christ is crucified in His members, sometimes by Jews, sometimes by Saracens, and sometimes by false Christians."⁸⁷ Moreover, he said, the threat remained real: "I have heard that in recent times, Christians have been crucified by Jews."⁸⁸ Although he did not elaborate on this allusion, it seems apparent that Caesarius was referring to the increasingly-common ritual murder accusation. This seems to be another instance when current circumstances, albeit mere rumor, affected the ideas in circulation in the monasteries.

One final example demonstrates that the conception of Jews as enemies, with all its components, served for the monks as a way of making sense of current events. After all, monks viewed their own lives as a continuation of the essential conflict of salvation history—the battle between the followers of Christ and their enemies. The notion that Jews were the quintessential and archetypal enemies of Christ and Christendom was

⁸⁶ See Bestul, 84-87. Bestul finds in this passage a reflection of the values of feudal society. The kiss of Judas, says Bestul, is a mockery of the kiss of peace, an essential gesture in the feudal relationship; it represents for Ekbert the Jews' attempt to overstep their bounds in society, to place themselves in a privileged position alongside the Christian elite. He thus contends that Ekbert's intended audience extended far beyond the walls of the monastery. While such an interpretation is intriguing, there is very little in this text to indicate an audience outside the monastery; on the other hand, a number of Ekbert's comments—including his exhortations to his readers to envision themselves in the place of Christ—show that his audience was primarily monastic. While Bestul is justified in calling this passage a creative extension of the Gospel narrative, his reading of it appears to miss its primary purpose of fostering devotion in Ekbert's fellow monks and nuns.

⁸⁷ DM 8.27: Strange 2.102-03. "Hoc etiam scias quod usque hodie Christus in suis membris crucifigitur, nunc a Judaeis, nunc a Sarrecenis, nunc a falsis Christianis."

⁸⁸ Ibid: Strange 2.103. "Christianos nostris temporibus a Judaeis esse crucifixos audiui"

certainly one of those images that bubbled to the surface with regularity in the monastic chronicles wherein monks expounded on salvation history. One event from the chronicle of Otto of St. Blasien, the continuation of Otto of Freising's chronicle, serves to demonstrate this tendency. Therein, Otto narrated a crusade expedition that took place in 1197, led by the archbishop of Mainz, the prince-bishop of Würzburg, and one of the nephews of Otto IV.⁸⁹ After crossing the sea and enjoying initial success, recounted the chronicler, the crusading force besieged Toron, a city between Tyre and Damascus that had been a crusader stronghold before Saladin's victories a decade previous to the events narrated in the chronicle. As the chronicler explained, the siege would have succeeded but for "the accursed hunger for gold, regarded in the minds of some as superior to Christ."⁹⁰ The Muslim occupants of the city managed to buy off some of the Crusaders—he singled out Conrad, the prince-bishop of Würzburg—with "a tremendous weight of gold."⁹¹ The comments that follow this narration are particularly important for our purposes here. After narrating the acceptance of the Muslim bribes, Otto noted, "And thus, having sold Christ, just as to the Jews formerly, they withdrew, leaving the castle to the Muslims."⁹² From there he went on to compare the leaders of the Crusade to Judas

⁸⁹ This venture has been lumped together with the Third Crusade in most general histories of the Crusades. It was organized initially by Henry VI, eldest son of Frederick Barbarossa but was led ultimately by the archbishop of Mainz because Henry fell ill at the same time he was dealing with some unrest in southern Italy. Successful initially, the campaign eventually fell apart, largely due to the news of Henry VI's death on 28 September 1197. Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 146-47.

⁹⁰ Otto of St. Blasien, *Otonis Frisingensis continuatio Sanblasiana* 42: MGH SS 20.327. "auri sacra fames in mente quorundam Christo preponderans"

⁹¹ Ibid. "Nam sicut fertur, quidam de militibus Templi a paganis corrupti pecunia, animum Cunradi cancellari, qui in hac ipsa obsidione precipue clarebat, cum quibusdam aliis inflexerunt, eisque auri maximo pondere collato obsidionem solvere persuaserunt." It is unclear whether the "miles Templi" refer to Knights Templar among the crusading force or to the crusaders generically.

⁹² Ibid. "Sicque vendito Christo, tradito paganis castello, sicut olim Iudeis, recesserunt."

and their bribe-price to the thirty pieces of silver.⁹³ Otto thus identified the Jews as the archetypal enemy of Christ, on account of their having “bought him” in order to kill him. To interpret the deeds of the current Muslim enemies, Otto referred back to the Jewish betrayers of Christ. Furthermore, he identified the Jews very closely with Judas: an association that came readily to the minds and pens of high medieval monks, as we have already witnessed. With a brief aside comment in a monastic chronicle, then, the monastic chronicler displayed the monks’ absorption and modification of the stock image of the inimical Jew.

5.3 Eschatology and Prophesied Jewish Conversion

While the image of Jews as crucifiers of Christ and persistent enemies of Christendom was an uncompromisingly negative trope, other ideas about Jews that circulated in the monasteries—in both the monks’ sources and in the works they wrote themselves—were a bit more optimistic about the Jews’ prospects before God. When examined collectively, it becomes apparent that ideas about Jews were inconsistent and ambivalent. This is why such common scholarly terms as “the hermeneutic Jew” and even the adjective “anti-Jewish” are problematic; while they are nearly ubiquitous in scholarship on medieval Jewish-Christian relations, they fail to capture the nuances inherent in that complicated relationship and in the ways each side imagined the other. In no element of Jewish-Christian contact do such words as “ambivalence” and “nuance” apply more than they do to the common trope of the eschatological Jew.

⁹³ Ibid. “Nec tamen de pretio taliter acquisito aliquod emolumentum, sicut nec Iudas de triginta argenteis, consecuti sunt.”

As with the tropes discussed earlier, contemplation of the *eschaton*—and of the Jews’ role in that future event—spoke to fundamental monastic values. Monks in the high Middle Ages displayed a strong eschatological awareness, drawing a great deal of inspiration from such scriptural texts as the Book of Revelation. Van Engen notes that “the monks’ most common depiction of themselves [was] the likening of their worship to that of the twenty-four elders gathered round the Lord in the Book of Revelation.”⁹⁴ The war they were waging against the devil and his enemies, the Jews among them, was to go on until the end of the world, an event which, in their minds, would come quickly if they could bring about a purification, first of themselves and then of Christian society as a whole.

The monks’ accepted narrative of the second coming of Christ, extricated from Revelation and Daniel and read into other scriptural books, had the Jews playing a fairly substantial role. The eschatological Jew trope was a multifaceted character to be sure but one defined most prominently by an eventual, prophesied, wholesale conversion to Christianity. Put simply, monks understood and accepted that the Jews would convert at the end of the world, as part of the events immediately preceding the second coming of Christ. As was the case to some extent with the other two major tropes, this idea arose from the Christian understanding of the broad narrative of salvation history. As Brett Whalen remarks, “Christian eschatology, of course, did not simply relate to the future, but also depended upon a close reading of the past that informed the present and pointed toward events approaching on the horizon.”⁹⁵ The second coming of Jesus and the end of

⁹⁴ Van Engen, “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered,” 300.

⁹⁵ Brett Edward Whalen, *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009), 3. See also Richard K. Emmerson and Ronald B.

the world were just the final chapters in a story that stretched back to the creation of the world and included various high points, the climax being the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus. Because the hopeful narrative of the eventual conversion of the Jews was juxtaposed with these earlier events in salvation history, monastic attitudes toward this trope took on a strong element of theological ambivalence. In other words, it was difficult for many monks to reconcile the Jew of the crucifixion narrative with the converted Jew of the *eschaton*.

One compelling example of this ambivalence comes from Rupert of Deutz, in the penultimate book of his lengthy *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*. This was not the first time he dealt with this subject in that text; indeed, he discussed various theological aspects of the Jews—their place in salvation history and their blindness and carnality received particular emphasis—in earlier parts of the same work. Still, since the section in question concerned the “present age” and offered pointed instructions on monastic piety, it was a very important part of the overall work. After all, it dealt with monastic observance in the present—a period Rupert labeled “the monastic age”—and thus cut to the heart of the monastic life as Rupert and his contemporaries viewed it.⁹⁶ The fact that he felt it important to treat the subject of the Jews in such a vital, relevant part of this work constitutes compelling evidence of monastic concern with this issue. A close analysis of the texts reveals a fundamental characteristic of the monastic interpretation of the Jews, seen in many other works from this same period: the juxtaposition of a host of

Herzman, *The Apocalyptic Imagination in Medieval Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 101.

⁹⁶ For a description of this vital chapter, see Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 93-4.

pejorative characteristics with the prophesied conversion of the Jews at the end of the world.

In this particular part of his work, Rupert attempted to offer a definition of piety, or at least to list the various characteristics of a righteous individual. In the process, he also detailed the characteristics of the impious. Not surprisingly, he used the Jews as his chief counter-example, drawing on elements of the apostate Jew trope discussed in the previous chapter. The Jews, he noted, “have strayed for a very long time” from “piety, the true worship of God, true religion.”⁹⁷ He went on to describe them as “ignorant” and “cruel,” though he also suggested that labeling the Jews as ignorant does not tell the whole story of their wickedness, some of which involved calculated malevolence. Rupert elaborated on this thought by proclaiming that the Jews are like the elder brother in the Prodigal Son parable, jealous that they have lost their chosen status in the eyes of their Father and their God.⁹⁸ This jealousy, wrote Rupert, does not arise from ignorance but rather from a willful rebellion against the things of God, a conscious choice to remain standing outside “the Gospel house.”⁹⁹ They have, as a consequence, been “dispersed through all peoples,” and they stand on the outside looking in as the Christians receive grace and participate in the true worship of God.¹⁰⁰ They cling to one Testament yet

⁹⁷ Rupert, *De operibus spiritus sancti*, 8.3: CM 24.2075: “Ergo pietas, verus Dei cultus, vera religio est, a qua longius aberraverunt, primum Iudaei.”

⁹⁸ Ibid., 8.14: CM 24.2091.

⁹⁹ Ibid. “Non ergo arbitremur Iudaeos per ignorantiam foris stare, et in evangelicam domum nolle introire.”

¹⁰⁰ Ibid: CM 24.2091-2. “Symphonia quippe concors et consona est evangelicae praedicatio gratiae, chorus autem gratiarum action est et vox laudis quae in omni terra et per omnes terras corporaliter quoque auditur, Iudaeis qui per omnes gentes dispersi sunt audientibus, et quaque versum distracti sint, nostras per vicos et urbes urbiumque plateas festivitates aspicientibus, nostros die et nocte foris et intus choros, quibus Deum et Christum eius cum sancto Spiritu laudamus, visu et auditu percipientibus.” The “symphonia” and “chorus” are references to the Prodigal Son narrative in Luke 15.

refuse to accept the second witness, the New Testament, of the truths of God.¹⁰¹ Put simply, the Jews have exhibited a profound, willful blindness to the truths and promises of God.

Alongside this preponderance of pejorative sentiments about Jews, however, Rupert also displays a different, and much less futile, image. This is of the eschatological Jew who will convert to Christianity at the end of the world. To explain this future event, Rupert continued to draw on the imagery of the Prodigal Son parable. As mentioned, the elder son in the story—the one to whom the father had promised the inheritance but who was nevertheless jealous of the favor shown to his formerly wayward brother—represents the Jews. Like the elder son, the Jews have refused to enter into the banquet celebrated in honor of the younger son's (i.e., the Christians') return to the house. This jealous pride, suggested Rupert, has kept the Jews, like the elder son who represents them, from enjoying the blessings of God, represented by the story's father. Nevertheless, the father, or rather God, is willing to leave the banquet—to go “out of doors,” as Rupert described it—to reclaim his elder son. Rupert read this parable with Paul's words to the Romans in mind: “For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery . . . that blindness in part has happened in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles should come in.”¹⁰² In other words, the Jews have been blind, but God will ultimately, at least after the Gentiles have been converted, reclaim them from that blindness and bring them back into his grace. “Having laid aside unrighteousness,” explained Rupert, “he [the elder son] may enter the

¹⁰¹ Ibid: CM 24.2092.

¹⁰² Romans 11:25.

banquet of piety.”¹⁰³ Rupert appears to have had no idea how such a transformation would occur. He remarked, “The words themselves, by which the father will turn away the unrighteousness—these are mysterious.”¹⁰⁴ This represents an echo of Paul’s speculation on the future Jewish conversion in Romans 11. Like Paul, Rupert saw this prophesied event as a “mystery,” in the sense that God alone knew how He would bring it about. In other words, Rupert was unsure how exactly God would reclaim and convert the Jews to Christianity, given their current state of blindness and unrighteousness, and he did not offer any speculation on that score. Still, this trope was common enough that Rupert included it in his discussion of Jews, alongside the more negative tropes discussed above. The juxtaposition is quite stark.

We see this same assumption of the eventual Jewish conversion, juxtaposed with the pejorative tropes, in other monastic writings as well, a fact that indicates its prevalence in monastic discourse about Jews. Another example comes from Berengosus of Trier’s work on the cross of Christ. Therein, Berengosus held forth at length on Jewish blindness, explaining that this characteristic would remain with the Jews “all the way to the evening of the world grown old.”¹⁰⁵ He expounded further on Jewish blindness by comparing the Jews to the servants of Abraham who were commanded to remain behind while Abraham went to sacrifice his son Isaac on Mount Moriah (Genesis 22:5). Berengosus thus suggested that the Jews have missed out on the promises and covenants associated with that seminal event in salvation history. However, Berengosus

¹⁰³ Rupert, *De operibus spiritus sancti*, 8.15: CM 24.2093. “deposita impietate ad conuiuium pietatis introeat.”

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. “Verba ipsa, quibus impietatem pater auersurus est, haec mystica sunt.”

¹⁰⁵ Berengosus of Trier, *Libellus insignis de mysterio ligni dominici*: PL 160.985d. “ita caecitas Iudaeorum usque ad verperam mundi senescentis durare probatur”

also noted that these same Jews, “who never acknowledged the faith of the holy Trinity, ought to return with an oath to the faith around the end of the world.”¹⁰⁶ This knowledge, he remarked, is to be understood “*mystice*.” That is, it is part of God’s mysterious workings, beyond the comprehension of men. Although Berengosus did not cite Paul’s epistle to the Romans in his explication of this verse, he seems to have manifest the same kind of thought process as Rupert in contemplating the Jews of the *eschaton*. It was not readily apparent to him how this conversion would take place, but he was sure it would take place; after all, prophecy had decreed that it would be so. Despite their current blindness and all the other attributes and circumstances that combined against them, the Jews would turn their hearts to Christ, via divine intervention, at the end of the world.

These sentiments were not entirely unique to Rupert or Berengosus. As with the other stock images examined here, these ambivalent attitudes had their roots in the patristic tradition, in the works of the fathers whose works formed the basic corpus of monastic intellectual inquiry. Contained in the authoritative commentaries on the Canticle and the Psalms, and in other works that circulated in the medieval monasteries of Germany, was this same juxtaposition of references to Jewish wickedness and expressions of certainty about the miraculous, prophesied conversion of the Jews at the end of time. The German monks of the high Middle Ages struggled a great deal with this ambivalent legacy. In some cases their efforts led them to emphasize the negative aspects of the Jew of the *eschaton* much more than did the patristic commentators or the glossator. In other instances they enhanced the positive aspects of this trope, some to an extraordinary extent.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.: PL 160.990b. “Judaeos, qui nondum sunt fidem sanctae Trinitatis experti, circa finem saeculi fidei debent arrhabone reverti.”

The ambivalence inherent in this trope is particularly apparent in the authoritative exegesis on the Canticum, and, since monks drew much of their eschatological sentiment from that text and its commentaries, the Canticum commentaries' influence on the monks' intellectual world cannot be overstated. Drawing on Bede's Canticum commentary from which it borrowed heavily, the *Gloss* described in great though inconsistent detail the close relationship between the "Gentile church"¹⁰⁷ and the synagogue. The compiler of the *Gloss* never fully condemned *Synagoga* as a defunct institution like other patristic and high medieval monastic authors did. In fact, the *Gloss* depicted *Synagoga* as hiding in the shadows, watching intently and even admiring the deeds of *Ecclesia*, as the rest of the drama of salvation history proceeds. The compiler of the *Gloss* may have viewed *Synagoga*'s condition as a punishment for rejecting and killing Christ, but the glosses on the Canticum contain only one or two brief comments about that. The bulk of the exegesis adopts a more positive stance, particularly in relation to the Jew of the *eschaton*. After waiting through the rise of the church, first among the Jews and then among the Gentiles, *Synagoga* reenters the narrative. A marginal gloss on Song 6:9 remarked, "At the end of time the synagogue is now admiring the church, having toiled in the past and continuing to toil in the present and having spread so widely; [she also admires] so many of the supremely wise men who have followed one faith without schism, in addition to the miracles performed by the living and the dead and many other proofs of the Christian

¹⁰⁷ As opposed to the "church of the Jews," a euphemism for the early church which consisted entirely of converted Jews like Mary and the apostles. The progress and divine destiny of the "church of the Jews," the "church of the Gentiles," and the synagogue is a major element of the trajectory of this commentary, which builds on itself as the chapters proceed.

faith.”¹⁰⁸ Considering all these things, *Synagoga* becomes “convinced, penitent, and remorseful”¹⁰⁹ and proceeds to praise *Ecclesia* for her deeds and wonders. *Synagoga* furthermore is “aroused by wholesome penitence and confesses that she strayed for a long time because of profane blindness.”¹¹⁰ She also admits that “the [Jewish] law did not recommend to me the death of God.”¹¹¹ After listening to her confession and praise, *Ecclesia* invites *Synagoga* to join her: “So that we may become acquainted with the splendor of your chastity and, with the love of Christ binding us to each other, we may both build one house of faith on the real cornerstone.”¹¹² In other words, church and synagogue become joined irrevocably and eternally, with no lingering thought of their longstanding differences. Nevertheless, interspersed with this intriguingly positive interpretation of the place of *Synagoga* in salvation history are many references to Jewish guilt for crucifixion, Jewish carnality, Jewish blindness, and the other stock images discussed heretofore.

As evidenced in the works of Rupert and Berengosus, this puzzling juxtaposition was nearly ubiquitous in the writings of monastic authors of the high Middle Ages. Nearly every monk or nun who wrote about the Jews referred to their prophesied conversion, while at the same time depicting them in the most unflattering of terms. One

¹⁰⁸ *GO Song* 6:9 (marginal): CM 170.337. “illis nouissimis temporibus iam intuens synagoga tam bene operatam operantemque ipsam ecclesiam tam diffusam, tot sapientissimos sine scismate sequi unam fidem praeterea uiuorum et mortuorum miracula et multa alia christianae fidei argumenta”

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* “conuicta, penitens et compuncta”

¹¹⁰ *GO Song* 6:11 (marginal): CM 170.343. “illa salubri penitudine compuncta profitetur se causa profanae cecitatis diutius aberrasse.”

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* “Lex michi non saudebat mortem Dei.”

¹¹² *GO Song* 6:12 (marginal): CM 170.347. “Ut speciem tuae castitatis cognoscamus et copulante ad inuicem nos Christi amore unam domum fidei ambae in ipso angulari lapide construamus.”

of the more puzzling elements of this juxtaposition—and one that produced a wide variety of interpretations—was the identification of the Jews as the minions of the Antichrist. Although this identification had some of its roots in the monks’ patristic sources, it was developed much more fully in the central Middle Ages, especially in the highly influential *De ortu et tempore antichristi* by Adso of Montier-en-Der, a tenth century reforming monk and abbot.¹¹³ At least some German monks of the twelfth and thirteenth century must have been familiar with Adso’s work, since they adopted many of the ideas that were original to that text. Patristic sources, for the most part, made only oblique, uncertain references to a relationship or connection between the Antichrist and the Jews. Augustine, for instance, included such a remark in his commentary on Psalm 105:47 (“Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us from all nations into one flock.”) He explained that the rescue of the faithful referred to in the verse “will not be accomplished through the Antichrist, as the Jews suppose, but through Christ our Lord, who shall come in the name of his Father.”¹¹⁴ This comment appears to be more an allusion to the Jews’ mistaken belief in a future Messiah—Augustine used *antichristum* to describe that Jewish tenet—than an explicit remark on a close, future relationship between the Jews and the Antichrist. Nevertheless, such indirect comments would have been interpreted by monastic readers through the lens of Adso’s work and other texts that detailed a much stronger connection between the Jews of the *eschaton* and the final earthly enemy of Christianity.

¹¹³ Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De ortu et tempore antichristi*: CM 45.

¹¹⁴ EIP 105.37: CC 40.1569. “Non sicut per antichristum compleri existimant Iudaei, sed per Christum Dominum nostrum uenientem in nomine Patris sui”

Adso's narrative of the Antichrist, written as a kind of anti-saint's life, declared that he would be a Jew from the tribe of Dan, born in Babylon—the anti-Jerusalem—but raised in Bethsaida and Chorazin, the cities near Galilee that rejected Christ and were subsequently cursed by him. Monks in twelfth and thirteenth century Germany adopted much of this narrative but also made additions to it in order to instruct their monastic audiences. Werner of St. Blasien, for instance, recounted the essential features of Adso's text in a sermon he composed for the Advent season.¹¹⁵ However, in the middle of his explanation of the antecedents and allies of the Antichrist—figures like Antiochus, Nero, and Domitian—he declared that “whoever lives contrary to righteousness, whether layman or clergyman, or even a monk who will fight against the rule of his order and revile that which is good—these are the ministers of the Antichrist and of Satan.”¹¹⁶ After warning his fellow monks that they could be doing the will of the Antichrist if they were not careful, he elaborated on the degenerate characteristics of the Antichrist himself; Werner noted his Jewish birth alongside other diabolical origins, including the devil's own gross imitation of the incarnation of Jesus.¹¹⁷ He went on to describe the Antichrist's ascent to great power. The Jews again figure into this part of the narrative. When the Antichrist goes to Jerusalem, wrote Werner, echoing Adso, he will circumcise

¹¹⁵ On Werner's sermon collection, see Leclercq, 183 and P. Glorieux, “Les deflorations de Werner de Saint-Basile,” *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, vol.2 (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1951), 699-721. Some scholars have argued that Werner composed these sermons for the use of the secular clergy. Even though that may have been the case, the direct reference to monks in the following example suggests that this collection was used in the monasteries as well.

¹¹⁶ Werner of St. Blasien, *Libri deflorationum*: PL 157.744b. “Quicumque enim laicus sive clericus, seu etiam monachus contra justitiam vivit, et ordinis sui regulam impugnabit, et quod bonum est blasphemat, Antichristi sunt et ministri Satanae.”

¹¹⁷ Werner explained that the Antichrist will be conceived through sex in the normal way—conceived in sin, in other words—but that the devil himself will enter the womb of his mother thereafter and nourish him with his evil spirit until his birth. *Ibid.*: PL 157.744b-d.

himself and claim to be the Messiah. The Jews will accept his claims immediately and flock to his banner, even though this will amount to siding with the devil against God.¹¹⁸

As with other monastic texts, the point of this sermon is didactic; monks should learn from these counter-examples of righteousness, the Jews among them, and take the path of God. Werner was trying both to inspire disgust for the Antichrist and his allies and to admonish them to beware lest they unwittingly join the Jews in supporting evil.

This close identification between the Jews and the Antichrist was not always so clear. Some monks, in fact, produced a much less condemning and indeed positive picture of the Jews' involvement with the Antichrist. They acknowledged first of all that the Jews were not the only people who would be deceived by the Antichrist; many Christians would go along with his diabolical project as well. In a few cases, monastic authors suggested that Jews would be less guilty for their association with the Antichrist than some Christians. One remarkable example was a play composed in a Bavarian monastery—probably Tegernsee—in the middle decades of the twelfth century. Known by its simple title *Ludus de Antichristo*, this text borrowed some elements from Adso and other eschatological texts but otherwise provided an original and unique narrative of the world's final struggle.¹¹⁹ While the text will be dealt with in further detail in a later chapter, it seems fitting to note at this point that the play's author portrayed the character of *Synagoga* in a far better light than he did many of the play's other characters, including the Christian monarchs, who submit quickly and willingly to Antichrist's demands for obedience and fealty. The Hypocrites, Antichrist's chief allies, manage to

¹¹⁸ Ibid.: PL 157.747a.

¹¹⁹ *Ludus de Antichristo*, in *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, vol.2, ed. Karl Young (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), 369-96.

convince the King of Jerusalem (i.e., of the Crusader states), the King of the Greeks (i.e., the Byzantine emperor), and the King of the Franks (i.e., the king of France) to acknowledge Antichrist as their overlord without much effort. Only the King of the Teutons (i.e., the German king) puts up resistance, though he also submits after Antichrist uses intense trickery to confuse him. The Synagogue is the last of all the groups to join the side of Antichrist. Their reasons for submitting are predictable; specifically, Antichrist promises to restore the Jews' ancient promised land to the Jews. Still, the Synagogue is also the first of all the communities of the world to recognize her error. Upon hearing the preaching of the prophets Enoch and Elijah, who are sent to deliver mankind from their subjection to Antichrist, the Synagogue converts immediately and remains faithful, even when the servants of Antichrist put her to death. Meanwhile, the Christian kings remain convinced by Antichrist's deception, only returning to the faith after God intervenes directly against Antichrist. This text seems to follow the lead of the *Gloss* on the Song of Songs in portraying *Synagoga* as a heroic eschatological figure, one whom even the church admires, but it also extends some elements of its portrayal beyond the earlier commentary.

This ambivalent attitude toward the eschatological Jew may seem surprising, but it seems to have constituted an important strand of theological discourse in the mid-twelfth century German monasteries. Again, some of this speculation may be due to the influence of the ambivalent stance found in the *Gloss* and other commentaries on the Canticle, but some of this also seems to be original to these high medieval monastic authors. In his version of the events of the *eschaton*, Honorius Augustodunensis, writing

some years before the Tegernsee author of the *Ludus*¹²⁰, produced a narrative similar to the one propounded in the *Play of the Antichrist* but carried his speculation even further than the author of the later work.¹²¹ In more than one text, he described the situation that will prevail after the death of the Antichrist.¹²² At that time, he noted, “Christians, Jews, and Gentiles” will be joined “in a single faith” in the praise of the Lord.¹²³ In his Canticle commentary, Honorius laid out in detail how this would happen. Echoing the *Gloss* on the Canticle, Honorius described the lasting relationship between the “church of the Synagogue” and the “church of the Gentiles,” which were, in Honorius’s view, two parts of a single historical community.¹²⁴ During the time when the Synagogue went astray, the church of the Gentiles continued to pray for her return to the true faith. Their reunion, remarked Honorius, will occur in the future, when the Synagogue is reclaimed by “the preaching of Elijah and Enoch.”¹²⁵ She will thereafter become so faithful that the church of the Gentiles will marvel at her righteousness and good deeds. To this point,

¹²⁰ Jeremy Cohen notes that the dating of Honorius’s Canticle commentary—the main text that spelled out his vision of the eschatological Jew—is somewhat problematic. Scholars have placed it “sometime after 1132” though “perhaps as late as the mid-1150s.” Cohen, “*Synagoga conversa*: Honorius Augustodunensis, the Song of Songs, and Christianity’s ‘Eschatological Jew,’” *Speculum* 79 (2004): 311.

¹²¹ Since the *Ludus de Antichristo* came later than Honorius’s writings, the latter was obviously not influenced by the former. However, the author of the *Ludus* may have been familiar with Honorius’s works, since they circulated widely in the monasteries of Germany. Although no book list survives from Tegernsee in this period, the library of nearby Benediktbeuern (40 km away) possessed a copy of Honorius’s Canticle commentary. See MBDS 3.1.75. While the most proximate Benediktbeuern book list comes from the middle of the thirteenth century, it is not out of the question that the abbey obtained their copy of Honorius’s text earlier than that, particularly since Honorius spent at least the latter part of his career in Bavaria, close to both Tegernsee and Benediktbeuern.

¹²² For a discussion of Honorius and the eschatological Jew, see, in addition to Cohen’s article, Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 94-95.

¹²³ Honorius, *Gemma Animae* 2.41: PL 172.627c. “tunc Christiani, Judaei et Gentiles, in una religione Dominum laudare noscuntur.”

¹²⁴ Honorius, *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*, intro. to ch.1: PL 172.359a.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.10-11: PL 172.453d. “praedicationem Eliae et Enoch”

Honorius appears merely to have been echoing the *Gloss* and Bede's commentary on the Canticle. However, he pressed beyond those commentaries as he continued with his narration, when he explained that the Synagogue will *lead* the final struggle, "equipped with spiritual weapons," against the Antichrist and his minions.¹²⁶ As Jeremy Cohen explains, Honorius somewhat surprisingly viewed the eschatological Jews as "the shock troops of the church in her final struggle against Antichrist, those who will serve as leaders and provide inspiration for all the faithful."¹²⁷ This is the same Honorius who, as we have seen, stood firmly alongside other monastic commentators in passing on and extending the pejorative tropes about Jews that were bequeathed to the high Middle Ages by the patristic era. However, his textual encounter with the Jew of the *eschaton*, and more specifically the Jew of the Antichrist narrative, led him to adopt a more ambivalent overall interpretation of post-biblical Jewry.

Only rarely did monastic authors question the juxtaposition of the wicked, apostate Jewish servant of the Antichrist—one element of the narrative of the eschatological Jew—and the willing Jewish convert to Christianity—the other major element—and ask how such a fallen and wicked people could possibly convert to the true faith. Even when they did puzzle over this prophetic conundrum, it appears they did not really think about the logistics of thousands of Jews abandoning their ancestral faith wholesale. Hildegard of Bingen provides a very good example of this type of contemplation. After describing in significant detail the carnality and blindness of the Jews, along with their lingering guilt for the crucifixion of Christ, Hildegard referred to

¹²⁶ Ibid., 7.1: PL 172.456b. "spiritualibus armis instructis"

¹²⁷ Cohen, "*Synagoga conversa*," 318-19. See also Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 94-95.

their prophesied conversion: “Through divine mercy, the Synagogue will, before the last day, forsake her unbelief and truly arrive at the knowledge of God.” As if pausing to consider this puzzling yet entrenched image, she then asked, “How is this?”¹²⁸ To answer that question, she went on to explain that the practices associated with the Law of Moses have not actually passed away; they have each simply been transformed into something that coheres with the Gospel. She noted, “For the things that the ancients observed carnally, in legal rites, the new people, in the new covenant, practice spiritually, and what the former showed in the flesh, the latter accomplish in the spirit.”¹²⁹ Thus circumcision has not entirely been abandoned but rather “has been transformed into baptism.”¹³⁰ This is the pattern, contended Hildegard, by which the Synagogue will suddenly and miraculously convert to the truth at the end of time. Like the ritual of circumcision, the Synagogue “has not passed away” completely; she simply awaits the decree of God before undergoing a similar transformation and being united forever with the Church. According to Hildegard, the words of Ezekiel describe this eventual transformation: “I spread my garment over thee and covered thy ignominy; and I swore to thee, and I entered into a covenant with thee.”¹³¹ Hildegard’s explanation of the prophesied Jewish conversion was thus not concerned with the individual conversion process of individual Jews. Rather, it was a commentary on the miraculous power of God to transform his creations at his will.

¹²⁸ Hildegard, *Scivias* 1.5.6: CM 43.97. “synagoga ante nouissimum diem per diuinam clementiam excitata incredulitatem deseret et ad cognitionem Dei ueraciter perueniet. Quid est hoc?”

¹²⁹ Ibid. “quia quae antiqui in legalibus obseruationibus carnaliter obseruabant, haec nouus populus in nouo testamento spiritaliter exercet, quoniam quod illi in carne ostenderunt, hoc isti in spiritu perficiunt.”

¹³⁰ Ibid. “in baptismum translata est”

¹³¹ Ibid., 1.5.7: CC 43.98. She was quoting Ezekiel 16:8.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that monks in German monasteries in the high Middle Ages absorbed ideas about Jews from the popular sources that circulated commonly in their libraries. More than just absorbing and repeating, however, they modified these ideas to fit their contemporary events, concerns, and circumstances. These innovative notions appeared in monks' works on a variety of topics but were especially prominent in their exegetical, homiletical, and historical works. Monks did not often treat Jews as a theological topic separately from other matters. Since the monks' primary concern in writing—whether in biblical commentaries, sermons, chronicles, works of hagiography, or other kinds of texts—was to instruct or otherwise assist fellow monks in living the monastic profession, their treatment of Jews almost always occurred in a didactic context and served an applicative end. Monks used both historical and contemporary Jews as examples, or more often counter-examples, to instruct other monks, while at the same time comparing the Jews' place in salvation history—especially their role in certain key events of that history like the crucifixion—to their own place and to that of other Christians. This instruction and comparison led the monks at times to push the stock images of Jews they encountered in their sources in original directions.

Since these ideas were being absorbed, pressed, and modified—since this was a living tradition, in other words—they were often inconsistent. Some of the ideas inherent in the stock tropes competed with, challenged, or even canceled out ideas contained in other standard tropes. For instance, the eschatological Jew tradition did not match up well with the far more negative sentiments contained in the other tropes. Ambivalence also existed within specific tropes. In addition to the ambivalence bound up inherently

with the image of the eschatological Jew, monks sometimes expressed ambivalent sentiments in their comments on the other tropes as well. After all, these were complicated theological issues; neither the patristic sources nor their high medieval readers were unified entirely on any of the standard tropes. Each monastic author addressed, emphasized, and modified traditional ideas about Jews based on his or her current circumstances and the perceived needs of his or her monastic audience.

Among the other options they had at their disposal to flesh out these ideas, exegetes did on occasion find mitigating theological circumstances that blunted their otherwise virulent portrayals. In writing about the Jews' role in the crucifixion, for instance, some patristic and medieval monastic exegetes wrestled with the issue of necessity, recognizing that someone had to betray Jesus in order for him to die for the sins of the world. In other words, the Passion was an essential part of God's plan, so the Jews' rejection and condemnation of Jesus was also necessary.¹³² These authors still believed the Jews were culpable for the murder of Christ, but some also acknowledged that the necessity of their betrayal at least partially mitigated the extent of their accountability.

Moreover, both patristic and medieval monastic authors noted frequently that the earliest converts—Mary, the apostles, and even Jesus himself—were all Jews, a historical circumstance that spoke to the Jews' value in the narrative of salvation history. Even Ekbert of Schönau, whose work on the suffering of Christ was otherwise very unfriendly to the Jews, mentioned the Jewish identity of the early followers of Christ and saw this as a significant Jewish contribution to salvation history. In the midst of his condemning

¹³² On the topic of necessity of the crucifixion see, for instance, Honorius's discussion in his *Elucidarium*, 1.22: PL 172.1126B-C.

discussion of the Jews' rejection of Christ, he remarked that there were a "select few, nobler athletes whom you [i.e., Christ] chose among the weak and downcast of the world that through them you might vanquish the noble and the powerful in magnificent fashion."¹³³ This earliest Christian demographic ultimately gave way to the conversion of the Gentiles, but the Gentiles' dominance of the church would not continue until the end of time; the Jews would eventually join with Gentiles in the acceptance of Christ. These historical and exegetical points made it difficult to condemn the Jews fully, for they had played a significant role in salvation history during the period when the Law of Moses was God's essential set of commandments; indeed, they were destined to play a substantial role again. The evidence of such ambivalence does not mean that all monks found the complexity of these tropes compelling, but it does demonstrate that monks had various theological options to choose from when it came to thinking and writing about Jews.

The German monastic milieu thus constituted a fertile space for the development of ideas about Jews in the high Middle Ages. While the monks' approach to this and other theological topics was different from that of contemporary scholars in cathedral schools and burgeoning universities, monks were hardly standing still intellectually. Rather than merely parroting the patristic tradition on which they relied so keenly, they entered into inventive dialogue with that tradition. The Jew of the monastic text—in both the reading and the writing of it—was the product of a vital, living environment.

More needs to be said about the interaction between the textual interaction investigated in these chapters and the real interaction treated in the earlier chapters.

¹³³ Ekbert of Schönau, *Stimulus amoris*: PL 158.751b: "perpaucis nobilioribus athleticis, quos inter infima et abjecta mundi elegisti, ut per ipsos alta et fortia magnifice expugnares."

Before approaching that topic, however, I will conclude the discussion of the textual Jew by examining a monastic source, or rather corpus of texts, that seems representative of the exegetical approaches toward Jews formulated in the monastic scriptoria and choirs of this era. Taking an in-depth look at a single set of texts from the mainstream of monastic thought, rather than the piecemeal approach adopted thus far, will serve to clarify even further how these tropes surfaced and were modified in monastic writings.

CHAPTER 6

THE JEW OF THE MONASTIC TEXT, PART 3:

THE ADMONT SERMON CORPUS

6.1 Introduction

The goal of this section of the dissertation thus far has been to establish the types of images about Jews that frequented the German monasteries in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. With the focus on the tropes themselves, the selection and examination of monastic texts as evidence has in no way been systematic. This chapter, however, will look closely at a single corpus of texts produced in a single monastery (and probably within a relatively short period of time) to see if the same depictions—those I have called “stock images”—can be found occupying a prominent place in texts that were meant almost strictly for monastic consumption: that is, those texts written for monks and nuns, by monks and nuns.

The corpus of texts in question are the Admont sermons, produced at Admont Abbey, a mixed Benedictine house in Styria and a locus-point for the Hirsau reforms.¹

These sermons were composed at the monastery most likely during the abbacy of either

¹ Klaus Arnold, “Admont und die monastische Reform des 12. Jahrhunderts,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 89, Kanonistische Abteilung 58 (1972): 350-369 and Helmut J. Mezler-Andelberg, “Admont und die Klosterreform zu Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts,” *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereines für Steiermark* 47 (1956): 28-42. On the history of the Abbey, see Jakob Wichner, *Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Admont*, 4 vols. (Graz: Vereinsdruckere, 1874-1880).

Godfrey (d. 1165) or his brother Irimbert (d.1176).² A number of features make this corpus a compelling choice for ascertaining the frequency of ideas about Jews in the monastic lexicon. First, Admont in the mid-twelfth century was located nowhere near a Jewish community; it was (and remains to this day) a mountain abbey, far removed from larger towns like Regensburg, Salzburg, and Vienna, all of which, if one follows Michael Toch's painstaking research, held communities of Jews in this period.³ This is not to say that examining texts from, for example, St. Emmeram's of Regensburg would be any less interesting because of its proximity to real Jews, but to ascertain how common these tropes really were, it seems a good choice to select for examination texts from a monastery that had little, if any, contact with actual Jewish communities.

The second reason for employing this corpus in this investigation is that it seems to have been a kind of community project: that is, several individuals within the monastery appear to have contributed to the production of the sermon collection. Although the collection is ascribed solely to Godfrey of Admont by Bernard Pez in his 1725 critical edition, there exists no manuscript evidence to verify authorship by that

² The critical edition of this collection remains Bernard Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, 6 vols (Augsburg: Ph. M. et J. Veith frères, 1721-29). This chapter will utilize PL 174.21-1134, which copies the Pez edition and contains most, though not all, of the sermons. Migne divides them into three parts (see discussion of the three sections below): the *Homiliae dominicales*, PL 174.21-632 (hereafter HD), the *Homiliae in festa totius anni*, PL 174.633-1060 (hereafter HFTA), and the *Homiliae in diversos scripturae locos*, PL 174.1059-1134 (hereafter HDSL). On the sermons themselves, see the recent work of Alison I. Beach, *Women as Scribes: Book Production and Monastic Reform in Twelfth-Century Bavaria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 65-103. See also Ulrich Faust, "Gottfried von Admont: ein monastischer Autor des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige* 75 (1964): 273-359; Alf Härdelin, "God's Visiting: A Basic Theme in the Homilies Ascribed to Godfrey of Admont," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 27,1 (1992): 23-38; Stephan Borgehammar, "A Monastic Conception of the Liturgical Year," *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001), 13-44. On the careers and writings of Godfrey and Irimbert, see Johann Wilhelm Braun, *Die Überlieferung der Schriften Gottfrieds und Irimberts von Admont mit einem Lebesabriß Irimberts* (Ph.D dissertation, University of Giessen, 1967).

³ Toch, "The Formation of a Diaspora," especially the maps on pp.58-59. It should be noted that none of the three volumes of the *Germania Judaica* contains an entry on Admont.

long-time abbot.⁴ Godfrey's brother Irimbert, the author of a number of exegetical works, most of which remain in manuscript form, seems a more likely candidate for authorship. The sermons match to some extent the style and content of his other works, as Stephan Borgehammer has opined.⁵ Still, as Alison Beach has recently pointed out, there exists compelling evidence for the involvement of the nuns of Admont in the production of sermons and other texts in that community.⁶ Irimbert himself mentioned that the nuns for whom he was responsible took careful notes on and even produced written copies of his and other sermons, which they then used to teach their fellow sisters.⁷ Other evidence demonstrates clearly that the nuns produced their own sermons and involved themselves in other ways in the intellectual life of the abbey.⁸ While more manuscript work needs to be done to complement this compelling evidence, it seems plausible to state at this point that the Admont sermons were not a corpus produced in isolation by a single author.

⁴ J.W. Braun's 1967 dissertation (see note 2, above) was the first to raise the problems of the attribution to Godfrey, which had gone unquestioned for two and a half centuries. See also Fritz Peter Knapp, *Die Literatur des Früh- und Hochmittelalters in den Bistümern Passau, Salzburg, Brixen, und Trient von Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1273*, *Geschichte der Literatur in Österreich von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* 1 (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1994), 75-77.

⁵ Stephan Borgehammer, "Who Wrote the Admont Sermon Corpus—Gottfried the Abbot, His Brother Irimbert, or the Nuns?" *De L'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la predication médiévale*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand (Louvain: Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993), 47-51 and "The Admont Sermon Corpus," Paper presented at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Mich., 8 May 1993. I must thank Prof. Borgehammer for providing me with a copy of the latter paper.

⁶ Beach, *Women as Scribes*, 65-103. See also Beach's articles "The Multifarious Grace of the Holy Spirit: Salvation History and the Book of Ruth at Twelfth-Century Admont," *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture: Reform and Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany*, ed. Alison I. Beach (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 125-37 and "Listening for the Voices of Admont's Twelfth-Century Nuns," *Voices in Dialogue: Reading Women in the Middle Ages*, ed. Linda Olson and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 187-98.

⁷ Bernard Pez, ed., *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova*, 12 tomes (Regensburg: Peetz, 1723-40), republished in 3 vols. (Farnborough: Gregg, 1967), t.8 (vol.2), 460. Irimbert, it seems, eventually appointed two nuns to help him with his exegetical and homiletical works. See Beach, "Listening for the Voices of Admont's Twelfth-Century Nuns," 189.

⁸ For instance, Beach has drawn attention to manuscript images from Admont (MS 58 and MS 62) that show nuns preaching and otherwise carrying on learned discourse. *Ibid.*, 190-92.

They were, instead, a community production. While I will refer to their author simply as “the homilist” in this chapter, this term is meant to constitute a reference to the collective. Since this corpus was likely a communal project, the images contained therein reflect ideas and attitudes that would have been held in common among many, if not all, the brothers and sisters of the Admont community.⁹ Since it is almost certain that these sermons were preached out loud to the entire community in the respective cloisters—Irimbert’s comments about the nuns keeping record of his sermons gives some indication of preaching in the female section of the monastery—it seems wrong to suggest that their production represents a mere intellectual exercise. These sermons were decidedly not the sole property of the literate elite (which itself seems to have included more than just a few members); the ideas and images contained therein are representative of attitudes held in common by the entire community. Again, if we are to comprehend “stock images”, this is a good source to investigate.

Third, Admont’s library seems to have held many of the essential, authoritative patristic works wherein the stock images of Jews were propounded initially, including two of the Psalm commentaries discussed in previous chapters.¹⁰ Moreover, the Admont sermons adhere to the classical homiletic form—the phrase-by-phrase exposition of the

⁹ In referring to the author or authors of the sermons, I will use simply “the homilist,” although this nomenclature should not be taken to indicate that I think these were the work of a single author. For simplicity’s sake, I likewise refer here to the sermons’ audience as “the monks” or “the homilist’s brothers.”

¹⁰ The earliest complete catalogs of the Admont library come from the late fourteenth century and were compiled by Peter of Arbon. These show the presence of several glossed Psalters (both separate from and included as part of entire glossed Bible texts), as well as the Psalm commentary of Augustine. The monks, of course, would have been exposed to the commentary of Cassiodorus through the glossed Psalters. MBÖ 3.18, 3.24, 3.37-39, and 3.41. More than two hundred medieval manuscripts from Admont have survived, a greater number than those preserved from any other German monastery. Two of these manuscripts (Admont MS 426 and MS 508) are glossed Bibles. Beach, “Salvation History and the Book of Ruth,” 128.

biblical text—used by important patristic authors, especially Gregory the Great.¹¹ As such, the sermons feature a thorough digestion and recapitulation of the patristic tradition and thus constitute good source wherein to locate the standard tropes of Jews, which were themselves distilled largely from those authoritative texts.

The fourth and most significant reason for this choice of texts is that the sermons were written for, and delivered during, particular liturgical occasions that were integral to the monastic experience. I have tried to hint at the importance of the liturgy as the basis for monastic life in the previous chapter, and for good reason. As noted in the introduction, previous scholars have too often tried to ascertain what can be learned about general Christian or European attitudes from monastic products and, in the process, have overlooked what is particularly “monastic” about monastic texts. With notable exceptions—particularly the works of very popular figures like Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable, or Anselm of Bec, or even lesser figures like Rupert of Deutz, who wrote at times for a more general audience—the texts that were produced by monks were intended for the education and spiritual edification of their fellow monks. To examine the Admont sermon corpus with an eye to understanding universal attitudes would

¹¹ The library lists of the late fourteenth century, not surprisingly, show the presence of a number of Gregory’s works. MBÖ 3.18 and 3.40-41. Gregory’s homiletical techniques had largely fallen out of use by the mid-twelfth century. Borgehammar writes, “Students of the history of preaching will be quite familiar with this form of sermon. But I think it important to point out how uncommon it is in the twelfth century. I have been looking at random samples of roughly contemporary sermons, and so far I have not found the classical homily form anywhere except in Admont. The method does appear in Bible commentaries, and in various treatises – such as Aelred of Rievaulx’s *On Jesus at the Age of Twelve* – but in sermons it simply seems to be outmoded by this time. Indeed, I think it fair to say that it had last been *popular* at the end of the ninth century, in the school of Auxerre.” Borgehammar, “The Admont Sermon Corpus.” By contrast, Beverly Kienzle describes the typical form of the high medieval monastic sermon: “A typical monastic sermon begins with a biblical or liturgical lection. One or more key words are selected from the lection and used repeatedly to develop a motif or a theme. Thus the lection is a point of departure for the sermon but not a framework, as it is for the homily where the preacher *comments on the entire pericope and follows the order of its words like a roadmap.*” Beverly M. Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly M. Kienzle, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, fasc. 81-83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 281. Emphasis added.

likewise fail to take into account the fundamental fact that it was composed strictly for consumption within the cloister.¹² As demonstrated in previous chapters, the Jews constituted vital counter-examples to the monastic lifestyle, and the homilist used them as such in his homiletic constructions of the monastic life. The contrast between monk and Jew was absolutely vital, for it spoke to the most important aspects of the monastic experience.

To understand how these sermons fit into the monastic routine, which was always bound, of course, by the liturgy of the hours, one need look no further than their titles. The largest set of sermons were those intended for Sundays. Beginning with the first Sunday of Advent, or the beginning of the Tempore, the collection contains at least one sermon for every Sunday of the year. The homilist built his sermons around the texts that

¹² Much of the literature on medieval preaching begins with the assumption that preaching was a public activity. Nevertheless, until the close of the twelfth century, public preaching to the laity was not a terribly common practice. Rouse and Rouse explain, "In the twelfth century much of the preaching was monastic, preaching by monks to a monastic congregation. The homily, thoughtful, usually brief, and simple in organization, was the customary vehicle of monastic preaching. Sermons to the laity were not totally lacking, of course; in particular, preaching to the lay faithful was associated with the Crusades, and with wandering evangelists such as Robert d'Arbrissel. But the ordinary parish priest was not expected, and often not competent, to prepare and deliver regular sermons. The task of routine preaching to the lay faithful was the responsibility of the bishops, who were required to preach once each Sunday. When this requirement was fulfilled, and it often was not, the result might be no more than one sermon per diocese per week." Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979), 43. Several factors converged in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries to create the desire for regular preaching to the laity, including concerns over the spread of the Cathar and Waldensian heresies, the development of preaching manuals like Alan of Lille's *Ars praedicandi*, and the personal patronage of Pope Innocent III. The firm injunction for trained preachers to preach frequently and in multiple locales came in canon 10 of the Fourth Lateran Council. See *Ibid.*, 43-64. Unfortunately, there are very few studies of preaching in the monastic context. The collection of articles edited by Carolyn Muessig, *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) seeks to fill that void. See especially Muessig's article in the collection, "What is Medieval Monastic Preaching? An Introduction" (pp.3-16). See also Beverly M. Kienzle's excellent article "The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon" (see n.11, above). Monks, particularly Cistercians, did occasionally preach in public, although, like preaching to the laity in general, such outreach was by no means systematic. For an example of a monk preaching in public, see Kienzle, "Hélinand de Froidmont et la predication cistercienne dans le Midi (1145-1229)," in *La predication en Pays d'Oc (XII^e-début XV^e siècle)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 32 (Toulouse: Privat, 1997), 37-67. After the Fourth Lateran Council, monks in locations with few Mendicants, such as Styria, may have preached regularly. Such is the argument of Elena Lemeneva in her article "Preaching in a Rural Parish Community in Thirteenth-Century Styria," *Medieval Sermon Studies* 47 (2003): 22-24. They were forbidden from preaching in most places, however.

were read traditionally on particular Sundays. The sermons would have been delivered to the monks during one of three possible times on the appropriate Sunday. The first possibility was during Mass in the monastic church, since many of the scriptures around which the sermons were built are Gospel and other readings from the traditional Mass liturgy. The second possibility was during chapter: the assembly after the morning Mass that included a lesson on the Rule and a sermon by the Abbot.¹³ The third likely occasion was during the Sunday night office.¹⁴ The Rule of Saint Benedict dictated that the Abbot was to preside over this lengthiest of all monastic liturgical sessions, directing the monks as they recited the night's Psalms and reading to them passages he selected from the Prophets and the New Testament. After this came the centerpiece of the night's scriptural lessons: "Let the Abbot read the lesson from the Gospel, while all stand with reverence and awe."¹⁵ Since the majority of the Sunday sermons employed Gospel texts, one may surmise that the author intended for them to be delivered by the Abbot during this solemn occasion each week.

The next largest group of sermons are those intended to be delivered on Feast Days and similar observances. Many of these occasions would have entailed a break in the regular monastic routine to participate in special liturgical rites. Beverly Kienzle explains that, on feast days, formal sermons replaced the normal brief sermons in chapter; the entire community, including "lay brothers . . . from the granges" sat in the audience

¹³ Lawrence, 110. Chrysogonus Waddell explains that the sermon delivered in chapter "was itself a liturgical act, with the preacher breaking the bread received from Christ, ever present and acting through his word." Waddell, "The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Preaching," in *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, ed. Muessig, 337.

¹⁴ Kienzle explains, "The readings for the nocturnes of Matins included sermons (chiefly patristic)." Kienzle, "The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon," 271.

¹⁵ *Regula Sancti Benedicti* 11: SC 182.516: "Legat abbas lectionem de Euangelia, cum honore et timore stantibus omnibus."

while the abbot or a specially-appointed brother delivered the sermon.¹⁶ Obvious festive occasions like Christmas (nine total homilies) and Holy Week (ten total homilies, counting those for Palm Sunday) inspired numerous sermons, but other liturgical observances that were quite popular in this period—the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary¹⁷ (four homilies), for example—also inspired multiple sermons from the Admont homilist. Like the Sunday sermons, these Feast Day homilies were also organized according to their placement vis-à-vis the Temporale, starting with the Feast of Saint Andrew (30 November), which lay roughly at the same time on the calendar as the beginning of Advent.

As with the Sunday sermons, the choices of scriptural texts for the Feast Days were not haphazard. The scriptures explicated in these sermons were those traditionally associated with and found in the traditional liturgy of particular holy occasions.¹⁸ The association between text and occasion was thus fraught with meaning. For instance, the homilist began his first sermon for the Feast of St. Stephen with Jesus’s condemning words to the Jews in Matthew 23:34: “I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them you will put to death and crucify, and some you will scourge in your

¹⁶ Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 279.

¹⁷ The eleventh and twelfth centuries witnessed an escalation in the popularity of the Marian feasts, and Marian devotion in general. Rachel Fulton notes that “all communities throughout eleventh-century Christendom kept her four principal feast days (first adopted in Rome in the seventh century and disseminated wholesale by the Carolingian reforms in the ninth), and all, therefore, had occasion to commemorate her in the liturgy and liturgical art, not to mention in their private devotions. According to Lanfranc’s constitutions for the cathedral community at Canterbury, the feast of Mary’s Assumption (that is, her resurrection and bodily ascent into heaven) ranked among the five most solemn observances of the liturgical year, along with Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and the dedication of the local church (which was itself a Marian feast if the church or monastery was dedicated to the Virgin Mother.) Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion*, 196. On the early history of this feast, see Stephen J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary’s Dormition and Assumption* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹⁸ Kienzle explains, “The feast-day sermons were usually based on texts used in the daily liturgy.” Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 279.

synagogues, and persecute from city to city.”¹⁹ In the process, he surely reminded his audience of brother monks that St. Stephen, the church’s first martyr, had been stoned to death by Jews.

The third and smallest grouping of sermons were those built around particular scriptural passages—often lengthy scriptural narratives. The intended days or occasions for the delivery of these sermons, if they were to be delivered at all, is uncertain. They may have been prepared for specific liturgical occasions, yet they may just as well have represented a kind of exegetical calisthenics for their author or authors, using Old Testament narratives that appear to have been popular exegetical fare in Admont.²⁰ So, for instance, there are two lengthy sermons in the collection on the Michas narrative from Judges 17-18, a long one on the dream of Nebuchadnezzar from Daniel 7, and a sermon on the opening chapter of the first book of Machabees. While it is difficult to know exactly how these particular sermons fit into the daily liturgical life of the monastery, they do make plain a keen interest in the exegesis of the Old Testament, even of passages that might be assumed to have been obscure.

6.2 Stock Images of Jews in the Admont Sermons

All the common tropes about Jews found in works by German monks, and in the authoritative patristic and medieval exegesis that circulated in the monasteries, may be

¹⁹ HFTA 11: PL 174.665D.

²⁰ Irimbert wrote lengthy exegetical commentaries on the books of Judges and Kings, neither of which have been edited into standard critical editions. Many of the sermons in this third grouping come from those Biblical works. I have not been able to ascertain the relationship between Irimbert’s longer exegesis and these sermons. Beverly Kienzle sorts through the problems of sermon redaction, organization, and delivery in “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” 280-301. She notes that sermons were often sent as letters or written down for private devotional purposes rather than actually delivered in chapter or during Matins. “Monks too might ask the abbot to pursue in written form a topic discussed in chapter.” *Ibid.*, 300.

found over and over again in the Admont sermon corpus. Like his monastic contemporaries, the Admont homilist enhanced and modified these tropes to suit the needs and tastes of his monastic audience. He dwelt in detail on Jewish guilt for the crucifixion of Christ and on images of Jews as enemies, including the close association between Jews and the devil. Moreover, he expounded upon the blindness and carnality of the Jews and the consequent removal of God's promises in favor of the Gentile Christians; since he viewed monks as the ultimate heirs of those promises, the inclusion of such remarks comes as no surprise. In fact, the notion of the Jew as counter-example to the proper monastic life seems to have been the idea that underlay all of the homilist's comments about Jews. The sermons also applied to Christians titles that belonged scripturally to Jews and assigned to Jews pejorative scriptural labels. Finally, the Admont sermons included a significant number of comments about the prophesied Jewish conversion at the end of the world, often without reconciling this image with more negative notions like the association of the Jews with the Antichrist. In other words, the Admont homilist was motivated by fundamental values that underlay the monastic life, and he set up the Jews as counterpoints to those essential values through both the images he depicted and the negative, and sometimes aggressive, tone he adopted. After listening to or reading these sermons, there would have been little question in the minds of the monks about the Jews' place, both in the broader context of salvation history and in the more immediate context of contemporary Christian society. Moreover, the monks hearing these sermons would have used the images and ideas about Jews both to understand their calling better and to reaffirm their commitment to the monastic life.

In order to demonstrate the way in which the author of the Admont sermons included these tropes in his homilies, this chapter will proceed along two lines. First, it will touch briefly upon each of the aforementioned tropes in turn, sketching out briefly a few examples of the use of each trope. Second, and more substantively, it will examine a few key sermons in close detail, expounding at some length on the way the tropes fit into the context of each sermon.

Jewish Guilt for the Passion

Like his contemporary monks and the patristic exegetical tradition from which they all drew, the Admont homilist wrote about the Jews frequently in his many discussions of the passion of Christ. In the process, he joined with other monastic and patristic exegetes in asserting Jewish guilt for the crucifixion. The point of mentioning the passion in the context of a sermon was to encourage the monastic audience to contemplate the suffering of Christ and, by extension, to join with Christ in that suffering. As they pursued this contemplative imitation, monks would have envisioned themselves surrounded by their own Jewish tormentors.

One of the most vehement examples of the argument for Jewish guilt and Jewish intention occurred in a homily for the feast of St. Stephen. The text for the sermon was not, as might be expected, Acts 7, but rather Matthew 23:34, which the homilist understood as a prophecy of St. Stephen's martyrdom: "I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them you will put to death and crucify, and some you will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city." One of the key messages of this scriptural passage, declared the homilist, is that the generation of Jews who crucified Christ and stoned St. Stephen are consigned to eternal damnation. He explained,

“Just as there is one generation of the honest and saved who, with their head, that is Christ, will be crowned eternally, thus there is one generation of the wicked and unfaithful who, with their head, the devil, will be condemned forever.”²¹ From there, the homilist proceeded to recount in detail the wicked deeds of the Jews of Christ’s day. Not only did they reject Jesus, he noted, but they also persecuted those who were sent to preach to them after the death of Christ. The Jews merely killed some of these preachers or cast them out of their cities “into the city of the Gentiles.” Yet others received far worse treatment, including crucifixion and scourging with “very painful whips” in the synagogues of the Jews. The sermon singled out the synagogue as a place of evil deeds, as a repository of vices, and even as a vector for “contagion.”²² In other words, the homilist depicted it as the polar opposite of the monastery. He viewed this description of the Jews’ key institution as fitting because the Jews formulated the plot to kill Christ and carried out much of the persecution of the early Christians in their synagogues. Because of these deeds and because the Jews chose to wallow in the vices endemic to that institution, the inhabitants of the synagogue have become known fittingly as “an entire generation of the damned,” condemned forever to dwell “with their prince, the devil.”²³ This association with the devil was, of course, another of the common tropes passed around and enhanced in the monasteries of this period.

²¹ HFTA 11: PL 174.665B. “Sicut una est generatio rectorum et salvandorum, quae cum capite suo, videlicet Christo, aeternaliter coronabitur, ita una est generatio reproborum et infidelium, quae cum capite suo, id est diabolo, perpetim condemnabitur.”

²² He seems to indicate that the word “synagogue” itself means “immense contagion of vices.” HFTA 11: PL 174.666B. “*in synagoga*, id est innumeris vitiorum contagiis”

²³ HFTA 11: PL 174.666A. “universa reproborum generatio” and “cum principe suo diabolo”

Though he did not argue for absolute Jewish intention as vehemently as, say, Cassiodorus, the Admont author still suggested strongly that the Jews did not act out of ignorance when they crucified Jesus. After all, they heard Christ's prophecies about them—that they would kill, cast out, crucify, and scourge those sent to teach them the truth—yet they chose to carry out such persecutions anyway. The sermon's language made clear that the Jews who did this stand condemned forever before God.

The St. Stephen's Day homily was certainly not the only sermon in the Admont collection to propound Jewish guilt or to assign intentionality for the crucifixion of Christ. In another sermon, the homilist compared the murder of Christ to Cain's murder of Abel, the prime scriptural example of intentional murder. The same sermon echoed the notion that the Jews were not content with merely killing Christ; they also felt compelled to bring about the deaths of Christ's apostles. As the sermon in question was delivered during the feast of James the apostle, such a message would certainly have been on the minds of the monks who contemplated the martyrdom of James at the hands of angry Jews.²⁴ The collection's second sermon for the same feast went into more detail about the martyrdom of James. Therein, the homilist explained that James was tempted by the Jews, whom he calls "members of the devil," in the same manner that Jesus was tempted by the devil himself. According to the legend known (from patristic sources) and propounded by the homilist, the Jewish mobs, angry because James was converting so many to Christianity, set James on a parapet of the temple and demanded that he recall the believers of Christ from their error. Of course, James refused and was cast from the battlement, thus winning a crown of real glory, while the devil and the Jews continued to

²⁴ HFTA 43: PL 174.846B-847A.

seek vain glory.²⁵ Even though this was the standard legend of the death of James the Apostle, the homilist placed special emphasis in its retelling on the wicked intentions of the Jewish murderers and on the parallels between James and Jesus. The Jews who killed James were thus like the murderers of Christ, and their wickedness carried on after both deeds.

A final example of the argument for Jewish intentionality in the crucifixion comes from a sermon for *Inventio crucis*, the festival that celebrated the finding of the true cross. Naturally, the sermon's author took the opportunity on such an occasion to discuss the Passion, with special emphasis on the cross itself. He remarked, "For when the Jews put to death the Christ, our Lord Redeemer, with the punishment of the cross, they stole the tree upon which the Author of life perished on our behalf . . . that by this deed they might sweep away completely the memory of that name from the earth."²⁶ Such an act, asserted the homilist, represented "the peak of their treachery."²⁷ With this gratuitous deed, the Jews demonstrated their intention to obliterate all mention of Jesus from the earth. He went on in the same sermon to lament further the shame and treachery Jesus was forced to endure at the hands of the "unrighteous Jews [*ab impiis Judeis*]." No one, he proclaimed, can forget that he was arrested and bound by the Jews, or that he was scourged by Pilate and the Romans, "as if he were the most sinful thief and brigand."²⁸

²⁵ HFTA 44: PL 174.851A-851C.

²⁶ HFTA 45: PL 174.853B-853C. "Cum enim Judaei Christum Dominum Redemptorem nostrum crucis supplicio interemissent, lignum, in quo ipse Auctor vitae pro nobis moriens occubuit . . . absconderunt, ut hoc facto memoriam nominis illius penitus de terra auferrent."

²⁷ HFTA 45: PL 174.853C. "cumulum perfidiae suae"

²⁸ HFTA 45: PL 174.856B-856C. "Nullus est qui ignorare possit quomodo a Judaeis comprehensus et ligatus, ac postmodum iudici Pilato oblatus, ab ipso crudeliter flagellis caesus est, quasi fur et latro sceleratissimus."

While the homilist left the extent of the Jews' condemnation vague and, like Augustine, criticized most vehemently the leaders of the Jews who actually plotted to kill Christ, the language and tone of his sermons left little doubt about Jewish guilt. Although, again like Augustine, the homilist did make an occasional nod to the Jews who converted to Christ²⁹, the overarching message of the sermons on the Passion was that the Jews persecuted and killed Christ, the apostles, and other early Christians and that they stand condemned before God for these deeds. This enhanced Gospel narrative would have found great traction with its intended monastic audience, for the monks sought parallels between their lives and the lives of Christ and the apostles.

Jews as Enemies

The Admont sermons frequently portrayed the Jews as enemies, both in connection with his discussion of the crucifixion and in other contexts. The homilist's treatment of the inimical Jew trope frequently included a discussion of the fundamental alliance between the Jews, the devil, and the other enemies of Christ. The first homily for the fourth Sunday of Advent, to cite only one of many examples, explained that the Jews who sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to inquire of John the Baptist (John 4) "are the evil spirits who set out the snares of their treachery in every age to deceive the man desiring to be saved; that man is prefigured by John, which name is interpreted 'in whom is the grace of God.'"³⁰ So not only did he equate the Jews with evil spirits, but he also insisted that they perform their evil works "in every age." The homily noted that the worst kind of "snares" are those that claim to be good (i.e., the priests and Levites) when

²⁹ HD 60: PL 174.414D-415A.

³⁰ HD 12: PL 174.83A. "Judaei enim illi qui miserunt ab Jerosolymis sacerdotes et levitas ad Joannem, maligni spiritus sunt, qui ad decipiendum hominem salvari cupientem, qui figuratur per *Joannem*, qui interpretatur, *in quo est gratia Dei*, omni tempore perfidiae suae laqueos tendunt."

they are in fact evil mechanisms designed to ensnare those who, like John (or the monks), desire to do good before God. The homilist thus implied that the essence of the Jews' evil deception lay in the fact that their law and traditions appeared to offer salvation when in fact they could not, without the grace of Christ, bring anyone to God. This characterization of the Jewish tradition, of course, stood in direct contrast to the monastic life, which he extolled as the surest way to imitate Christ and achieve salvation.

The connection between the Jews, the devil, and other enemies of Christ becomes particularly apparent in a homily for Holy Thursday, surely one of the most emotive liturgical occasions of the year for the monks. The text, predictably, is John 13, which concerns the Last Supper and mentions Judas Iscariot's betrayal of Christ. This betrayal, the homilist declared, serves as an explicit warning to the believers in Christ against two kinds of peril: the spiritual and the practical. To explain the spiritual peril, the homilist discussed the text's moral meaning, pointing out that Judas took counsel with the Jews to betray Christ, just as some believers take counsel with evil spirits to commit sin. He thus connected, albeit subtly, "Jewish counsel," "evil spirits," and false Christians who follow the example of Judas in betraying Christ. The homilist also betrayed his concern over more proximate, practical perils by referring to the "money" Judas received from the Jewish leaders in exchange for his betrayal. In addition to deceiving Christians with evil "counsel" on a spiritual level, the homilist suggested, Jews attack them in the real world through such base, carnal forces as money. While he never stated this outright, the homilist appears to have been thinking about the Jews' prominent economic position when he conceived of them as enemies and agents of the devil. He drew reference to the double peril presented by these evil forces again in the next sentence: "This same *counsel*

and business of the evil spirit, signified by the Jews, drives us invisibly, so that because of money—that is, when we are enticed and deceived by their suggestions—we subject ourselves to their forsaken Lord and kingdom.”³¹ The homilist appears to have conceived of evil “counsel” as the spiritual threat posed by the devil, the Jews, and the other proponents of wickedness. The “*business* of the evil spirit,” on the other hand, evoked a more practical threat: the peril presented by borrowing money from or doing business with Jews. The homilist summed up this two-headed threat by warning his fellow monks that “we betray him when we accept the evil money of the Jews, namely the suggestions of evil spirits.”³² The Holy Thursday sermon thus connected the Jews with the devil, with Judas, and with Christians who join them in their wickedness, whether spiritual or practical. Indeed, the Admont homilist bifurcated the cosmos—with both natural and supernatural spheres—into the realms of good and evil. Judas, the Jews, and the devil are all part of the same diabolical cohort against which Christians must be totally vigilant, both in their spiritual preparations and in their business dealings.

The identification of Jews with the devil took an interesting and subtle turn in a homily for the first Sunday of Lent. Like many of the texts discussed in the previous chapter, this sermon betrays the theological complexity of some of the issues relating to Jews. The text, not surprisingly given the observance of Lent, is Matthew 4, which narrates the fasting and temptation of Christ in the wilderness. The sermon described the devil’s temptation as a test of Christ’s compassionate nature. It explained that the human

³¹ HFTA 33: PL 174.782C-D: “Idem hoc *consilium atque negotium* maligni spiritus, significati per Judaeos, invisibiliter agunt nobiscum, ut pecunia, id est suggestionibus eorum illecti atque decepti, relicto Domino, eorum nos subjiciamus dominio.” Emphasis added.

³² HFTA 33: PL 174.786A: “Tunc enim eum tradimus, quando malam illam pecuniam Judaeorum, suggestiones videlicet malignorum spirituum suscipimus.”

aspect of Jesus “grieved exceedingly” for the “perdition of the Jews,”³³ as was particularly evident in the part of the Gospel narrative when Jesus wept for the city of Jerusalem. Christ was prepared to suffer, noted the homilist, but the fact that this suffering would come at the hands of his own people inspired in him an acute grief. “The enemy,” who was acquainted with Christ’s nature through diligent investigation dating back to his antiquity as an angel, perceived this grief and sought to exploit it. So when he cajoled Christ, saying, “If thou be the son of God, command that these stones be made bread,” he was really tempting him to save the Jews (i.e., the stones) in spite of their betrayal, while they still persisted in their unrighteousness.³⁴ Christ’s refusal represented the ascendancy of his divine nature and preserved the divine plan. Although the sermon’s main purpose here seems to have been an exploration of the two natures of Christ, the homilist’s sophisticated interpretation of this Gospel narrative also served to connect the purposes of the devil with the plots and treachery of the Jews. His reading of the temptation story also demonstrates the ambiguousness of some of the theological questions surrounding the Jews. Echoing the Song of Songs commentaries discussed in the last chapter, the homilist acknowledged Christ’s empathy for the Jews, but he also celebrated his refusal to sacrifice the salvation of all mankind for an unjust rescue of his own mortal kinsmen.

The Apostate Jew

Of utmost importance to the arguments of many of the Admont sermons was the notion of Jewish apostasy, with its essential components of Jewish blindness and Jewish

³³ HD 25: PL 174.169B: “Ut enim duae naturae in illo erant, divina scilicet et humana, sic etiam duas voluntates habuit, divinam et humanam. Divinam dico, qua pati voluit; humanam, qua de perditione Iudaeorum, qui hoc facturi, nimis doluit.”

³⁴ HD 25: PL 174.169C.

carnality. Like his monastic contemporaries, the Admont homilist used his references to the carnality and blindness of Jews to instruct his fellow monks in proper monastic discipline. The Jews, of course, constituted the antithesis of this life. Also at stake here was the correct understanding of the history of salvation, which the homilist tried to convey to his fellow monks in a way that inspired self-reflection. By showing how the Jews lost their privileged access to their former, special status as God's chosen people, the homilist sought to instill in his fellow monks the knowledge that they were the true heirs to those special promises.

According to the common Christian conception of salvation history, the root of the apostasy of the Jews lay in their tendency to get caught up in serious vices that led them away from God's correct path. The greatest manifestation of this apostasy, of course, was the Jews' inability to recognize Jesus as the Messiah. The Admont homilist joined with patristic sources and many of his contemporary monks in pointing out the vices that caused Jewish blindness, ignorance, and ultimate loss of God's promises. These vices, naturally, were the opposite of the virtues the monks were encouraged to cultivate. A sermon for the Sunday of the Octave of Epiphany highlights this tendency quite well. The text for the sermon is the latter portion of Luke 2, which describes the preaching of the twelve-year-old Jesus in Jerusalem: certainly a fitting text for the Octave that follows Christmas. The homilist noted that this text recounted the first occasion upon which Jesus preached about the "new law" and thus kindled "the torches of envy and hatred" in the Jews to the point that they would eventually murder him.³⁵ These "torches" continued to burn through the passion, burial, resurrection, and ascension of

³⁵ HD 15: PL 174.102B. "Mox novam legem, nova edicta eo praedicante, Iudaei facibus invidiae et odii succensi ad hoc usque exarserunt, ut Auctorem vitae morti traderent."

Christ. All of these were occasions upon which salvation was offered to those who would believe, but the Jews returned on those days to their malice and hard-heartedness “because they were unwilling to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.”³⁶ Rather than embrace the salvation offered them, the Jews became marked by “pride and cruelty.”³⁷ Wallowing in these vices made the Jews excessively carnal; they expected a temporal Messiah and killed the true Messiah when he did not meet their expectations.

Both patristic and high medieval monastic authors often cited the observance of the law of Moses, or rather the tendency to observe the law in too carnal a fashion, as the most important source of Jewish carnality. In a homily for the Feast of the Translation of St. Benedict, the Admont homilist took up this train of thought in his interpretation of Luke 11:33: “No man lighteth a candle, and putteth it in a hidden place, nor under a bushel; but upon a candlestick, that they that come in, may see the light.” In keeping with his tendency to parse words and phrases closely, the author here drew a distinction between the terms “hidden place,” which he assigned to the Gentiles, and “bushel,” which, he said, signifies the Jews. That specific term describes the Jews accurately, he remarked, because they are measured (as a “bushel” is a measure) by their keeping of the law. While the Gentiles were simply hidden from God (hence “hidden place”), the Jews had direct contact with him and should have understood his will. They could not see the “candle,” that is Christ, for what he was because they obsessed over their “measured” keeping of the law of Moses. The “candle” did not cast his light on either the Gentiles or

³⁶ HD 15: PL 174.103B. “Judaei redierunt in sua, ad suam plane, malitiam ad pristinam duritiam, quia noluerunt credere in Filium Dei Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.”

³⁷ HD 15: PL 174.102C.

the Jews; he only shone brightly with the establishment of the church, the members of which became God's chosen people.³⁸

Jews revealed the depth of their carnality and blindness when they attacked Jesus. Especially profound for its depravity was the occasion, recounted in John 8, when the Jews accused Jesus of being a Samaritan and having a demon. This accusation, explained the homilist, was shockingly perverse. It would seem more tolerable, he maintained, "if they had called him a thief or a robber" because by accusing him of having a demon, the Jews, "who were wicked above all men," were trying to assert that "all vices" were found in Christ.³⁹ By casting these accusations, the Jews were, in essence, projecting their own vices on Jesus. The "Samaritan" accusation was scarcely better, since this label amounted to a denial of Christ's divine heritage: the most noble lineage possible. Such a title, moreover, cast Jesus as an illegitimate Jew; after all, the Samaritans occupied a sort of middle ground between Jews and Gentiles.⁴⁰ Ironically, it was the Jews who had become illegitimate in the eyes of God through their denial of Christ's divinity.

Scriptural Labels

Consistent with these arguments about Jewish apostasy and the correct understanding of salvation history, the Admont sermons definitely took part in the monastic practice of claiming for Christians those titles that formerly belonged to the

³⁸ HFTA 58: PL 174.924B-925A.

³⁹ HD 36: PL 174.246A: "In eo quod dicunt, daemonium habes, nihil perversius, nihil odibilis quod dicerent excogitare poterant. Nam si furem, si latronem eum nominassent, aliquid, ut ita dicam, tolerabilis videretur; quod vero daemonium habere eum dicunt, quasi universa in eo esse vitia ipsi omnibus hominibus nequiores affirmabant."

⁴⁰ It is interesting that the homilist takes such offense at the Jews' application of the "Samaritan" label on Jesus when he has no difficulty doing the very same thing to the Jews. Perhaps New Testament texts like this one served as an inspiration for the Christian practice of referring to the Jews by using unflattering biblical names, as detailed in the following section.

Jews. Just as his brother monks to the northwest in Tegernsee referred to themselves as “sons of Israel” and like terms⁴¹, the Admont homilist applied similar labels to the monks and nuns for whom he had stewardship. At the same time, he fixed the Jews with terms meant to indicate their lack of favor in the sight of God. With his monastic audience in mind, the homilist used these scriptural labels to emphasize the contrast between the wicked Jews and the righteous monks.

Perhaps the best example of applying formerly Jewish labels to Christians occurred in the first homily for the fourth Sunday of Lent, on which occasion the Admont homilist took up the subject of the Passover. Using the opening verses of John 6 as his text, he took pains to demonstrate the proper, Christian meaning of this supposedly Jewish occasion. He wrote, “On the feast day of the Jews we are able to comprehend the brightness and joy of the angels, who therefore are *Jews*, that is *confessors*, because they praise and glorify the name of God the Father with unceasing voice.”⁴² Thus, according to the moral meaning assigned by the homilist, the reference to “the Passover” (also called the festival “of the Jews”) has nothing to do with actual, or even historical, Jews. The word “Jew” simply means “confessor”—an etymology found in many patristic sources, including the authoritative Psalm commentaries⁴³—and can therefore be imbued with proper Christian meaning: that is, as a reference to the angels, who epitomize “confessing.” Just as the patristic exegetes and contemporary monastic writers were

⁴¹ See *Die Traditionen des Klosters Tegernsee, 1003-1242*, ed. Peter Acht, QE, n.f. 9.1.177, no.230. See also *Ibid.*, 178, no.231; 180, no.234; 187, no.248; 208, no.275.

⁴² HD 35: PL 174.238A: “In die festo Judaeorum possumus accipere claritatem et gaudium angelorum, qui ideo Judaei, id est confitentes, quia incessabili voce laudant et glorificant nomen Dei Patris.”

⁴³ See, for instance, EP 75.13: CC 98.697.

accustomed to doing, the homilist claimed for his tradition a pair of terms (“Passover” and “Jew”) that otherwise referred obviously to the rival religious tradition.

The homilist not only stripped Jews of their former titles but also fixed them with such pejorative, albeit scriptural, labels as “the migration of Ethiopia” and “Philistines.”⁴⁴ This tendency becomes particularly apparent in a homily for the seventh Sunday after Pentecost. His text for this sermon was the death scene of David from 2 Samuel 23; therein, he combined derogatory labeling of the Jews with other stock images from the monastic exegetical tradition. Especially striking is the part of the homily that attaches meaning to the companions of David: Jesbaham, Eleazar, and Semma. Verse 9 of the biblical chapter notes that these three “were with David when they defied the Philistines, and they were there gathered together to battle.” The word “Philistines,” asserted the homilist, means “falling down with drink (*cadentes potione*)” and is thus a fitting label for the Jews, since they “were drunk with malice” to the point of “insanity” against Jesus, such that they hurled endless insults at him and his good works.⁴⁵ The three companions of David (who is always a Christ figure in medieval exegesis) prefigured the apostles who stood with Jesus as he endured countless troubles at the hands of the Jews, “whom

⁴⁴ The former label comes from a sermon for the second Sunday of Advent, which builds upon Isaiah 20:4: “So shall the king of the Assyrians lead away the prisoners of Egypt, and the captivity of Ethiopia, young and old.” The homilist explained that the “prisoners of Egypt” signify the Gentiles and “the migration of Ethiopia” the Jews (Douay-Rheims has “captivity of Ethiopia” for *transmigrationem Aethiopiae*, but the sermon text stresses movement). The Gentiles, he said, served the devil before their conversion because of ignorance and thus constituted “prisoners (*captivitatem*)”. The Jews, on the other hand, are “darkened by the fog of pride and treachery,” such that they have “moved away from God of their own free will,” having rejected Christ and persisted in their carnal reading of the law and the prophets. HD 9: PL 174.64B: “Populus vero Judaicus caligine superbiae et perfidiae contenebratus, quasi sponte a Deo transmigravit; quia Unigenitum Dei, quem ex lege et prophetis venturum in carne audierat, hunc jam venientem et viam vitae doctrinis et exemplis ostendentem reprobavit.”

⁴⁵ HD 71: PL 174.502A-B: “Possumus etiam per Philisthium, qui interpretantur cadentes potione, Iudaeos non inconvenienter accipere, qui sic inebriati erant per malitiam, quod etiam proruperunt ad insaniam, ita ut Domino coelestia eis praeponenti et multa bona opera in eis facienti, infinita objicerent opprobria.”

the evil spirits inspired.” Although the Jews tried after the Passion to remove even the memory of Christ from the earth (another common element of the enhanced crucifixion narrative, as we have seen), the apostles defended the “side of Christ (*partem Christi*)” against their “common enemies, the Jews” and, like David’s companions, “struck down the Philistines, namely the Jews, with heavy smiting.”⁴⁶ With a simple change of label and a Christological interpretation of the text, the homilist transformed the Jews into one of the most significant enemies of the Old Testament, the very people against whom they fought to secure their kingdom.

Eschatology and Conversion

Finally, like other monastic authors, all of whom followed a long exegetical tradition, the Admont homilist operated under the assumption that Jews would convert to Christianity at the end of the world. After all, this doctrine provided an important justification for the enduring presence of the Jews in Christian society. This idea appears with some regularity in the homilies. In the midst of a discussion about the healing of the leper in Matthew 8, for instance, the homilist explained that two peoples are in need of healing: the Jews and the Gentiles. A part of the Jews will convert, he said, but only at the end of the world, and then only after “the fullness of the Gentiles” will have converted to the faith. This conversion, he noted, will save the Jews from an eternal damnation.⁴⁷

The sermons did not, however, always present the notion of this eventual Jewish conversion in so straightforward a manner. Like other monastic authors of this period,

⁴⁶ HD 71: PL 174.503A-B: “ordo apostolicus . . . partem Christi defendit contra publicos hostes illos, Judaeos, fortiter et viriliter gladio verbi Dei dimicando, et percussit, inquit, Philisthaeos. Gravi nimirum ordo apostolicus Philisthaeos, Judaeos scilicet percussione prostravit.”

⁴⁷ HD 17: PL 174.115D-116A.

the Admont homilist had absorbed the ideas contained in Adso's tract on the Antichrist and thus presented competing versions of the end-time Jew. A sermon for the second Sunday of Advent demonstrates the complexity of this trope. Exploring the parable from Luke 21:29-30 ("See the fig tree, and all the trees: when they now shoot forth their fruit, you know that summer is nigh."), the homilist explained that the fig tree could be interpreted as the "synagogue" and "all the trees" as the Gentiles. Furthermore, as Jesus delivered this parable in an eschatological vein, the symbols refer on one level to the end of the world, though they have multiple meanings. Most simply, "the fruit of the fig-tree is the future conversion of the synagogue at the end of the world." Nevertheless, observed the homilist, it can signify other things simultaneously: "Or the fruit of the fig-tree is, as certain people say, the chief of the unjust, the Antichrist who is about to be born among the Jews." The two possible meanings are not mutually exclusive, since both are signs of end times: "For when the seed of iniquity and wickedness, which is the Antichrist, is brought forth out of them, and Judaea is converted to God in the faith of Christ . . . and the multitude of the Gentiles has entered in, then is it certain that *summer* is at hand."⁴⁸ This sermon thus described the two sides of the Jew of the *eschaton*. On the one hand, noted the homilist, he will be associated with the ultimate enemy, the Antichrist, but, on the other hand, he will convert from his apostasy to the true faith. Such a dichotomy represents the homilist's attempt to incorporate both the patristic focus on the eventual prophesied conversion of the Jews and Adso's narrative of the close

⁴⁸ HD 8: PL 174.55D-56A: "Per ficulneam Synagoga accipimus, per omnes arbores multitudinem gentium intelligimus. Fructus ficulneae est futura in fine mundi conversio Synagoga. Vel ficulneae fructus est, ut aiunt quidam, nasciturus ex Judaeis caput omnium iniquorum Antichristus. Cum enim productus ex se germine iniquitatis et nequitiae, quod est Antichristus, sterilis nunc in fide Christi Judaea ad Deum conversa fructus fidei, fructus dico justitiae et veritatis, producere credendo et eadem fidem praedicando coeperit, et multitudo gentium introierit, certum est quod prope sit aestas."

association of the Jews with the Antichrist into his description of the Jew of the *eschaton*. Like his contemporaries, the Admont homilist made no effort to reconcile these two images and seems to have been content to interpret both future events as signs of the imminent second coming of Christ.

6.3 Dalila the Jewish Temptress

One exploration of the relationship between Jews and Christians occurs in the Admont corpus's fourth homily for Palm Sunday, which consists of an exposition of Judges 16, the Samson and Dalila narrative. While other monastic figures, most notably Hildegard of Bingen, had compared Samson and Dalila to Christ and the Synagogue, the Admont homilist gave that comparison its fullest treatment in medieval literature, at least insofar as I can tell.⁴⁹ This sermon touched on several of the aforementioned tropes, focusing heavily on the Jewish involvement in the Passion, the notion of Jews as enemies, and the assigning of pejorative labels to the Jewish people. That this was to be delivered on Palm Sunday, as the monks began the intense meditation on and celebration of the passion that marked Holy Week, probably augmented the force of its message.

The homilist opened the sermon by remarking on the significance of Palm Sunday, as well as the rituals of the day. He asked the monks to contemplate the ways in which the deeds of Christ—his incarnation, passion, descent into hell to reclaim captive souls,

⁴⁹ This comparison does not seem to have been made by authors in the patristic era. The *Glossa Ordinaria* for Judges 16 also took the exegesis in a different direction. The only interpretation similar to this can be found in the fifth vision of Hildegard's *Scivias*, although it is not nearly so detailed as the Admont sermon. Hildegard wrote, "But, O human, understand that Samson's wife left him, and so he was deprived of his eyesight, and the Synagogue likewise forsook the Son of God, spurning Him stubbornly and rejecting His doctrine. But later, when his hair grew again, as the Church of God was strengthened the Son of God in His might overthrew the Synagogue and deprived her children, who were crushed by God's jealousy by means of pagans who did not know God. For she had undergone many errors of confusion and discord, and polluted herself by wicked transgressions." Hildegard of Bingen, *Scivias* 1.5.8: CM 43.98. I have relied here on the Columba Hart and Jane Bishop translation, *Classics of Western Spirituality Series* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 136.

and resurrection—are prefigured in the story of Samson.⁵⁰ The similarities, he explained, are readily apparent. Like Christ, Samson was a true Nazarite, consecrated from the womb of his mother to the service of God. Moreover, Samson’s physical strength paralleled Christ’s spiritual strength. Just as Christ endured the betrayal of those who had been close to him, Samson was stripped of the source of his strength and handed over to tormentors by his erstwhile lover, Dalila.⁵¹

After pointing out the similarities between the protagonists of these two narratives, the homilist proceeded in his usual way, reading and interpreting the chapter sentence by sentence, and at times word by word, drawing out literal, allegorical, and moral meanings of characters, words, and phrases. His interpretations of Dalila are particularly important, both for the course of the sermon itself and for the purposes of this chapter. He first suggested that Dalila represents human nature, which began with the fall of Adam and Eve and contains both good and evil elements. He followed up this suggestion with a lengthy discussion of the temptation of Adam and Eve and the characteristics of human nature.

Having thus described the fallen, ambivalent state of mankind, he began his discussion of the central message of the sermon: the necessity of the incarnation of Christ and the process of revealing that most important of all truths to mankind.⁵² The Samson and Dalila narrative, then, offered the monks a guide for understanding the purpose of the “true Samson” in the cosmic narrative of salvation history. Each element of the story

⁵⁰ The notion that Samson signified Christ was very common in medieval exegesis. See, for instance, the parallels propounded in Richard of St. Victor, *Liber exceptionum* 2.4.10: *Textes Philosophiques du Moyen Âge* 5, ed. Jean Chatillon (Paris: J. Vrin, 1958), 278-79.

⁵¹ HD 42: PL 174.275C-276A.

⁵² HD 42: PL 174.277A-277B.

contributes to his explanation of the necessity and historical process of the incarnation. So, for example, Dalila's request for Samson to reveal the source of his strength parallels the prayers of those who lived before the law; God responded to those prayers by revealing his advent through the patriarchs.⁵³ Each of Dalila's requests and subsequent plots symbolize a particular period in salvation history.⁵⁴ The binding with seven cords of wet sinews represents the period before the law, the binding with new ropes is the period under the law, and the platting of the seven locks of Samson's hair is the time when grace was made manifest, or, as the homilist noted, when "God deigned to become man."⁵⁵ Dalila's fourth, and ultimately successful attempt to steal Samson's strength represents the passion of Christ. Not surprisingly, this is the point at which the Jews enter the sermon. The homilist here identified "another Dalila" (i.e., another interpretation of this character) as "a part of the condemned Jews."⁵⁶

The homilist began his discussion of the fourth temptation of Samson and the passion of Christ by clarifying that Jesus voluntarily gave up his life. The description of Samson becoming weary at the pleadings of Dalila gave him a text ripe for such an interpretation. Just as Samson volunteered the information that ultimately led to his loss of strength and eventual death, Jesus, or, as the homilist called him, "our Samson"

⁵³ HD 42: PL 174.277B-277C. "Sic Dalilae, oranti et instanti vero Samsoni ante legem, coepit per patriarchas adventum suum promittere."

⁵⁴ The binding with seven cords of wet sinews represents the period before the law.

⁵⁵ HD 42: PL 174.279B. "Tertii temporis gratia manifestatur, qua Deus homo fieri dignatus est." The homilist interprets the seven locks of hair as "the spirit of Christ filled with the grace of the seven-form Holy Spirit." The lace with which they are tied is the flesh, the nail with which they are bound is the "strength of divinity," and the earth to which they are fastened is Mary, or, more precisely, the womb of the Virgin.

⁵⁶ HD 42: PL 174.281A. "a Dalila alia, id est parte reproborum Judaeorum"

actually “wanted to suffer.”⁵⁷ With that established, the sermon turned to the details of the passion narrative itself, including the role of the Jews. Summing up all that would be demonstrated thereafter, the homilist remarked, “When the head of Christ was shaven and laid bare, when in death, or when the spirit was separated from the body, [then] his strength departed and failed.”⁵⁸ The Jews, of course, were the agents who brought this about. For that reason, the homilist interpreted Dalila as “the treacherous and unbelieving Synagogue.”⁵⁹ The Jews did this horrible deed, he asserted, in spite of the miracles and other good works Jesus performed.

This was no ignorant refusal to believe. The sermon suggested very strongly that the Jews knew who Christ was but killed him nonetheless; at the very least, insinuated the homilist, they *should* have comprehended the identity of the one whom they were putting to death. Although “this treacherous Dalila” witnessed his glorious deeds, heard his wondrous words, was “astonished at his doctrine,” and, most significantly, “recognized that [such things] were possible only through the Son of God,” she, or rather they, “nevertheless refused to believe in him.” Moreover, he explained, Dalila’s message to the “princes of the Philistines” was done at the prompting of “evil spirits, by whose inspiration the chief priests and elders of the people gathered and incited all the people against our Lord Jesus Christ.”⁶⁰ The Jews thus killed Jesus not because they failed to

⁵⁷ HD 42: PL 174.281A. “Samson noster . . . pati voluerit.”

⁵⁸ HD 42: PL 174.281B. “caput Christi rasum est et denudatum, cum in morte, quando separata est anima a corpore, it recessit fortitudo ejus et defecit”

⁵⁹ HD 42: PL 174.281B-281C. “Samson noster omnem animum suum Dalilae illi, perfidae scilicet et incredulae Synagogae, confessus est.”

⁶⁰ HD 42: PL 174.281C. “Quae perfida Dalila, licet gloriose et magnifice ab eo gesta et dicta, nonnisi per Filium Dei fieri posse cognosceret, quemadmodum audita doctrina ejus admirans ait: *Nonquam locutus est homo, sicut hic homo*. Tamen credere in eum noluit, sed *misit ad principes Philistinorum*, quando malignos spiritus ad cor suum intromisit, quorum instinctu principes sacerdotum et seniores populi

recognize his divinity, but rather because they were inflamed by the inspiration of the devil. While it is consistent with other sentiments expressed in these texts, this is perhaps the strongest statement of Jewish intention in the Admont sermon corpus.

The homilist followed up these accusations by suggesting further parallels between Dalila and the Jews who plotted against and crucified Christ. Just as Dalila had tried through devious means to get Samson to reveal his true nature to her, so the Jews, after seeing his signs and miracles, “unrighteously and shamelessly threatened [Jesus] by saying, ‘How long dost thou hold our souls in suspense? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly;’ and ‘Whom dost thou make thyself?’”⁶¹ The Jews also taunted Christ in similar ways during the passion, at which point Christ did reveal his true nature as the Son of God.⁶²

From there, the homilist explored the meaning of the “princes of the Philistines . . . who went up, taking with them the money which they had promised.” He proposed two possible interpretations of these characters.⁶³ First, he understood them to mean “evil spirits” who “*went up* during the passion of the Lord *taking with them the money which they had promised.*” This “money,” he explained, was the same payment the devil had offered Adam and Eve when he tempted them in the Garden of Eden, namely the promise that they would be “as Gods, knowing good and evil.”⁶⁴ This promise was only realized

convenerunt, et universum populum adversus Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum concitaverunt.” See John 7:46.

⁶¹ HD 42: PL 174.281D. “Judaei, dum visis signis et miraculis ejus impie et proterve instarent dicendo: *Usquequo animas nostras tollis? Si tu es Christus, dic nobis palam; et: Quem teipsum facis?*” See John 10:24 and John 8: 53.

⁶² HD 42: PL 174.281D.

⁶³ Judges 16:18.

⁶⁴ Genesis 3:5.

during the passion, when “the eyes of the whole human race were opened and illuminated.” On that occasion, Christ offered his “deity” to man, thus making them “as Gods.” They also “knew good and evil” because they were offered “remission of sins and redemption from death and hell” yet received these at the cost of Christ’s suffering.⁶⁵

The other interpretation of this verse pointed again to the Jews. The homilist explained that “the money of the Philistines, that is of the Jews, is the law and the prophets.” Not wanting to lose their control over that currency, the Jews “*went up* when they gathered together a council that they might destroy our Lord Jesus Christ, lest, by chance, if they sent him away, all might believe in him, and the law and the prophets might be taken away from them.”⁶⁶ Such an interpretation drew upon and enhanced the aforementioned “stock images” in multiple ways. Perhaps most obviously, the Jews were equated with the Philistines, that quintessential enemy of the Old Testament, an obvious example of the tendency to apply pejorative biblical labels to the Jews. More importantly, this reference to Jewish carnality, with misplaced and outdated devotion to the Law of Moses as its central feature, dovetailed with the other patristic and monastic exegesis examined previously. This was particularly important for the essential, implicit contrast between Jews and monks that informed most of the homilist’s thought about Jews.

⁶⁵ HD 42: PL 174.281D-282A. “Versus iste duplicem habet sensum. Diximus superius per Philistaeos malignos spiritus posse intelligi. Hi *ascenderunt* in passione Domini *assumpta pecunia quam promiserant*. Pecunia eorum quam primis parentibus nostris in paradiso promiserunt, erant mille centum argenti: mille, dum dicunt: *Eritis sicut dii*; centum, *scientes bonum et malum*. Haec pecunia, quam tunc spoponderunt, in passione Domini nostri Jesu Christi data est et accepta, quia tunc in veritate aperti et illuminati sunt oculi totius generis humani; facti sunt ex hominibus dii, quia Deus homo factus, largitus est nobis suam deitatem; facti sunt *scientes bonum et malum*: *bonum*, quia data est remissio peccatorum, et de morte et de inferno redemptio; *malum*, quod passus est Christus pro nobis cruce supplicium.”

⁶⁶ HD 42: PL 174.282A-282B: “Sed et hoc modo possumus sentire quod pecunia Philisthinorum, id est Judaeorum, lex esset et prophetia, qua accepta *ascenderunt* quando collegerunt concilium, ut interficerent Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ne forte, si dimitterent eum sic, omnes crederent in eum, et ipsis lex et prophetia tolleretur.” That he introduces this explanation with the words “possumus sentire” indicates that the homilist was advancing an original interpretation.

Furthermore, by suggesting that the “princes of the Philistines” represent both the devil and the Jews simultaneously, the homilist, through the juxtaposition seen frequently in texts like the *Glossa Ordinaria*, forged a connection between the enemies of Christ, placing them together on the wrong side of a bifurcated world.⁶⁷ The monks, of course, stood on the other side, in the company of Jesus and the apostles.

Finally, the pivotal scene in the Samson narrative—the point at which he loses his hair, his strength, and his divine assistance—again took the form of a passion play, featuring the Jews as the tale’s central antagonist. The sermon here identified Dalila as “that whore, the Synagogue.”⁶⁸ It was she who “made him sleep upon her knees;” that is, she ordered a legion to seize and bind Jesus, at which point all of the apostles—identified as the “knees” of Christ—fled for their lives. Jesus thus stood alone, abandoned by his would-be defenders, laying “his head in her bosom”: in other words, completely at the mercy of the evil Jewish council who had plotted his death. Hence, “the glory of his divinity disdained and forgotten, she led him into her council, where with filthy spittle she defiled his angelic face and struck him with fists.”⁶⁹ The barber summoned by Dalila, or rather by the synagogue, is Pilate; he was the one who “sheared that most mild Lamb and deprived him of his fleece, when he inflicted the most bitter lashes upon his most

⁶⁷ It should be noted, however, that the *Gloss* for Judges 16 did not equate Samson and Dalila with Christ and the Jews. The excerpts of commentaries in the margins consisted almost entirely of moral interpretations.

⁶⁸ HD 42: PL 174.282B: “meretrix illa Synagoga”

⁶⁹ HD 42: PL 174.282B-282C. “*Genua* Jesu Christi sancti dicuntur apostoli, *super* quae *genua* fecit eum meretrix illa Synagoga dormire, quando missa cohorte cum gladiis Dominum Jesum comprehendere et ligari jussit, quia tunc in eis ita obdormivit, quod nec ipse Petrus, qui dixerat: *Tecum paratus sum et in carcerem et in mortem ire*, cum eo perduraverit, sed relicto eo omnes fugerunt. Sic eo dormiente *super* genua sua fecit etiam eum *in sinu suo reclinare caput*. Nonne nimis *in sinu suo caput ejus inclinavit* et humiliavit, quando divinitatis ejus Gloria contempta et oblita duxit eum in concilium suum, ubi immundis putaminibus suis angelicam faciem ejus foedavit, colaphis caecidit, faciem velavit?”

holy body.”⁷⁰ This was the worst thing Christ had endured up to that point; it was during the scourging that “his seven locks were shaved off.”⁷¹ Finally, just as Dalila “thrust him from her” after his hair had been removed, so “Judaea thrust Christ from them; when Pilate asked, ‘Shall I crucify your king?’ they responded, ‘We have no king but Caesar;’ and ‘If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar’s friend.’”⁷² This event betrayed the Jews’ ruthlessness and hatred very clearly: their “hatred . . . so vomited forth that their voices became heated, saying, ‘Away with him; away with him; crucify him.’ They were filled completely and rejoiced when Pilate awarded their petition and, having released Barabbas, handed Jesus over to their will.”⁷³

The rest of the sermon continued to follow the parallels between the Samson story and the Passion narrative, although Dalila, and with her the Jews, dropped out of both the narrative and the exegesis.⁷⁴ Like Samson’s betrayer, the betrayers of Christ had sold their services to the enemies of God: Dalila to the princes of the Philistines and the Jews to the devil. Her role, and theirs, was finished. Still, in the eyes of the sermon’s author,

⁷⁰ HD 42: PL 174.282C: “Tonsor iste Pilatus fuit, qui idcirco recte *tonsor* nominatur, eo quod Agnum illum mitissimum tunc . . . totonderit, et vellere suo privaverit, cum acerrima flagella sanctissimo corpori suo imposuit.”

⁷¹ HD 42: PL 174.282D: “Ibi rasi sunt *septem crines ejus*.”

⁷² HD 42: PL 174.283A: “Abjecit et a se repulit Judaea Christum, cum interrogante Pilato: *Regem vestrum crucifigam?* Responderunt: *Non habemus regem, nisi Caesarem*; et: *Si hunc dimittis, non es amicus Caesaris*.” See John 19:12 and 19:15.

⁷³ HD 42: PL 174.284C-284D: “Odium . . . sic evomuerunt ut incalescerent voces eorum dicentes: *Tolle, tolle, crucifige eum*. Satiati sunt valde et laetati, cum Pilatus adjudicavit fieri petitionem eorum, et dimisso Barabba Jesum tradidit voluntati eorum.” See John 19:15.

⁷⁴ The homilist did mention the Jews on one other noteworthy occasion in the sermon. During his explanation of the putting out of Samson’s eyes, he noted that “the two eyes of Jesus were two peoples, the Jews and the Gentiles.” This is part of a discussion that revisited his earlier comments about the fall of Adam bringing the two sides of human nature into the world. HD 42: PL 174.284A: “Duo oculi Jesu duo erant populi, Judaei et gentes.” Interestingly, he said nothing about the Jews when he discussed Samson’s final act of collapsing the Philistine palace at the end of the narrative. For the homilist, that act represents the rending of the veil of the temple at the death of Christ and the coming forth of the saints from the graves. HD 42: PL 174.286A-286B.

Dalila represents the Jews at their very worst hour. His descriptive language about Jewish intention left little doubt about his opinion of Jewish guilt. For the Admont homilist, and for the monks and nuns to whom he preached, contemplating the Passion meant also contemplating the Jews' role in that same foundational story and implicitly comparing their behavior with the imitation of Christ expected of the monks. "That whore, the Synagogue" plotted Christ's death, sent the soldiers to seize him outside Gethsemane, spit upon, struck, and mocked him, and turned him over to Pilate to endure the even worse torment of the nail-studded lashes. It was they, moreover, who demanded Christ's crucifixion, selling their loyalties to Caesar in the process. This condemning view of the Jews at the Passion thus joined other stock images—Jewish carnality, Jews as diabolical enemies, and so forth--in the Admont homilist's exploration of the Samson and Dalila narrative.

6.4 The Exodus Narrative and the Salvation History of the Jews

None of the Admont homilies capture the monastic view of salvation history, particularly the Jewish place within that history, quite so well as a pair of sermons on the Exodus narrative. The first of these, like the Samson and Dalila sermon just analyzed, was intended to be delivered on Palm Sunday to begin Holy Week. It dealt with chapter 16 of Exodus, which narrates the entrance of the children of Israel into the desert of Sin and the gift of manna from heaven. The second sermon is the collection's first homily for the day of Pentecost. That occasion was especially significant for a monastic audience, since it marked the formation of the first Christian community; the monks, of course, considered themselves the legitimate heirs, the true practitioners, of the apostolic life of that initial community. The Pentecost sermon expanded on Exodus 19: the first

part of the Sinai theophany narrative wherein God instructs Moses to prepare the children of Israel for the reception of the Law. As he did frequently in his sermons for high liturgical observances, the homilist began these two sermons by discussing the parallels between the text in question (i.e., the Exodus narrative) and the sacred occasion at hand.⁷⁵ Then, throughout both sermons, he used the elements of the Exodus text to expound on the observances of the day. As the homilist viewed it, the common feature among all three events was that, on those occasions (i.e., Exodus, Holy Week, Pentecost), God revealed his will to his chosen people. Put another way, the Exodus constituted the *sub lege* event that prefigured the days of great revelation—especially Holy Week and Pentecost—from the *sub gratia* period. In both sermons, he also demonstrated how these biblical episodes prefigure the events of the *Eschaton* still to come. The homilist discovered many parallels between the Jews of the Exodus, the Passion of Christ, the formation of the Christian community at Pentecost, and the end of the world.

Since the Jews were the main characters described in the Exodus narrative, and, since the Exodus narrative constituted, for the Admont homilist, a palimpsest for subsequent events in salvation history, he depicted the Jewish experience as archetypal. Of course, he understood the Jews as mostly, though not entirely, a negative archetype: the great example from salvation history of what not to do and the antithesis of the monastic life. Consequently, in both sermons, he first explored the character of the Jews before contrasting them with other peoples from different periods in that history, in the

⁷⁵ So, for instance, he began his Palm Sunday sermon by explaining why the Exodus narrative is a good choice for reading at the opening of Holy Week. “We think it not inconsistent,” he said, “that this recitation be read today, on the day whereon the passion of our Savior is meditated upon with solemn devotion. For in this very recitation, we can discover the mysteries of the Lord’s passion prefigured mystically.” HD 39: PL 174.258C-D: “Praesens ista Lectio non incongrue, ut putamus, hodierna die legitur, in qua passio Salvatoris nostri solemniter devotione recolitur. Nam in hac eadem Lectione sacramenta Dominicae passionis mystice praenotata invenire possumus.”

hope that his fellow monks would learn proper behavior before God by observing the striking differences between the Jews and the faithful.

In the Palm Sunday sermon, the key Jewish characteristic upon which he expounded was pride. In the process of discovering the prefiguration of the Passion in the Exodus narrative, said the homilist, one might also come to understand “both the pride of the Jews, who always exasperated the Lord from the beginning, and their calling, by which they were to be converted to the faith in the end of the world.”⁷⁶ The majority of the sermon was concerned with the former, and the homilist was certainly eager to describe the origins and effects of Jewish pride in great detail. The homilist’s indication that the Jews “always exasperated” God gives some indication about his opinion of the destructive nature of the pride of the Jews. Put simply, this was the factor that separated them from God and established them as rivals and enemies of the Christian cause. This was also the chief vice the homilist was exhorting his fellow monks and nuns to excise from their lives. Per his tendency to parse words and phrases closely, he provided definitions for specific words from the text that indicate Jewish pride. “Elim,” (from the closing verse of Exodus 15) means “ram;” as the ram is the head of the flock, it reflects well the Jews’ “pride, into which they then [i.e., during the Exodus] surely came by glorying in evil.”⁷⁷ Although the Jews experienced countless blessings from God, “for which they ought to have been humble,” they nevertheless “elevated themselves vainly,

⁷⁶ HD 39: PL 174.258D: “Invenire possumus, nec non et superbiam Judaeorum, qui ab initio semper Dominum exacerbaverunt, et vocationem ipsorum, qua in fine mundi ad fidem convertendi erant.”

⁷⁷ HD 39: PL 174.258D: “*Venerunt in Elim*, quod interpretatur *aries*. Nam per arietem, qui praeest gregibus, superbiam illorum non injuste designari credimus, in quam tunc profecto male gloriando devenerunt.”

as if they were above the other nations.”⁷⁸ The twelve fountains of Elim represent the twelve ancient patriarchs “out of which the entire multitude of the Jewish people surely arose.”⁷⁹ Ironically, it was on account of their noble heritage that the Jews fell into pride and boasting: “And therefore they boasted that they had these twelve fountains of water, because their noble progenitors were from the lineage of the holy patriarchs.”⁸⁰ This lineage, says the homilist, was “the first source of pride.”⁸¹

The Jews’ most significant spiritual legacy—the Decalogue—became yet another source of their unrighteous pride. Instead of actually displaying the godly behavior mandated by the Ten Commandments—the very kind of behavior the monks tried to evince—the Jews boasted simply that they alone, out of all the peoples of the earth, had received such a law from God. In one of his strongest statements on this issue, the homilist exclaimed that the Jews “gloried [in their sole possession of the law] to a greater and greater extent, lifting themselves up, as it were, in the singularity of their reception of the law, but they sought neither the welfare of the soul nor the attainment of spiritual understanding.”⁸² In other words, their excessive pride in their heritage prevented them from attaining the virtues the monks prized most highly—unity with God and knowledge of His ways. Instead, they “became slaves to carnal desires.”⁸³ The more the Jews tried

⁷⁸ HD 39: PL 174.258D-259A: “pro bonis divinitus sibi collatis, ex quibus humiliari debuerant, quasi caeteris nationibus praeessent, inaniter se extulerunt.”

⁷⁹ HD 39: PL 174.259A: “ex quibus profecto orta est universa multitudo Judaici populi.”

⁸⁰ HD 39: PL 174.259A. “Et ideo gloriati sunt hos *duodecim* se habere *fontes aquarum*, quod videlicet progeniti erant nobili prosapia sanctorum patriarcharum.”

⁸¹ HD 39: PL 174.259A. “Haec fuit prima causa superbiae.”

⁸² HD 39: PL 174.259B. “Sed illi magis magisque gloriantes, quasi de singularitate acceptae legis semetipsos extollentes, nullam ex his quaerebant animae vel profectum spiritalis intelligentiae.”

⁸³ HD 39: PL 174.259C: “carnalibus concupiscentiis serviebant.”

to lift themselves up in their pride and carnality, the more they failed to accomplish good works. It is thus fitting, remarked the homilist, to recall the words of the Psalmist: “The pride of them that hate thee ascendeth continually.”⁸⁴ As mentioned before, this pride also prevented them from comprehending the real identity of Jesus and from listening to his message of salvation. When Jesus taught them that the law ought to be observed spiritually and not carnally, “the entire multitude of the Jews came into ‘the desert of Sin,’ which is interpreted as ‘temptation,’ since, on account of their pride, such great temptation dashed upon them that they were forsaken and discarded by the Lord.”⁸⁵ Although Christ tried to give “new teachings of evangelical perfection to the world” and to establish an observance of the law that was not carnal but spiritual,” the Jews remained fixated on their carnal rites. The preaching and miracles of Christ notwithstanding, the Jews “always opposed the word of truth and did not want to believe that he was able to take away the sins of the world.”⁸⁶ Pride and carnality thus halted them from progressing once the higher law, or the Gospel, was introduced into the world. Such an interpretation of the Jews surely would have spoken powerfully to the monastic audience and inspired them to live a spiritual life, contrary to that of the Jews.

This vice led not only to the Jews’ exiled state in this world, but ultimately to their eternal damnation. To underscore this point, the homilist returned to his meditation on the journey of Israel into the desert of Sin “between Elim and Sinai.” While *Elim* or

⁸⁴ HD 39: PL 174.259C-259D. “Nam quanto magis superbiendo profecerunt, tanto magis in bonis defecerunt. Unde Psalmista ait: *Superbia eorum, qui te oderunt, ascendit semper.*” See Psalm 73:23.

⁸⁵ HD 39: PL 174.260C-260D: “Cum enim Salvator in carne veniens nova praecepta evangelicae perfectionis mundo traderet et legis observantiam non carnaliter, sed spiritaliter tenendam esse doceret, omnis multitudo Iudaeorum venit in *desertum Sin*, quod interpretatur *tentatio*, quia propter superbiam illorum tam grandis super eos irruit tentatio, quod deserti et derelicti sunt a Domino.”

⁸⁶ HD 39: PL 174.260D: “Nam semper verbo veritatis restiterunt, et quod peccata mundi tollere posset credere noluerunt.”

“ram” indicates Jewish pride, *Sinai* he defined as “amphora” or “measure,” meaning the expectations against which the Jews should “measure.” Hence, *Sinai* became the Jews’ “measure of eternal damnation” since they did not live up to the covenants they made with God at that mountain.⁸⁷ In other words, noted the homilist, the Jews were given every advantage, every blessing, and were consequently required to live in a righteous manner that corresponded with their privileged position. Nevertheless, they readily departed from righteousness and eventually sank into the depths of depravity. As the sermon lamented, “For [the Jews], despite the favors gathered together for them by God, burst forth into such pride that they did not fear to exercise great malice against the Savior.”⁸⁸ Since “they were found, *or are found*, in that pride . . . a harsh *amphora*, that is, the measure of eternal damnation, is reserved for them.”⁸⁹ The use of both past and present tense is significant here; by employing both tenses, the homilist suggested that the Jews have persisted in their pride and that they continue to merit everlasting damnation.

Like the Palm Sunday sermon, the homily for Pentecost explored Jewish vice in great detail, focusing in particular on Jewish carnality. Also like the Palm Sunday sermon, the Pentecost sermon expounded on both Old and New Testament circumstances, cutting back and forth between the Exodus and Pentecost without warning. The parallels, however, would have been obvious to the monastic audience; these were both occasions when God spoke directly to the community of believers and, in a sense, when those communities achieved a cohesive structure, the template for which, the monks believed,

⁸⁷ HD 39: PL 174.260D-261A.

⁸⁸ HD 39: PL 174.261A: “Nam qui ex beneficiis a Deo sibi collatis in tantam eruperunt superbiam, quod tam magnam contra eundem Salvatorem malitiam exercere veriti non sunt.”

⁸⁹ HD 39: PL 174.261A. “In eadem superbia inventi sunt *vel inveniuntur*, his . . . dura reservatur *amphora*, id est aeternae damnationis mensura.” Emphasis added.

was imitated in the organization of the monastery. The homilist began his exegesis of Exodus 19 by noting that the thunder and lightning emanating from Mount Sinai during the Theophany parallels the preaching of Christ: it frightened those who heard it and, figuratively, killed those whom it struck. In particular, it brought great terror to the Jews, because they were “lovers of the world.” To the poor and humble—people like the monks, in other words—it brought great relief.⁹⁰

The Jewish rejection of the things of God did not, however, begin with the advent of Christ and the church. Just as he did in the Palm Sunday sermon, the homilist found the seeds of complete Jewish apostasy all the way back in the Exodus period. So, again, he criticized the Jews’ misuse of their noble heritage. “Through Moses,” he explained, “the Lord had entrusted to the Jewish people and had confirmed his promises. If they would keep his commandments and legal rites, he would give bountifully to them, without any want, an abundance of all things, plenty of children, fertility of fields and vineyards, and whatever else pertains to transitory happiness.”⁹¹ However, when Christ came preaching the rejection of all the things promised in the law of Moses, “the unrighteous Jews were struck by the thunder of his preaching, and, inflamed by the torches of hatred against the Son of God, they persecuted him to death.”⁹² The homilist proceeded to compare the Jews both to the rich young man Jesus counseled to sell all his

⁹⁰ HFTA 51: PL 174.886B: “Judaeis denique amatoribus saeculi magno terrore praedicationis intonuit, dum humilis et pauper in hoc mundo degens contemptum saeculi et paupertatem spiritus praedicavit dicens: *Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum.*”

⁹¹ HFTA 51: PL 174.886B-886C: “Dominus autem per Moysen populo Judaico demandaverat, promissionibusque suis firmaverat, si mandata ejus legalesque caeremonias sollicite custodirent, omnium rerum abundantiam, filiorum copiam, agrorum et vinearum fertilitatem, et quidquid ad transitoriam felicitatem pertinet, eis absque ulla penuria largiretur.”

⁹² HFTA 51: PL 174.886C: “*Tonitru* hujus praedicationis impii Judaei percussi facibus invidiae in Filium Dei succensi usque ad mortem eum sunt persecuti.”

possessions and to the money-changers he cast from the temple.⁹³ They could not rid their minds of the notion that temporal wealth equaled spiritual success.

So, according to both sermons on the Exodus narrative, the Jews' heritage constituted a source of unrighteous pride, carnality, and other vices; the very things that ought to have inspired them to follow God in humility instead led them to reject God and trust in the arm of flesh. Pride and its attendant consequences (apostasy, damnation, etc.) have remained an essential part of the Jewish existence since ancient times. That, according to the homilist, is the first meaning of the Exodus narrative.

After discussing these Jewish vices and drawing implicit comparisons to Christian virtues, the homilist proceeded in both sermons to compare the Jews to other peoples from salvation history. From such comparisons, he extracted the moral meaning of the Exodus text and used it to preach righteous behavior to his monastic charges. Naturally, he exhorted them to reject the example of the unrighteous Jews and emulate the faithful followers of Christ, the best examples of which the monks knew intimately from their study and their participation in the liturgy. This exegesis thus cut directly to the heart of some of the most important features of monastic life.

In the Palm Sunday sermon, the homilist followed his discussion of Jewish vice with an exploration of the people who lived *ante legem* and, in the process, drew an implicit comparison between them and the Jews discussed earlier. He began with the fall of Adam, explaining that the coming "out of the land of Egypt" refers to the departure of

⁹³ The homilist explains that the "lightning" from verse 16 represents Christ's miracles. The dense clouds represent the "grace of the Holy Spirit." HFTA 51: PL 174.887C-887D.

Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden.⁹⁴ The fall created in mankind an acute sorrow that leads the righteous man to appeal to Christ, out of the worry that God might abandon his children, leaving them “poor wanderers in solitude.”⁹⁵ In this state, man had to learn to overcome carnal desires and yearn for the spiritual things he had enjoyed in his previous Edenic state.⁹⁶ Unlike the Jews, the elect recognized the deception of the carnal and denied themselves, preferring instead to seek after and wait for their eternal, spiritual rewards.⁹⁷ The state of those who seek after God thus becomes one of wandering, as if in the desert, like the children of Israel.⁹⁸ He asserted that the Lord was, is, and always will be ready to show mercy to those who seek after him, whether they lived “before the law, under the law, [or] under grace.”⁹⁹

The homilist next discussed the *ante legem* prophets, who, surprisingly, came off scarcely better than the Jews. The truths revealed to the prophets who came before the law (he mentions Abel, Abraham, Noah, Isaac, and Jacob by name) were, at least compared to what would come later, “small and meager,” delivered “drop-by-drop” as it were.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the people who lived before the law, by nature, “were not spiritual,

⁹⁴ The sermon explained that Egypt means “darkness,” thus indicating the ignorance of sin experienced by Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. This was “good darkness,” from which Adam and Eve were expelled into the “evil light.” HD 39: PL 174.261A-261B.

⁹⁵ HD 39: PL 174.261D-262A.

⁹⁶ HD 39: PL 174.262B-262d. He uses the “flesh pots” in verse 3 to discuss the battle against fleshly desires.

⁹⁷ HD 39: PL 174.262D.

⁹⁸ HD 39: PL 174.263A. Such sentiments would certainly have found resonance in the monastic context, wherein “exile” and “wandering” were key metaphors to describe the monks’ existence. “Desert,” of course, was used frequently as a metaphor for the monastery as well.

⁹⁹ HD 39: PL 174.263B.

¹⁰⁰ HD 39: PL 174.263D. “Pluvia quidem guttatim super terram descendens res parva et exigua est.”

but carnal.” Some of the things they accomplished imitated the works of the apostles, but they were not able “to attain apostolic perfection;” more specifically, “they did not forsake those things which are of the world and love the virginal life.”¹⁰¹ He added more emphasis to this last point, contending about Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that “although they were just in their generation, they were, nevertheless, carnal because they had wives and children.”¹⁰² Their only hope lay in the eventual sacrifice of Christ, who extended his mercy to them. Given his monastic audience, this emphasis on celibacy is not terribly surprising; still, it is significant that the homilist’s condemnation of all things carnal led him to disparage the ancient patriarchs in this way. The need to underscore the importance for personal salvation of the disciplined, celibate, monastic life seems to have outweighed any admiration he might have felt for the Old Testament prophets. With such a standard of behavior in mind, the Jews certainly did not measure up to his rigorous principles.

After exploring the condition of those who lived before the law, he drew into his comparison those who lived, respectively, under the law and under grace. For this, he used as his exegetical guide the Lord’s directive to the children of Israel to gather manna in the wilderness. He interpreted the command “to go out” as a command to depart “from carnal ignorance;” the directive “to collect” represented the gleanings of truth from the law. The law, he declared, did offer a better understanding of commandments like sexual purity, since it explicitly forbade such things as incest, but its advantages paled in

¹⁰¹ HD 39: PL 174.263D. “Qui cum in generatione sua iusti essent, et multa, qui imitatione digna sunt, fecissent, tamen hanc apostolicam perfectionem attingere non poterant, ut, quemadmodum apostoli eorumque imitatores fecerunt, et adhuc nonnulli faciunt, ea quae mundi sunt derelinquerent, et vitam virginalem diligerent.”

¹⁰² HD 39: PL 174.264A: “Quemadmodum Noe, ita et Abraham et Isaac et Jacob et alii nonnulli, licet iusti in generatione fuerunt, tamen carnales erant, quia uxores et filios habuerunt.”

comparison to those revealed in the age of grace. Indeed, if those who lived under the law gathered enough for a single day, like the children of Israel on the days of the week, then those who live *sub gratia* “desire to collect double,” like the Israelites on the day before the Sabbath.¹⁰³ Not surprisingly, the homilist portrayed the followers of Christ—and especially the monks—as both the most privileged and the most godly of all the peoples in salvation history.

In the Pentecost sermon, the Gentiles who converted to Christianity in the early years of the church serve as the chief counter-examples to the wicked Jews. The “sound of the trumpet” in Exodus 19:19 represents the “apostolic doctrine,” preached by the apostles after the reception of the grace of the Holy Spirit. This preaching and doctrine was, of course, not well received by the Jews; in fact, said the homilist, “very few of the Jews believed.”¹⁰⁴ He continued by emphasizing the fact that the apostles had great success converting the Gentiles. As a consequence of the Jews’ rejection and the Gentiles’ reception, God’s favor departed from his former chosen people and rested upon those whom he had previously despised. While the numbers of converts to the Christian church were initially few, the grace of God so fully inundated the Christians that they soon spread throughout the earth. Unlike the Jews, Christians accepted and lived God’s higher law; men repudiated wives, and wives repudiated husbands, in order to pursue

¹⁰³ HD 39: PL 174.264C-264D: “Sic, sic his qui sub lege erant misericorditer consulens, quasi simplum de singulis colligere jussit. Nos vero, qui sub gratia sumus, duplum colligere voluit, dicens.”

¹⁰⁴ HFTA 51: PL174.887D: “Eo quippe praedicante et docente in terries pauci admodum crediderunt ex Judaeis.”

lives focused entirely upon God.¹⁰⁵ So, just as in the Palm Sunday sermon, the homilist argued for monastic celibacy, over against the carnality of the Jews.¹⁰⁶

At this point in the sermon, the homilist moved from the implicit to the explicit in comparing his fellow monks to the wicked Jews. After referring to the aforementioned trumpets of Sinai as a Christian call to war against the forces of the devil, he addressed his charges directly, commending them for being willing to go to battle by denying themselves worldly pleasures and placing themselves “under obedience” within the cloister. They have become as the children of Israel standing before Mount Sinai, awaiting God’s direction. Nevertheless, they should draw an important lesson from this biblical story. Just as many of the children of Israel who came out of Egypt faltered in their righteousness in the wilderness and never reached Canaan, so there are those who enter the spiritual life only to turn back to their worldly desires.¹⁰⁷ There are also those who continue to wear the habit while never giving themselves over wholly to the religious quest; such persons have “frigid hearts” and “die miserably and unprofitably” in their vocations.¹⁰⁸ The homilist thus exhorted his brethren to faithfulness by warning them not to follow after the examples of unrighteous Jews from salvation history, as some of their brethren have done.

¹⁰⁵ HFTA 51: PL 174.888A-888B: “Modo viri uxores propter Deum relinquunt, mulieres viros, dulcia pignora, ob amorem aeternae vitae contemnunt.”

¹⁰⁶ He also discussed the virtues of submitting to the obedience of prelates. This is yet another bit of evidence of the homilist’s effort to use scripture to inspire monastic discipline.

¹⁰⁷ HFTA 51: PL 174.888C: “Multi sunt in proposito spiritali, qui, quamvis de Aegypto cum filiis Israel exstiterint, in deserto tamen prosternuntur, et nequaquam terram repromissionis ingrediuntur, hi profecto qui in spiritali conversatione usque ad finem vitae suae non perdurant, sed ad saeculum saeculique voluptates redeunt.”

¹⁰⁸ HFTA 51: PL 174.888C-888D: “Sunt et alii, qui in spiritali proposito corpore quidem usque ad finem suum perseverant, sed corde frigido remanentes miserabiliter et inutiliter in eo moriuntur.”

After drawing these comparisons between the Jews and several righteous examples from the narrative of salvation history, the homilist turned in both sermons to an exploration of Jewish conversion. In the Pentecost sermon, he drew attention to the few Jews who converted on the day of Pentecost, although this example seems also to have hinted at the eventual, prophesied conversion of the Jews at the end of the world. While most of the Jews who heard the preaching of the apostles did not convert on Pentecost and instead scoffed at the apostles' Galilean origins and accused them of drunkenness,¹⁰⁹ some Jews responded positively to the Pentecost miracles. He explained that Exodus 19:17 ("And when Moses had brought them forth to meet God, from the place of the camp, they stood at the bottom of the mount") refers to the Jews who, on Pentecost, were "completely petrified with holy and chaste fear" and "who believed in the preaching of the apostles."¹¹⁰ These were the Jews who understood the real intent of the law of Moses, even as it was taught to them from Mount Sinai. That is, they comprehended that the temporal rites and strictures of the law were meant to point the way to Jesus Christ, "whom all things in the law prefigured."¹¹¹ The base of Mount Sinai, he explained, prefigures the foundation of the faith of these believing Jews, which faith had its beginning on the day of Pentecost. It was from that beginning that "the church [was] established."¹¹² Thus all believers who have lived since the days of the apostles owe a debt to these early Jewish Christians, since they carried out the important work of

¹⁰⁹ HFTA 51: PL 174.888D.

¹¹⁰ HFTA 51: PL 174.889A. "Timore sancto, timore casto perterritis Judaeis, qui in Filium Dei praedicatione apostolorum crediderunt."

¹¹¹ HFTA 51: PL 174.889B: "ut in Filium Dei carne indutum crederent, quem omnia quae in lege erant praefigurabant."

¹¹² HFTA 51: PL 174.889B. "Cujus montis radices fides illorum exstitit, super cujus fidei fundamentum firmatur et fundatur Ecclesia."

establishing both Christian doctrine and the Christian church. With these statements, the homilist followed Augustine and other authors in commending the foundational work accomplished by the first Jewish converts to Christianity. These observations tempered, albeit to a small extent, his more condemnatory language and thus betray an ambivalent view of the Jews, though one certainly slanted to the unsavory aspects of the perceived Jewish character.

Ironically (though not unlike many of his contemporaries), he went on to cite the righteous Jews of Pentecost as counter-examples to the wicked Jewish majority discussed earlier and exhorted his fellow monks to emulate their actions. He explained that the smoke of Mount Sinai, “which is accustomed to stir up tears,” represents the “tearful sighs” which the humble, penitent Jews offered “from the inmost part of the heart” on the day of Pentecost as they listened to the doctrine set forth by the apostles. This preaching caused them to recognize “how perversely and wickedly they had acted against their Creator and Redeemer” and to submit to the guidance of the apostles.¹¹³ As the holy spirit descended upon them, they found themselves changed, filled with “the love of the Son of God, whom they had persecuted before.” Such, he remarked, is the transformation all believers experience when they ingest “the bread of the word of God.”¹¹⁴ Pentecost thus represents a kind of restoration of God’s covenant with the Jews,

¹¹³ HFTA 51: PL 174.889C-889D: “in fumo vero, qui lacrymas solet excitare, lacrymosa suspiria eorum possumus accipere. Ipsi namque legis observationes audita Evangelica doctrina toti *fumabant* quia dum cognovissent quam perverse et malitiose erga Creatorem et Redemptorem suum egissent, lacrymosa suspiria ex intimo cordis affectu proferentes dixerunt ad apostolos: *Quid faciemus, viri fratres?*”

¹¹⁴ HFTA 51: PL 174.889D-890A: “Visis denique signis et miraculis, viso quod in linguis igneis super eos Spiritus sanctus descendisset, et ipsi igne Spiritus sancti intus accensi, in amorem Filii Dei se converterunt, quem ante fuerant persecuti. *Et ascenderet fumus quasi de fornace.* Dum fornax igne succenditur, speramus quod in ea panis praeparetur, unde corpus corruptibile, quod gestamus, refocilletur et sustentetur. Ita dum apostolic Spiritu sancto sunt inflammati, panis verbi Dei in ipsis est praeparatus, ex quo omnes credentes aluntur et reficiuntur.”

although it pertains only to those Jews who converted to Christ on that day. The rest remained trapped in a carnal worldview that left them incapable of discerning God's purposes spiritually. As the homilist mused, "We frequently discern how worldly men, given over to the emptiness and cupidity of this world, stand in awe of spiritual and good men, and are terrified by the sight of them."¹¹⁵ Such language offered an implicit challenge to his fellow monks to measure up to the standard of those who put the Jews to shame with their righteousness.

Unlike the historical view of Jewish conversion used in the Pentecost sermon, the conversion of the Jews discussed in the Palm Sunday sermon was explicitly eschatological; it was the same prophesied conversion discussed frequently in both authoritative patristic works and medieval monastic writings. At the conclusion of his explication of Jewish pride in that sermon, the homilist expounded, "And because the Jews oppose this faith to the utmost, and nevertheless will be converted near the end of the world, therefore, as at the beginning of this reading their pride and rebellion were explained, so in the end of the same reading their calling is explained."¹¹⁶ As the sermon continued, it became clear that "calling" was really a euphemism for "eventual conversion."

He began his treatment of this subject by maintaining that the calling of Israel depends entirely upon the favor and arbitration of Christ. Referring again to the Exodus narrative, he explained that Moses represents the humanity of Christ, while Aaron, or

¹¹⁵ HFTA 51: PL 174.890A-890B: "Terribilis itaque factus est coetus apostolicus Judaeis non credentibus, sicut et frequenter nunc cernimus, quomodo saeculares homines, hujus saeculi vanitati et cupiditati dediti, spirituales et bonos viros reverentur, et ab eorum conspectus terrentur."

¹¹⁶ HD 39: PL 174.267B: "Et quia Judaei maxime huic repugnant fidei, et tamen convertendi erunt circa finem mundi, ideo sicut in exordio lectionis hujus praenotata est superbia eorum et repulsio, sic in fine ejusdem lectionis illorum praenotatur vocatio."

“mountain of valor,” designates his divinity. So Moses’s command to Aaron in Exodus 16:9 (“Say to the whole congregation of the children of Israel”) represents a “righteous supplication of the assumed humanity of Christ to his divinity on behalf of the remaining children of Israel.”¹¹⁷ In other words, it is Christ who pleads before his Father for the salvation of the Jews.¹¹⁸ As part of that supplication, Christ (personified in first person in this part of the sermon) explains that he received his flesh from the Jewish people, by virtue of being incarnated in the womb of his Jewish mother. Nevertheless, God has abandoned the Jews, cutting them off from his grace “for a long time.”¹¹⁹ So Christ pleads for his own people, urging God the Father to have mercy on them, to provide for them, and ultimately to bring those who remain (since almost all have perished) to faith and salvation.¹²⁰ In a similar way, the ancient prophets also plead with God, from the grave as it were, for the welfare their unrighteous children.¹²¹ Such language is reminiscent of the authoritative commentaries on the Song of Songs discussed in the previous chapter.

¹¹⁷ HD 39: PL 174.267C: “Unde dicere illus Moysi ad Aaron est pia supplicatio assumptae humanitatis Christi ad divinitatem suam pro reliquiis filiorum Israel.”

¹¹⁸ HD 39: PL 174.267C. “Humanitas itaque Redemptoris nostri sedens ad dexteram Patris, ubi etiam interpellat pro nobis, pro salvatione reliquiarum Israel divinitati suae, qua patri conaequalis est, supplicare non cessat.”

¹¹⁹ HD 39: PL 174.267C. “Massa illa, ex Judaico scilicet populo, assumpsi, qui a te derelictus est, dui expers factus est gratiae tuae.”

¹²⁰ HD 39: PL 174.267C-267D. Here the sermon slipped into first person, taking on the voice of Jesus: “Sed reminiscere miserationum tuarum, Domine Pater, istumque populum placates respice. Et quia jam pene totus periit, saltem reliquiae salvae fiant.”

¹²¹ This comes from the sermon’s messianic prayer. “You have heard, O Lord Father, the murmur of their faithlessness, with which they never cease, from the beginning, to murmur against you. You have heard the murmur of your servants, *namely their fathers*, who have murmured, not in a wicked but in a good way, before you and *who have deplored with great sadness the treachery of their children*.” HD 39: PL 174.267D. “Audisti, Domine Pater, murmur infidelitatis ipsorum, quo semper ab initio murmurare non cessant contra te. Audisti murmur servorum tuorum, *videlicet partum eorum*, qui non male, sed bene coram te murmurabant, *qui perfidiam filiorum magno dolore deplorabant*.” Emphasis added.

Although “up to this point none of them, or at least very few, who have converted to the faith,”¹²² the pleas of Christ and the ancient prophets will eventually effect the conversion of the Jews. Exodus 16:10 provides a key for understanding that conversion: “And when Aaron spoke to all the assembly of the children of Israel, they looked towards the wilderness: and behold the glory of the Lord appeared in a cloud.” As before, Aaron represents God the Father; as prophesied, he will “speak through faith in their hearts” and “illuminate the darkness of their blindness with the light of his visitation.” Consequently, the Jews will eventually come to recognize “*the glory of the Lord in the cloud*, that is, in the flesh of Christ” and “believe and proclaim with great faith the glory of the divinity of Christ, whom they previously did not want to believe and confess.”¹²³ This conversion, explained the homilist, “is not yet made but still ought to be hoped for.”¹²⁴

The homilist concluded both sermons on the Exodus by building upon these discussions of Jewish conversion to expound important moral lessons to the monks. In the Pentecost sermon, he remarked that, despite the wonderful progress of Christianity in the world, the process of conversion is not complete and that the monks should remember in their prayers the Persians, the Babylonians, and other peoples who remain in error.¹²⁵ His musings on the conversion of the Jews, the advancement of the Christian church, and

¹²² HD 39: PL 174.267D-268A. “Sunt etiam adhuc nonnulli ex ipsis, licet pauci, qui conversi ad fidem, tristi dolore pro illis murmurant, qui adhuc in infidelitate et caecitate cordis sui perseverant.”

¹²³ HD 39: PL 174.268A-268B: “Cum enim summus ille Aaron, Deus Pater, in cordibus illorum per fidem loqui coeperit, eumque lumine visitationis suae tenebras caecitatis eorum illustraverit, turbati et contristati *ad solitudinem respicient*, quod Redemptorem nostrum non Deum, sed solum purum hominem esse putaverunt. Qui dum tam respectu ad hanc solitudinem respexerunt, *ecce Gloria Domini in nube*, id est in carne Christi *apparebit*, quia gloriam divinitatis Christi magna fide credunt et praedicabunt, quem prius natum de matre Virgine Deum et hominem credere et confiteri noluerunt.”

¹²⁴ HD 39: PL 174.268B: “Judaeorum conversio nondum facta, sed adhuc speranda est.”

¹²⁵ HFTA 51: PL 174.890C.

the still unconverted world led him to his final summing-up of the message of the Day of Pentecost. He exhorted his brethren to “cherish the advent of the holy spirit” and to pursue the workings of grace, “that, just as in former times,” the monks may be “gathered in the tabernacle of Zion” and “included on account of a fear like that of the Jews.”¹²⁶ This “fear,” he explained, should imitate the fear of the righteous Jews who converted on the day of Pentecost, not the fear of those who refused to believe: in other words, “the fear, not of the carnal Jews, but of the spiritual Jews.”¹²⁷ In particular, monks should fear “that evil spirits might destroy [their souls] through sin.” To avoid this fate—which, he implied, is the lot of the unrighteous Jews—the monks have separated themselves from the world and dedicated themselves to God.¹²⁸ So, just as in many of his other sermons, the homilist closed with a reference to the goodness and utility of the monastic profession. In the process, he set the Jews up as the ultimate foil to the ideal, cloistered manner of life.

His final exhortations to the monks in the Palm Sunday sermon proceeded in a similar vein. The homilist closed that sermon by referring once again to the sacred occasion upon which this homily was to be delivered. Each year during the commemoration of the Lord’s Passion, he explained, the monks sing of the treachery of the Jews; “and until the conversion of all the Jews occurs at the end of the world, we will never cease to sing.”¹²⁹ So, like many of his contemporaries, the homilist juxtaposed the

¹²⁶ HFTA 51: PL 174.890C. “in coenaculo Sion, et propter metum Judaeorum inclusis.”

¹²⁷ HFTA 51: PL 174.890C-890D: “propter metum Judaeorum, non carnalium, sed spiritualium inclusae estis.”

¹²⁸ HFTA 51: PL 174.890D: “Timuistis enim, si saeculo huic licite uteremini, quod maligni spiritus vos in anima interficerent per peccata, et ideo a mundo corpore segregatae contempsistis propter Deum, quidquid deliciarum habet mundus.”

¹²⁹ HD 39: PL 174.268D-269A. “Et donec universitatis illorum conversio in fine mundi fiat, nunquam cantare cessabimus.”

trope of the treacherous Jew with that of the converted, eschatological Jew without making any effort to reconcile these two contradictory images. The unreconciled juxtaposition itself contained an important message: that the monks were to remember both depictions. Both were essential to their understanding of the Jewish character and, by extension, to their understanding of salvation history. Particularly during Holy Week, they were to think about the evil characteristics of the Jewish tormentors as they commemorated the final events of the life of Jesus in their sacred liturgy. Yet this powerful image was to stand alongside that of the Jewish converts at the end of time. The homilist did not account for this miraculous transformation that would occur in the future. For him and for his audience of monks and nuns (most of whom had probably never met real Jews), Christ would bring about yet another stunning miracle in transforming that obstinate people, very suddenly it seems, into faithful Christians. This future, blessed event constituted but one more wondrous thing for the monks to contemplate during the holiest festival of the year.

These lengthy expositions on salvation history were intended as a moral guides to the homilist's monastic audience. He wanted his monks to locate themselves in the exiled, wandering, seeking condition described in this exegesis. Such was their lot in life, after all. The foil to this productive way of explaining man's fallen state was, of course, the obstinate, unrepentant Jew. Instead of turning their unfortunate condition into an opportunity for growth and a quest for the divine, the Jews fell into murmuring, carnality, pride, deception, and, ultimately, the rejection and murder of their only real hope for overcoming their fallen state, at least until the end of the world, when they would, by virtue of a miracle, be converted and joined with the believers.

6.5 Conclusion

The Admont homilist constitutes an important witness of cloistered culture in the high Middle Ages. His sermons arose directly from the intellectual culture that flourished in the monasteries in this period: the intense mastery of patristic exegesis and the application of that exegesis to the liturgy and daily life of the monks. His frequent comments on Jews remained, for the most part, true to the letter of that intellectual tradition. However, at times, he took the exegetical themes laid out by the fathers and expanded in original ways on biblical narratives; his treatment of the Samson and Dalila narrative certainly appears to constitute a unique contribution to the homiletic and exegetical literature of this period. Still, his understanding of the place of the Jews, both in salvation history and in contemporary Christian society, remained in line with the common tropes repeated and enhanced by his contemporary monks as they digested them in their study of the ancient fathers. For most of the monks and nuns of Admont, the Jews described in these sermons and in the authoritative literature they read would have been the only Jews they ever knew. Isolated Admont thus provides an excellent case study of the Jew of the monastic text. While monks in less remote regions—those who had real contact with real Jews—also internalized and passed on the same images used by the Admont homilist, they did occasionally refer to actual Jews, particularly in describing their occasional conversions to Christianity. It is to some of these references that this work now turns its attention.

CHAPTER 7

THE TWO JEWS CONVERGE

7.1 Jewish Converts and the Monasteries

Despite the difference between monks' real interactions with Jews and their textual encounters with Jews, there were circumstances, or rather issues, that forced monks to deal with both real Jews and textual Jews at the same time. One such issue is Jewish conversion: not the prophesied *en masse* conversion at the end of time discussed earlier, but actual conversion to Christianity of real, contemporary Jews. While providing even a rough estimate of the number of such converts is impossible given the data available, there are enough monastic sources that mention such converts to be certain their experiences were known in the monasteries. There were even instances—assuredly more than extant records indicate—of converted Jews becoming monks or interacting in other ways with monasteries.

Monks took an interest in the conversion of Jews for a variety of reasons. While this issue involved actual Jews, it was also bound up closely with the trope of the eschatological Jew discussed in the previous section. As this trope was the most complicated and ambivalent of all the stock images of Jews, it left monks with a variety of theological options to interpret contemporary conversion of Jews. Conversion was also the theological issue that spoke more than any other to the social and political

realities of the continued Jewish existence in Christendom. The notion of *Christianitas* that was bound up with the Gregorian reform and pervaded the religious mind-set of the high Middle Ages hoped and strove for a world wherein everyone was converted to Christianity, and both churchmen and, on occasion, laymen committed themselves, if only rhetorically, to that task.¹ Because they exposed Christendom to previously little-known and unconverted peoples, the Crusades in particular added a palpable sense of urgency to the task of conversion.² In fact, conversion of the Jews and pagans as a prelude to the *eschaton* was a motivating factor in the Crusade movement; more than one version of the sermon of Urban II at Clermont contained allusions to this desire.³ The legend of the “last emperor,” a common trope in eschatological literature since antiquity,

¹ On the impact of this notion on high medieval Christian attitudes toward Jews, see Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, especially 265-322 and Gavin Langmuir, “The Transformation of Anti-Judaism,” in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 88-99. On the notion of *Christianitas* in the high Middle Ages more generally, see Raoul Manselli, “La *respublica christiana* e l’Islam,” in *L’Occidente e l’Islam nell’alto medioevo* (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1965), 115-47, Jan Van Laarhoven, “*Christianitas* et la reform grégorienne,” in *Studi Gregoriani* 6 (1959/61): 1-98, Friedrich Kempf, “Das Problem der *Christianitas* im 12.-13. Jahrhundert,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 79 (1960): 104-23, and Jean Rupp, *L’idée de Chrétienté dans la pensée pontificale des origines à Innocent III* (Paris: Les Presses modernes, 1939). John Van Engen provides a thorough historiographic survey of this issue in “The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 539-41. Van Engen’s call for greater attention to and analysis of the medieval meaning of *Christianitas* has still not been fully heeded.

² Acknowledging this *Zeitgeist* does not take us all the way to Moore’s “persecuting society” or even suggest that there was a planned, universal program to missionize Jews and Muslims in this period. There remains too much evidence of peaceful and amiable co-existence between the religious majority and various religious minorities—Jews, heretics, Muslims—to take those steps. Nevertheless, documentary evidence from the period is replete with rhetoric about purifying Christendom, and the Crusades and other efforts meant that the authorities were actually trying to accomplish that goal. In discussing the Crusade context, scholars should also be careful about drawing hasty connections between Christian attitudes toward Jews and their attitudes toward Muslims. One problematic and spurious attempt to do so is Allen Harris Cutler and Helen Elmquist Cutler, *The Jews as Ally of the Muslim: Medieval Roots of Anti-Semitism* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986). On this topic, Gilbert Dahan’s review of the Cutlers’ work is particularly helpful; see Dahan, “Cutlers’ *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim*,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 79 (1989): 370-77.

³ Both Baldric of Dol’s and Guibert of Nogent’s versions of Urban’s sermon mentioned of the unconverted and exhorted the Christian knights to win back the Holy Land in order that their conversion should be hastened. Baldric of Dol, *Historia Jerosolimitana*, ch.1 and Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per francos*, ch.2, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol.4 (Paris: L’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1879), 13-14 and 139.

made appearances in both the Hebrew crusade chronicles and the crusade chronicle written by Ekkehard of Aura, a source I will discuss below.⁴

The issue of conversion also resonated well with monks because their numbers included at least a few converted Jews. Jeremy Cohen has argued that the most profound effects of the First Crusade massacres were felt not because so many Jews were killed, but rather because so many Jews converted to Christianity to save their own and their families' lives. "One should not underestimate the extent or the significance of the conversions," argues Cohen, since "the shock of these conversions haunted the self-consciousness of Ashkenazic Jewry through the decades that followed." This factor more than any other, asserts Cohen, influenced the nature of the Jewish reactions to the First Crusade massacres, enshrined in sources like the Hebrew First Crusade chronicles.⁵ I contend that this factor also influenced Christian, and especially monastic, attitudes toward Jewish conversion through those same decades. While, as we have seen, many of these Jews returned to their ancestral religion with the permission of Henry IV, there were some who remained Christian. Many, perhaps most, of these were children. Moreover, given the unfavorable demographic and social situation of the Jews, there is little doubt that some, perhaps many, Jews made the decision to convert voluntarily during the period in question. The size of that number—whether it was a steady stream or an intermittent trickle—remains in question, yet it cannot be statistically insignificant.

⁴ Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 142. Yuval explains, "The Jews' adamant refusal to convert to Christianity, even at the cost of their lives, could have been interpreted as an attempt to frustrate Christian eschatological expectations." This may have been one of the justifications for the violence of the 1096 pogroms.

⁵ Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God*, 5. Many other works have been written on the Hebrew chronicles themselves; Cohen remains in dialogue with many of these other scholars throughout his work. See especially Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History* and Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980), 27-52.

For those Jews who chose to remain Christian after a forcible conversion or who became Christian voluntarily, the choice to enter a monastery was a sensible one. As privileged entities (in both the legal—i.e., *privilegium*—and the monetary sense), monasteries were in a powerful position to protect former Jews both from their former coreligionists and from the potential predations of untrusting Christians. Moreover, since Jewish converts to Christianity often left behind both their wealth and, given the emerging guild presence and the other dynamics of growing towns in this period, the prospect of obtaining more, the monastery may have been the only real option for some converts. This was certainly the case with Jewish children spared during the First Crusade massacres. Churchmen were the most common saviors of such children, so it stands to reason that they would have committed them into the physical, intellectual, and spiritual care of monasteries. After all, monasteries had been dealing with child oblates since the emergence of western monasticism and were thus quite well-equipped to take care of Jewish orphans.

While it is almost certainly impossible to know the exact number of formerly-Jewish monks, it stands to reason that the number was not insignificant. As John Van Engen asserts, “Contact between Jews and Christians—in neighborhood streets, in marketplaces, at princely and episcopal courts—could provoke questions, even doubts, about which “law” was right.”⁶ Such doubts must have led at least on occasion to conversion. Two prominent examples of twelfth-century Jewish converts to Christianity stand out in particular. In his memoir, Guibert of Nogent mentioned a young boy rescued from the slaughter of the Jews of Rouen during the Crusader procession through that city; the boy—who took the name William—later became both a monk at Fly and a favorite of

⁶ Van Engen, “Ralph of Flaix: The Book of Leviticus Interpreted as Christian Community,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 153.

Guibert himself. In fact, Guibert wrote his *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judaeos* specifically for that monk's instruction. While no autobiographical or polemical work of William's remains extant, a few homilies and biblical commentaries from his pen do survive.⁷ The other prominent figure is Hermann of Scheda, otherwise known as "Hermannus quondam Judaeus." After flirting with Christianity for a time during his early adulthood and even entering into debate with Rupert of Deutz, Hermann received baptism and eventually became a Premonstratensian canon at the monastery of Scheda, near Cologne. The narrative of his conversion that he wrote later in life constitutes an invaluable source for the study of conversion in the high Middle Ages. Concerning this work, William Jordan remarks, "It is fortunate that we are able to anchor ourselves in at least one text, the twelfth-century autobiographical memoir of Herman the Convert."⁸ Both of these examples will be dealt with in greater detail in this chapter.

The main argument of this chapter is that monastic interpretations of and reactions to Jewish conversion (or lack thereof) were marked by confusion, consternation, and volatility in the early twelfth century but assumed a milder tone by the middle of the twelfth century. Whereas monks in the early twelfth century displayed impatience over the lack of Jewish conversion and skepticism about the sincerity of those Jews who did convert (many by forced baptism, which explains their perceived lack of sincerity), monastic authors of the later period appear to have embraced the ambivalent stance on

⁷ See Jessie Sherwood's recent, admirable study of William's career, "A Convert of 1096: Guillaume, Monk of Flaix, Converted from the Jew," *Viator* 39:1 (2008): 1-22. Sherwood notes some of the important differences between William and both Hermann of Cologne and Petrus Alfonsi, including William's complete embrace of Christianity—as opposed to the more ambivalent stance of the other two scholars—and apparent forgetfulness of his Jewish heritage.

⁸ Jordan, "Adolescence and Conversion in the Middle Ages," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 83.

Jewish conversion displayed in the patristic sources and amplified by contemporary monks (that is, the perfidious Jew juxtaposed with the prophesied Jewish convert). The hope inspired by that prophecy, along with several other mitigating factors, made most of them content to wait for predicted events to unfold. Indeed, “patient” may be the most apt word to describe the attitudes exhibited by the cloister in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century. The factors that contributed to this softening of opinion included the success of Jewish privilege and the consequent entrenched Jewish position in German society in the decades after the First Crusade, the withdrawal of most monks from involvement in scholastic pursuits, and, perhaps, the influence of formerly-Jewish monks and canons like Hermann of Scheda. However, as Jewish privilege became less certain over the course of the thirteenth century, monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion assumed again an element of mistrust. They also retained some of the features of late twelfth-century opinions, though these increasingly gave way to pessimistic attitudes as the Jews’ social and political position deteriorated further and as widespread persecution and massacre of Jews impacted Jewish-Christian relations in profoundly negative ways. This chapter will examine each of these periods in turn.

7.2 The Atmosphere of Mistrust

Perhaps the dominant characteristic of monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion in our first period was skepticism or, one might even say, cynicism. The monks who commented either on actual conversions of Jews or conversed in more abstract ways about the prospects of such conversion placed little trust in either the sincerity of the converted Jews or their ability to contribute to Christian society. Although exact lines of influence are difficult to sketch, it seems apparent that the

outcomes of the First Crusade massacres contributed heavily to this skepticism. Since the pogroms in northern France, the Rhineland, and other regions produced a fairly large number of forced converts, and since the vast majority of these forcibly-baptized Jews returned to their ancestral religion, violating the strictures of canon law in the process, monks and churchmen in general began to have doubts about the prospects of Jewish converts. It seems also to have been the case that the increasingly privileged position of the Jews in the German Empire—hastened in part by Jewish efforts to secure greater protections in the wake of the pogroms—added to the frustration expressed by churchmen over Jewish conversion, especially when placed alongside memories of the Jews’ rejection of their forced baptisms. As Alfred Haverkamp has sketched out, this cynical attitude appears in a significant number of texts and seems to have reflected widespread opinion among churchmen.⁹ Even though some of these works lie outside the geographical and institutional scope of this dissertation, it still seems valuable to explore a few of these texts before turning specifically to German monastic sources from this period.

The first of these sources comes from Guibert of Nogent, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Nogent, near Rouen in Normandy. Due to the very personal nature of the account, his *Monodiae* has been seen as a vital source for grasping the mood of the early twelfth century, despite the fact that it does not appear to have circulated widely in that era.¹⁰ An admirer and chronicler of the crusading movement, Guibert is also the chief source for the massacre of the Jews of Rouen at the very beginning of the First Crusade.

⁹ Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century,” in *Ibid.*, 264-67.

¹⁰ Jay Rubenstein notes that there is no extant medieval exemplar of this work. Scholars are reliant on seventeenth-century transcriptions of a now-lost manuscript. Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait*

Guibert's very brief and, one might say, calloused narrative of the Rouen pogroms led him to discuss what he saw as the chief positive result of these occurrences. This was the forced conversion of a Jewish boy who later became a monk at the monastery of Fly, the same house in which Guibert spent much of his career. After explaining that the Christian persecutors rounded up Jews in a church and offered them the choice of baptism or death, Guibert wrote, "In the midst of this massacre a certain nobleman saw a little boy, had mercy on him, rescued him, and entrusted him to his own mother."¹¹ This woman, a countess in northern France, took in the boy and asked him if he would accept baptism. Guibert noted that the boy accepted this offer out of fear rather than pious feeling, but those responsible for him still made hasty arrangements for baptism. Despite these haphazard and arguably questionable preparations, the baptism itself featured a remarkable manifestation of God's favor. Guibert recounted, "When the rite had reached the point where the candle was lit and liquid wax was dropped into the font, at that moment it was seen that one drop in particular had fallen which formed a likeness of the cross so precise that it would have been impossible for such a small piece of matter to be

of a Medieval Mind (New York: Routledge, 2002), 61. On the *Monodiae*, see Trudy Lemmers, *Guibert van Nogent's Monodiae: een twaalfde-eeuwse Visie op kerkelijk Leiderschap* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998), Jean Batany, "L'Autobiographie de Guibert de Nogent (vers 1115): identite sociale et identite langagiere," in *Die Autobiographie im Mittelalter*, ed. Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok (Greifswald: Reineke, 1995), 1-10, and Rubenstein, 61-86. Citations from the *Monodiae* are drawn from the edition entitled *Autobiographie* and edited by Edmond-René Labande (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981). There are multiple English translations of this text, the most recent being *A Monk's Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent*, trans. Paul J. Archambault (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

¹¹ Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae* 2.5: Labande, 248. "In qua digladiatione vir quidam nobilis puerulum vidit, misertus eripuit et ad matrem suam detulit."

so shaped by human hand.”¹² This miracle, for Guibert, was a portent of greater things to come.

In spite of the miraculous events of this Jewish child’s baptism, Guibert admitted that he would not have thought the matter important “if I had not witnessed the exceptional advancement of the little boy.”¹³ The element of this story that really stood out to Guibert was the fact that this boy grew up to become an admirable monk. Even as a young child, the boy excelled at learning Latin. Fearing that the Jews would try to reclaim him, the countess’s son placed him, presumably as an oblate (Guibert never mentioned his age), in the monastery of Fly, where he excelled. Guibert explained that the boy “endured with such patience the discipline inflicted on him, that he was accorded no small amount of respect by all for his victory over his wicked nature.”¹⁴ More than simply casting off his Jewish identity, the boy earned a reputation as an excellent scholar. Guibert was so impressed with his progress that he sent him a copy of a treatise he had written “against the count of Soissons, who was equal parts Judaizer and heretic.”¹⁵ The boy received this very well and proceeded to imitate Guibert by writing a similar work.

¹² Ibid. “cum ad locum ventum esset, ubi, accenso lumine, liquens in undam cera dimittitur, gutta singulariter ibidem visa est cecidisse, quae per se solam in ipsis aquis adeo accurate sua, ut sic dicam, quantitatula effigiem crucis expressit, ut ex tantilla materie simile quid manu fieri humana non possit.” Guibert backed up this assertion by stating the credentials of the witnesses who told him the story. This is an excellent example of the persistence of oral authority in the early twelfth century. The authoritative studies of oral culture and its transition to written authority include M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record* and Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*.

¹³ Guibert, *Monodiae* 2.5: Labande, 250. “nisi successus egregius pueruli indubie pervidissem.”

¹⁴ Ibid. “tanta aequanimitate ea quae sibi disciplinae gratia inferebantur pertulit, ut suae nequam naturae victoria . . . non minimam reverentiam a cunctis exigeret.”

¹⁵ Ibid.: Labande, 252. “contra Suessorum comitem, judaizantem pariter et haereticum.” The accusation of “judaizing” in this case was not about usury but rather about two other practices that Guibert identified as unacceptable. He charged the count with believing some of the tenets of the Jewish faith and with forming relationships with Jews that were too friendly. This criticism thus parallels some of the attacks against German authorities who formed privileged relationships with Jews.

Guibert concluded this narrative by offering his own sentiment on the possibilities of Jewish conversion. Concerning the boy, he remarked, “The cross at his baptism, then, did not appear by chance but occurred by decree from heaven. It made conspicuous the faith—*unheard of in our time*—that would develop in this man of Jewish origin.”¹⁶ This final statement captures the most common sentiment about Jewish conversion in this era. Three characteristics of this narrative stand out. First, it took place within the context of the First Crusade massacres. The young monk was surely not the only Jew to receive baptism under threat of death. Guibert may well have known, or had at least heard of, other Jews who became Christians in this manner, yet William was the only one whose story Guibert included in his memoir, the main point of which was to inspire piety in his fellow monks. That is why the bulk of the text consisted of stories—*exempla* really—of monks engaged in both righteous and evil works. If William was one of very few Jews who persisted in his conversion, as seems to have been the case in other Jewish communities affected by the First Crusade, then the inspiration of this story was heightened all the more by its contrast with the standard experience. By offering this story as a coda to his brief narrative of the Rouen massacre, Guibert was suggesting that William’s conversion mitigated the otherwise negative results of the massacre.

The second element of this story that warrants analysis is its miraculous content. By recounting the miracle at his baptism and referring to it again at the end of the narrative, Guibert explained that God himself had a hand in William’s conversion and subsequent accomplishments. Divine intervention authenticated William’s true conversion in Guibert’s eyes; without the miracle at his baptism, Guibert would not have

¹⁶ Ibid. “Crux igitur in ejus baptismo non fortuito, divinitus autem facta jure apparuit, quae *insolitam nostro tempore* in judaici generis homine credulitatem futuram innotuit.” Emphasis added.

paid attention to William's subsequent progression or would simply have dismissed him as another Jewish convert likely to lapse into apostasy. As we will see, miracles were featured in numerous accounts of Jewish conversions and often served the very same purpose displayed in Guibert's account, though later monastic evinced very different attitudes toward Jewish conversion than did Guibert.

A final, related element that deserves comment is the basic sentiment, simply assumed by Guibert and his readers and implied throughout his discussion: that Jews do not make good converts. As Guibert noted in the closing sentence of the narrative, William possessed a "faith unheard of in our time." In this sense, the miracle at William's baptism was a portent of a greater miracle to come—the authentic conversion and flourishing of a Jew. The specific benchmarks that William reached give some indication of the reasons churchmen assumed Jews did not make worthy or sincere converts. Guibert noted, for instance, William's brilliance as a scholar and his penchant for proving the faith through reason. Moreover, he highlighted William's seamless transition into the monastic community. Thus, unlike his fellow Jews (at least by Guibert's reckoning), William was reasonable and disciplined, and he fit in well with his Christian peers.

This attitude accords with Guibert's treatment of Jews in one of his more systematic sources: the *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judaeos*, the very work Guibert gave William to aid in his intellectual progression.¹⁷ Following the lead of Anselm of Bec, whom Guibert held in high esteem and who may even have been his mentor, Guibert wrote this treatise in order to argue for the necessity of the incarnation,

¹⁷ Guibert, *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judaeos*: PL 156: 489-528.

specifically against the objections of Count Jean of Soissons, whom he targeted in the *Monodiae* for his judaizing tendencies.¹⁸ Still, even though the count was the actual target, all of the arguments he combated were those he assumed came from the Jews.

Like many similar works in this period, the majority of Guibert's *Tractatus* employed *ratio* in order to demonstrate both why it was necessary for Christ to take flesh and enter the womb of the Virgin and why such an act did not in any way compromise God's divinity. Guibert explained, for instance, that Mary's sexual organs remained blessed and pure since they were free from carnal desire. Jesus thus received no pollution from inhabiting her womb and passing through her birth canal.¹⁹ Moreover, Guibert argued for the possibility of nonsexual reproduction, noting that Adam and Eve, as well as various animal species, were produced without coitus.²⁰ Guibert also commented extensively on the life and passion of Christ, demonstrating both his divinity and the necessity of his humanity through Christological readings of Old Testament texts.²¹

After spending the entire treatise employing *ratio* and *scriptura* to argue for the incarnation and virgin birth, over against the objections of Jews and judaizers, Guibert adopted a very different strategy in the final chapter of the work. Here Guibert offered a

¹⁸ Guibert explained that it is far easier to endure Jewish ignorance than disbelief from one (i.e., Jean of Soissons) who supposedly adheres to the Christian faith. Having no way to describe such a man, he ended up calling the count a "neuter." Ibid., 1.1: PL 156.489-92. For a summary of Guibert's anti-Jewish polemics, see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 192-201 and Anna Sapir Abulafia, "Theology and the Commerical Revolution: Guibert of Nogent, St Anselm and the Jews of Northern France," *Church and City 1000-1500: Essays in Honour of Christopher Brooke*, ed. D. Abulafia, M. Franklin, and M. Rubin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 26. On Guibert as a disciple of Anselm, see Jaroslav Pelikan, "A First Generation Anselmian, Guibert of Nogent," *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed F. Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 71-82.

¹⁹ Guibert, *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judaeos* 1.6: PL 156.497C-498B.

²⁰ Ibid., 2.2: PL 156.499C-500A.

²¹ He makes particular use of the prophecies of Daniel in this regard. Ibid., 3.3: PL 156.510-12.

final proof of Jewish faithlessness by recounting a second-hand narrative of a Laon cleric who, after failing to convince his Jewish adversary by means of reason, sought a different means of proving his case. Guibert reported that “when the cleric was no longer able to put up with the vanity of this perfidious man, he said, ‘In the name of the Lord Jesus, I will pick up this flaming firebrand with my bare hand and carry it out of the door of the house.’”²² Essentially, as Robert Bartlett explains, the cleric offered to undergo trial by fire: that increasingly discouraged but still authoritative, communal method of ascertaining innocence or guilt, truth or falsehood.²³ Although the cleric did this without receiving harm, the Jew still refused to believe. For Guibert, this story constituted a final, concluding proof of the Jews’ incorrigible hard-heartedness. Not only do the Jews fail to recognize the dictates of reason, suggested Guibert, but they also fail to accept a recognized, divine method of proving truth. The outcome of the ordeal was seen to express both the will of God and the decision of the entire community. To reject that decision was to place oneself fundamentally outside the boundaries of both the community and the favor of God.

Similar sentiments were expressed by other monastic figures of this period, including some of the leading monastic lights in all of Christendom. Bernard of Clairvaux, perhaps the most influential monk of the high Middle Ages, evinced analogous, though even harsher, opinions in a letter to the German emperor Lothar III during the papal schism between Innocent II and Anaclete II in the 1130s. As the anti-

²² Ibid., 3.11: PL 156.528A. “Cumque clericus perfidi illius resistere ventositati non posset: ‘In nomine, inquit, Jesu Domini titionem flammantem ea parte qua ardet apprehendam nuda manu, et extra ostium domus efferam.’”

²³ Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 21.

pope's critics pointed out with zeal, Anaclete was the great-grandson of a Jewish convert to Christianity. This corrosive background, remarked Bernard, accounted for the antipope's unsavory character and devilish machinations. To Lothar, he wrote, very starkly, "It is evident that the Jewish offspring occupy the see of Peter to the insulting of Christ."²⁴ Bernard thus expressed fundamental doubts about the efficacy of Jewish conversion, such that it continued, in his mind, to taint the converts' descendants even after the passage of several generations. Of course, as we have seen, Bernard defended the Jews from the potential predations whipped up by the renegade monk Radulf, but he nevertheless held many of the same opinions about the rightful place of the Jews in Christian society as his contemporaries, Radulf included.

This atmosphere of mistrust also entered into the German monasteries and other clerical institutions during this early period. As with Guibert, the main influence on the attitudes of the German monks and other churchmen toward conversion seems to have been the abortive forced conversions of the Jews during the First Crusade massacres. The measures taken by the authorities to allow Jews to return to their mother religion and, moreover, the legal privileges enacted to prevent further Jewish conversion (especially the institution of a "waiting period" for potential converts) surely embittered monks and other clergy who desired and anticipated the mass conversion of the Jews and who perhaps saw the 1096 baptisms as valid.²⁵

²⁴ Bernard, *Epistola* 139: SBO 7.335. "constat Iudaicam sobolem sedem Petri in Christi occupasse iniuriam."

²⁵ Haverkamp explains, "From the Christian point of view, [the Jewish rejection of the baptisms] was equal to the accumulation of apostasy insofar as coerced baptism was viewed as irrevocable." Haverkamp, "Baptised Jews," 262.

One witness of this frustration comes from a collegiate canon at Trier, who wrote the continuation of the *Gesta Treverorum* around 1130.²⁶ Two stories from this chronicle seem particularly revealing of these attitudes. The first is one of the more bizarre vignettes in the entire corpus of high medieval chronicles. In recounting the tale, the author built on an earlier text from the same monastery: an inscription on the tomb monument of Archbishop Eberhard of Trier. This inscription described the Archbishop's manner of death, explaining that he perished during a liturgical observance in full Episcopal attire because the Jews burnt in effigy a wax figure of the bishop that they had fashioned.²⁷ The chronicler, writing over sixty years after the death of the bishop in 1066, expanded on this story in ways that seem to speak to the issue of forced conversion. Before getting to the spectacular story of the bishop's demise, he first explained that the bishop "proclaimed a persecution against the Jews; he decreed that, unless they should be made Christians by the next Easter Sunday, they ought to be driven out of the city."²⁸ After this decree, remarked the chronicler, a few "of that same wicked people fashioned a wax image in the likeness of the bishop and placed it on a woodpile." They also "corrupted with money a certain clerk of the monastery of Saint Paul, a Christian in name but not in works, so that he would baptize [the wax image]."²⁹ On the chosen Sunday, as the bishop made preparations for the baptisms, the Jews lit the image on fire. When a part of the wax effigy had been consumed by the flames, the bishop suddenly fell gravely

²⁶ *Gesta Treverorum*, *additamentum et continuatio prima*: MGH SS 8.111-200.

²⁷ Alfred Haverkamp, "Die Juden inmitten der Stadt," in *Trier im Mittelalter*, ed. Anton and Haverkamp, 477.

²⁸ *Gesta Treverorum* 8: MGH SS 8.182. "Dein Iudaeis persecutionem indixit, eosque, nisi proximo sabbato paschae christiani efficerentur, civitate pellendos esse decrevit."

²⁹ Ibid. "quondam clericum de coenobio sancti Pauli, Christianum nomine non opere, ut eam baptizaret, pecunia corruerunt"

ill while he was standing at the font. He withdrew to the sacristy with help and died there, wearing his liturgical vestments.³⁰ The chronicler ended the story abruptly and commented no further on the aftermath of this odd turn of events. He did not explain whether or not the Jews or the complicit clerk were punished for their acts of voodoo.

Among other interpretations, this record has been held up as an example of a false accusation leveled against the Jews in this volatile period of Jewish-Christian relations.³¹ While I certainly do not doubt the falsity of the story about the burning waxwork or contend against the consensus that the story grew with retelling, I would suggest that the monastic chronicler may have had a different message in mind when he composed this narrative. Specifically, he may have been warning his fellow clerics that trying to force Jews to convert, as the victimized bishop had done, was a fruitless exercise. Because the Jews had powerful allies, both human and supernatural, to attempt their forced conversion was a foolhardy enterprise that could only end in failure, or, as the bishop Trier found out, in something worse than failure.

In another part of the chronicle, the same author provided a lengthy account of the 1096 pogroms in Trier. After describing the suicides of many frightened Jews, the chronicler explained that the remaining Jews approached Archbishop Egilbert in the hope of obtaining his protection from the predations of the crusaders. In the chronicle there follows a long dialogue between the clergyman and the Jews, wherein the archbishop tries to convince them that they should convert to Christianity, and the Jews deliberate

³⁰ Ibid. "Quam ipso sabbato, episcopo iam ad baptisimi sollemnia celebranda praeparato, accenderunt. Qua ex parte iam media consumpta, episcopus super fontem sacris instans officiis coepit graviter infirmari, et secedens in sacrarium cum adiutorio ministrorum genibusque in oratione flexis, in sacris vestibus obiit."

³¹ See Haverkamp, "Die Juden inmitten der Stadt," in *Trier im Mittelalter*, ed. Anton and Haverkamp, 477.

over this possible course of action. Finally, led by their spokesman Micheas, who expresses belief in the Trinity and renounces Judaism publicly, the Jews accept baptism at the hands of the archbishop and the cathedral clergy. The sentence that follows the description of these baptisms, however, laments that all the baptized Jews, apart from Micheas, who remained close to the archbishop, “apostatized [*apostatantibus*]” the following year.³² The author of the chronicle remained skeptical even of Micheas. “I will not dare to say,” he wrote, “that the conversion of that man [*istius*] constitutes salvation for the converting soul.”³³ Because he observed the apostasy of the other Jews, the chronicler remained convinced that Micheas’s baptism was less than sincere. In any case, the fact that the baptisms were encouraged and performed by ordained clergy—and were thus valid sacraments—made the Jews’ rejection of them that much more troubling for the Trier chronicler, particularly since the archbishop had tried to convince them of the doctrines of Christianity before he actually led them to the font.³⁴

Unlike at Trier, the clergy were not usually involved in the forced baptisms of the First Crusade. Consequently, in other instances, when narrating the accounts of crusaders performing forced baptisms themselves without the aid of clergy, chroniclers of these events spread the culpability for apostasy around. Indeed, Ekkehard of Aura and some other authors who chronicled the First Crusade massacres and forced baptisms, along with Henry IV’s decision to allow the Jews to return to their religion, found fault for the

³² *Gesta Treverorum* 17: MGH SS 8.191. “Sed ut cetero taceam, aliis omnibus in sequenti anno apostatantibus, iste adhaerens episcopo in fide permansit.”

³³ Ibid. “Non ergo audebo nunc dicere, quod istius conversio sit animae convertentis salvatio.”

³⁴ The chronicler justified the role of the archbishop by referring to Ezekiel 3:19: “But if thou give warning to the wicked, and he be not converted from his wickedness, and from his evil way: he indeed shall die in his iniquity, but thou hast delivered thy soul.” Ibid.

subsequent violation of canon law in two places. Like the author of the Trier chronicle, they blamed the baptized Jews for returning to Judaism and thus profaning sacred Christian rites. Still, acknowledging that under the circumstances they could do little to stop this from happening, they also placed a great deal of blame on the perpetrators of these forced baptisms, since their misguided efforts both constituted an affront to priestly authority and led ultimately to the apostasy of the Jews. As Kenneth Stow has discussed in great detail, Emicho of Flonheim, a minor noble who led the attack on the Jews of Mainz, was singled out for special opprobrium by monastic chroniclers. In fact, chroniclers depicted him almost universally as a negative *exemplum*, juxtaposed starkly with the crusaders whose deeds won renown and brought glory to the cause of Christianity.³⁵ Although chroniclers placed a great deal of emphasis on the misguided efforts of Emicho, however, the notion that Jews do not make good converts and that they might not deserve the effort in the first place remained an implicit part of this conversation. Both elements of these sources will be dealt with here. Since they were produced in the monastery and since their author was most proximate to Emicho and the pogroms in space and time, Ekkehard of Aura's two treatments of these events (in his *Chronicon universale* and his *Hierosolymita*) will receive particular consideration here, although they will be compared with the works of other chroniclers.

The description of Emicho's person and deeds in these sources certainly demonstrates the frustration the chroniclers felt over the failed baptisms. Since they could only protest in vain against Jews violating canon law and the sacred sacraments

³⁵ See Kenneth Stow, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness." Stow explains, "Others failed, too, but none as spectacularly as Emicho, nor so out of character: a noble fighting alongside rabble. His failure thus served as a kind of grand exemplum, like those on which medieval chroniclers, theologians, and moralists, whether Jewish or Christian, loved to dwell. Ibid., 918.

with their apostasy, monastic authors transferred much of their *Angst* to this figure, although, historically-speaking, he appears to have been involved only in the massacre of Jews at Mainz.³⁶ At the beginning of his account of these episodes, Ekkehard called him “an extremely disreputable man, given formerly [i.e., before taking the cross] to a tyrannical way of life.” Ekkehard even ascribed divine pretensions to Emicho, explaining that he fancied himself “another Saul called by divine revelations” to lead the armies of the Lord.³⁷ He also insisted that Emicho “usurped” control over an army of twelve thousand crusaders.³⁸ Ekkehard thus besmirched his background, making him a rake and blackguard even before he perpetrated his crimes at the head of a crusading force.

Part of Ekkehard’s and other chroniclers’ criticism of Emicho was directed at his eventual decision to lead his crusading troops into battle against the Duke of Swabia, which decision led to his and many of his companions’ deaths on the battlefield before getting anywhere near Jerusalem, the goal of their expedition. Ekkehard explained that “the largest mob [of the crusaders] were seduced by a certain military man called Emicho, or rather as once the Israelite army was deceived by the spirit of fornication.”³⁹ Despite these promises, the journey to fight the Muslims and establish Christian ascendancy

³⁶Ibid., 913. Only one chronicle, “the geographically far removed William of Tyre” had Emicho appearing at Cologne in addition to Mainz. Stow also demonstrates that modern accounts of the crusades have stretched the legend of Emicho even further, giving him “messianic pretensions” and “prophetic tendencies” and according him “responsibility for actions throughout the Rhineland and even in places beyond,” despite the fact that neither Jewish nor Christian chronicles, apart from William of Tyre, show him anywhere except Mainz.

³⁷ Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Tübingen: Fues, 1877), 126-27: “alter Saulus revelationibus, ut fatebatur, divinis in huiusmodi religionem advocatus.” Stow shows that the Saul reference probably came from the *Glossa Ordinaria*’s description of Saul as a failed military ruler, in contrast to the true messiah whose deliverance of his people was spiritual rather than political and military. Stow, 917, n.19.

³⁸ Ekkehard, *Hierosolymita*, 127. “fere XII milia signatorum sibimet usurpans ducatum”

³⁹ Ekkehard, *Chronicon Universale*: MGH SS 6.208. “amplissima utriusque multitudo a quodam Emichone viro militari seducta, vel potius ut Israheliticus quondam exercitus spiritu fornicationis decepta”

never materialized. Emicho's fatal squabbles with other Christians and his consequent failure to lead his troops to the Holy Land cemented his ignominious legacy. In that vein, Ekkehard reported, "And thus indeed the men of our people, having zeal for God, although not according to the knowledge of God, began in their turn to persecute other Christians while yet upon the campaign which Christ had provided for freeing Christians."⁴⁰

Other chroniclers expressed similar sentiments about Emicho and his errant forces. Out of all the Christian chroniclers, Albert of Aachen⁴¹ issued the most direct condemnation of the crusaders who forced baptism on the Jews, an accusation that Ekkehard made only implicitly by discussing the final results of the conversions. Albert described the pogroms, in the first place, as "the cruelest sort of murder."⁴² Moreover, after narrating Emicho's inglorious military defeat, he opined, "In this the hand of God is believed to have been against the pilgrims, who had sinned in his eyes by excessive impurities and fornicating unions, and had punished the exiled Jews (who are admittedly hostile to Christ) with a great massacre."⁴³ According to Albert, the crusaders' motivations came "rather from greed for their money than for divine justice, since God is a just judge and commands no one to come to the yoke of the Catholic faith against his

⁴⁰ Ekkehard, *Hierosolymita*, 130-31. "Sic nimirum, sic nostrae gentis homines zelum Dei sed non secundum scientiam Dei habentes, quippe qui in militia, quam in liberandis christianis Christus providerat, alios vicissim christianos persequi ceperant."

⁴¹ We know nothing about Albert's life, other than that he was, at least for a time, a canon at the cathedral of Aachen.

⁴² Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 50. I have modified Edgington's translation of "crudelissimam . . . necem."

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 57-59.

will or under compulsion.”⁴⁴ Albert wrote at a later date than Ekkehard; as a result, he seems to have considered more closely the canon legal ramifications of the forced conversions and issued a more forcible critique of Emicho’s actions while at the same time remaining ambivalent about the Jewish victims.

Still, in addition to turning Emicho of Flonheim and the rabble associated with him into scapegoats for their affront to canon law and the sacraments, Ekkehard of Aura and the other chroniclers who narrated the forced baptisms of 1096 continued to cast aspersion on the character of the Jews who submitted to and renounced those sham conversions. Ekkehard, for instance, called Emicho’s victims “the detestable mass of Jews” in his *Hierosolymita*.⁴⁵ In his continuation of the *Chronicon universale*, Ekkehard used even more critical language, referring to the pogrom victims as the “most abominable survivors of the Jews”⁴⁶ and, employing the same verbiage as other monastic authors, “the internal enemies of the church.”⁴⁷ However, this identification of the Jews as enemies may not be so straightforward as it appears initially. The word “internal,” or *intestinos* in Latin, can also mean “domestic” or “civil,” and this may have been the nuance that Ekkehard had in mind when he described the Jews with these words. Another passage from the same chronicle clarifies his meaning; this comes from Ekkehard’s narrative of Henry IV’s actions in the aftermath of the pogroms. He wrote, “Returning from Italy, the Emperor Henry came to the Bavarian city of Regensburg, and, having lingered there for a considerable time, he allowed the Jews who were compelled

⁴⁴ Ibid., 59.

⁴⁵ Ekkehard, *Hierosolymita*, 127. “execrabilem Judeorum . . . plebem.”

⁴⁶ Ekkehard, *Chronicon universale*: MGH SS 6.208. “nefandissimas Iudaeorum reliquias”

⁴⁷ Ibid. “intestinos hostes aecclesiae”

to be baptized the rite of judaizing [*ritum iudaizandi*].”⁴⁸ The author of the *Rosenfeld Annal* used nearly the same words in his account of the events.⁴⁹ Particularly significant in both passages is the word “judaizing.” As discussed previously, this charged term was used in various ways by many Christian authors of this era, though rarely if ever in the way Ekkehard used it in this passage. It was not usually applied to the Jews themselves, but rather to Christians who acted like Jews: by charging usury on money loans, by taking too great an interest in the things of the flesh, by insisting too vehemently on the literal meaning of the scriptures, and by performing other activities or holding other opinions that were normally ascribed to Jews.⁵⁰ By referring to the Jews’ return to their rites and practices as “judaizing,” Ekkehard was essentially calling them apostate Christians, which, according to canon law and the rites of the church, they were. In other words, Ekkehard referred to the Jews as “internal” or “domestic” enemies because their baptism rendered them Christians, and their return to Judaism rendered them apostates. It did not matter that they were forced into baptism; in fact, Ekkehard fully acknowledged that this was the case. It only mattered that they had received the sacrament. Having done so, they could not return to Judaism without committing the egregious sin of betraying the true faith.

A final witness to the clerical consternation over Jewish baptism and subsequent apostasy in the early twelfth century is Hermann, bishop of Prague between 1099 and

⁴⁸ Ibid. “Heinricus imperator ab Italia rediens, Ratisponam Baioariae urbem venit, ibique aliquamdiu moratus, Iudaeis qui baptizari coacti sunt iudaizandi ritum concessit.”

⁴⁹ *Annales Rosenfeldenses*, ch.41, MGH SS 16.102. “Henricus rex de Ytalia redit, et Iudeis baptizatis iudaizandi ritum concedit.”

⁵⁰ Guibert, for instance, accused Jean of Soissons of “judaizing.” See n.14 above. On judaizing as a legal problem in this era, see Sean Eisen Murphy’s article “Concern about Judaizing in Academic Treatises on the Law.”

1122. The description of his experience by Cosmas of Prague effectively summed up the feelings of the monks and other clergy who opposed the Jews' return but did nothing, or at least not enough, to stop it. In the aftermath of the crusade massacres and mass forced baptisms, which touched the city of Prague, Bishop Hermann had followed the lead of the emperor in allowing the baptized Jews to return to their mother religion, despite the blatant betrayal of canon law entailed in such an act. He had, it appears, even befriended and consorted with Jews in Prague throughout his tenure as bishop. Given the evidence of social interaction between Jews and Christian authorities presented earlier in this work, Hermann's actions are not terribly surprising. However, it seems he remained haunted by his decision to obey the emperor in the period following the First Crusade. He also regretted the close relationships he had with Jews in the intervening years. According to Cosmas, he lamented these decisions severely as his life drew to a close:

Woe is me! For I remained silent; I did not restrain that apostate people and thus did not contend for Christ against the sword of anathema! Instead, I suffered myself and the Christian people to be polluted with an unholy people through the touch of a hand. . . . The apostate people, I say, are the Jews, who, through our negligence, fell back into Judaism after their baptism.⁵¹

The case of Hermann thus demonstrates the sort of tensions that continued to exist in the decades following the 1096 massacres.

So, as was the case with Guibert, those monastic and other clerical authors who chronicled or otherwise described the massacres and forced baptisms of the Jews during the First Crusade were highly skeptical and even critical both of Jews as converts and, more generally, of the forced conversion process. On the one hand, they witnessed with

⁵¹ Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum* 3.49, MGH SS 9.125. "Vae mihi! quia silui, quia apostatricem gentem non revocavi, nec in gladio anathematis pro Christo dimicavi; sed me ipsum et populum christianum passus sum per tactum manus cum gente non sancta pollui . . . Apostatricem gentem dico Iudeos, qui per nostram negligentiam post baptismum relapsi sunt in iudaismum."

abhorrence the (in their minds) gross violation of canon law that took place when the Jews rejected their forced baptisms, thus profaning the holy sacrament, and returned to Judaism, even though other tenets of canon law seemed to indicate that this was allowed. Even if they sympathized with the Jews on account of the cruel massacres they endured at the hands of crusaders, the monastic authors of this period could not endure the affront to the sacraments and to priestly authority. It may even be the case, as Kenneth Stow suggests, that Christian authors' disgust at the thought of the Jews' mass suicides during the pogroms (the Jews' *Kiddush ha-Shem*) came because some of the sacrificial victims had already been baptized as Christians.⁵² Furthermore, as Stow and Israel Yuval argue compellingly though controversially, these memories may have contributed to the later Christian formulation of the ritual murder accusation.⁵³ In any case, having witnessed the actions of the Jews during and after the massacres and forced baptisms, monks and other churchmen could not be other than apprehensive about Jews as Christian converts. This skepticism continued through the first half of the twelfth century, although the ambivalence of canon law and the general social and institutional ambivalence toward the place of Jews in Christian society led some authors to adopt, or at least entertain, multiple opinions about Jewish conversion. Rupert of Deutz is perhaps the best example of the complexities of thought that came from this ambivalent legacy.

⁵² Stow, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness," 930. He writes, "What I suspect these bishops may really have wondered is something more. They wondered not only why Jews slaughtered themselves, as Christian chroniclers, too, observed, but why, perhaps more awfully in cases of the conversion of children, Jewish parents slaughtered those who had now become innocent 'Christian' children, creating Christian martyrs."

⁵³ Ibid. and Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 163-74.

7.3 Rupert of Deutz and the Struggle with Ambivalence

More than any other German monastic commentator on the hermeneutic Jew, Rupert seems to have been influenced by the results of the First Crusade massacres, especially the return of the Jews to their mother religion after the mass forced baptisms. As a monk in Liège from 1091 to 1119 (and later as abbot in Deutz near Cologne), Rupert lived in the middle of the region most affected by the 1096 pogroms. The perceived Jewish apostasy seems to have weighed on his mind heavily, especially during the writing (between 1112 and 1116) of his longest exegetical work, the massive *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius*.

One passage from this commentary that contains criticism of the return of many forcibly-baptized Jews to Judaism is Rupert's treatment of Lamentations 4:2-5. Willis Johnson and Kenneth Stow have both expounded on this selection at some length, but their observations bear repeating, given the subject at hand.⁵⁴ Rupert began his commentary on these verses by drawing upon the stock images explained earlier in this work. As Rupert clarified, the lamentation in this passage is for the dispersed Jews who have forfeited their original covenant. Echoing the biblical text, Rupert explained that the Jews, who were once overlaid with gold, have now been stripped of this raiment and are left as "earthenware vessels" because of their rejection of the teachings of Christ.⁵⁵ At the outset, then, Rupert's interpretation of these verses simply repeated the common tropes of Jewish apostasy and loss of covenant status.

⁵⁴ Willis Johnson, "Before the Blood Libel: Jews in Christian Exegesis After the Massacres of 1096" (MA Thesis, Cambridge University, 1994) and Kenneth Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and Its Interpreters: Continuity in the Catholic-Jewish Encounter* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006), 25-26.

⁵⁵ Rupert, *De sancta trinitate, in Hieremiam* 1.82: CM 23.1634.

This standard, predictable criticism takes a different turn, however, in the following paragraph, the commentary on verse 3. Therein, Rupert compared the Jews to a *lamia*, a female demon creature that appeared in medieval bestiaries. Even though the *lamia* is a “monstrous animal,” she still has enough solicitude, enough “natural affection,” to feed milk to its “cubs.”⁵⁶ On the other hand, “the daughter of my people”—the Jews, that is—was “exceedingly cruel and did not even bare her breast for her most pitiable young.”⁵⁷ Instead, she is like the female ostrich who scatters her eggs in the sand, giving no thought to the care of her young. By rejecting Christ and exclaiming “his blood be upon us and upon our children,” the Jews effectively “killed [their] posterity.”⁵⁸ While this seems on the surface to be merely another condemnation of the Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus, it also appears on another level to be a reference to the Jewish mothers who ended the lives of their children during the massacres of 1096. The exegesis that followed clarified this point. Rupert continued his discussion by quoting verse 4 and 5 of Lamentations 4: “The tongue of the sucking child hath stuck to the roof of his mouth for thirst; the little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them. They who were fed delicately have died in the streets; they who were brought up in scarlet have embraced the dung.”⁵⁹ For Rupert, this seemed a fitting description of the mass Jewish suicides he certainly would have heard about and discussed with travelers and his fellow monks in Liège. The Jews suffered for the crucifixion when

⁵⁶ Ibid., 1.83: CM 23.1634-35. “sed et lamiae, quae non tam bestiae quam monstra sunt, naturalem erga fetus suos habent affectum.”

⁵⁷ Ibid.: CM 23.1635. “At vero *filia populi mei* nimium *crudelis*, nec saltem mammam nudavit infelicissimis catulis suis.”

⁵⁸ Ibid. “Neque enim *filia populi mei* posteros suos, ut struthio oua sua solummodo derelinquit, sed insuper occidit, dicendo: *Sanguis eius super nos, et super filios nostros.*”

⁵⁹ Lam. 4:4-5.

Jerusalem was destroyed, he wrote, but the heirs of that ignominious legacy have continued to languish in hunger and thirst. “*From then until today*,” he remarked, “‘the tongue of the sucking child’ continues to stick ‘to the roof of his mouth for thirst,’ and they continue to suffer hunger without anyone breaking bread for them. This lack of spiritual nourishment does not exist because the children long for or request the word of God; their mothers do not even allow them to become acquainted with it. Instead, the mothers “*prefer them to die* rather than to break the bread of the scriptures for themselves, that they might live from the marrow of spiritual understanding.”⁶⁰

As Johnson and Stow have argued convincingly, Rupert’s exegesis of this passage was a subtle, though unmistakable, reference to the baptized Jewish children who perished at the hands of their parents and Jewish leaders in the aftermath of the First Crusade pogroms. The mothers on those occasions preferred their children to die rather than hear the word of Christianity. More specifically they would rather have let their children die than “break the bread,” a phrase that evoked the Eucharist. Since many of these children were baptized Christians at the time of their death, the crime of their mothers was, in Rupert’s estimation, all the more diabolical; their deeds constituted an attack on the body of Christ from multiple fronts—the denial of the Eucharist and the killing of individual members of that body. This is why the Jewish mothers were, for Rupert, more reprehensible, more evil, than the *lamia*—the demons or hyenas described, and occasionally compared to Jews, in medieval bestiaries. Not only did they kill their own young—something the *lamia* do not do—but they also denied them the very thing

⁶⁰ Rupert, *De sancta trinitate*, in *Hieremiam* 1.83: CM 23.1635. “Porro spiritualiter *extunc usque hodie* lingua lactentis adhaeret palato eius in siti, et non est qui panem frangat petentibus paruulis, nimiam quippe habent famem et sitim audiendi uerbum Dei, non quod desiderent uerbum Dei, sed quia *malunt interire* quam frangere sibimet panem Scripturarum, ut uiuant ex medulla intelligentiae spiritualis.” Emphasis added.

that will bring them salvation, namely the communion with Christ through church and Eucharist.

Rupert's interpretation of these verses from Lamentations thus constituted a harsh condemnation of the Jewish mothers who sacrificed their newly-baptized children rather than allow them to progress in their new, Christian vocation. That their baptisms occurred under duress and coercion was, for Rupert, irrelevant. The fact that the Jewish children were cleansed of their sins and put into a position that would allow them to live good Christian lives, only to have that opportunity snatched away by their treacherous parents, was the real tragedy. By killing their children, the Jews demonstrated their true character as enemies of Christ and Christianity and proved their inability to recognize the necessity of converting to the truth.

In Rupert's opinion—or at least according to the harsher side of the ambivalence he displayed on this issue—such obstinacy and perfidy can only be overcome by coercion. If forcible conversion is the only way to bring Jews to the truth, he opined on at least some occasions, then Christian authorities should consider adopting such policies. In other words, Rupert appears to have condoned the tactics of Emicho of Flonheim and other crusaders, or, at the very least, to have accepted them as the lesser of two evils. Another text concerning Jewish conversion that was influenced obviously by the results of the First Crusade massacres and that contains perhaps his most vehement stance on this issue can be found in the ninth book of Rupert's commentary on Genesis. This treats the Joseph narrative, at the point when Joseph encounters and imprisons his brethren in Egypt. Rupert explained that Joseph's treatment of his treacherous brethren serves as a good antecedent for the Christians' current relationship with the Jews. After all, the Jews

were treasonous in that they had crucified Christ, a crime similar to that of Joseph's brothers, who had betrayed and sold him. Just as Joseph had cast his brethren into prison for three days and otherwise treated them harshly in order to teach them a lesson, so "Christian princes" should act toward Jews. They should "not kill them," since, as Augustine had argued, that is specifically forbidden in the Psalm: "God shall let me see over my enemies: slay them not, lest at any time my people forget."⁶¹ Instead, Christian authorities should do as the latter part of the same Psalm verse instructs: "Scatter them by thy power."⁶²

After this instruction, Rupert laid out his suggestions for "scattering the Jews," with the Joseph narrative again serving as his guide. The point of taking coercive measures against the Jews, he remarked, is to "entice them to an examination of their guilt."⁶³ Like the brothers of Joseph, who were reduced to groveling at the feet of the one whom they had sold, the Jews have been "placed under the feet of Christ, whom their fathers rejected and crucified," since they have become subject to Christian princes.⁶⁴ Therefore, he declared, those princes should take advantage of the situation, just as Joseph used his power, not to kill his brothers out of vengeance, but to change their attitudes and behavior. They should make use of "righteous torture" to compel them to repentance—to say, like Joseph's brothers, "We deserve to suffer these things, because

⁶¹ Psalm 58:12. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 33.

⁶² Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta trinitate*, in *Gen.* 9.4: CM 21.536.

⁶³ Ibid. "Non ergo illos occidere, sed ad cognitionem sui reatus hoc exemplo convenit euocare."

⁶⁴ Ibid. "Nam sicut tunc adorauerunt illi principem Aegypti nescientes esse Ioseph quem uendiderunt, sic hodie Iudaei christianis principibus subiecti sunt, nescientes hoc modo se esse subiectos pedibus Christi quem negantes patres ipsorum crucifixerunt."

we have sinned against our brother.”⁶⁵ Jews have been made “the captives and bondsmen of Christ” for this very purpose.⁶⁶ In order to get the Jews to reach this point, Christian princes should “weigh down the rustic Jews of their patrimonies with such a great tax burden” that they would “be compelled to hasten to the faith” in order to ease the pressure on their purses. If a conversion process motivated by monetary gain would not necessarily yield faithful converts in the short run, explained Rupert, it would nevertheless pay eventual dividends because the children of those first generation converts, having grown up at a distance from their ancestral religion, would become faithful Christians. “Therefore,” he concluded, “we will win either them or their children.”⁶⁷

Even though it was not the same kind of forced conversion enacted by the perpetrators of the First Crusade massacres—forcing Jews into the water at swordpoint and raising a cross on the shore and other such tactics--Rupert still advocated forced conversion. As Rupert wrote the commentary on Genesis in the early 1110s, when the Rhineland pogroms and their consequences were still fresh in the minds of interested observers, his advocacy of this position surely arose from the frustrations he and other churchmen felt keenly while watching Jews violate—as they saw it—the sacred dictates of canon law. Even if the armies of the likes of Emicho of Flonheim were misguided in

⁶⁵ Ibid. “Igitur quemadmodum Ioseph illos in ultionem sui no occidit, sed pia tortura ad paenitentiam compulit, ut dicerent, *merito haec patrimur quia peccavimus in fratrem nostrum*, etc.” He was quoting Gen. 42:21.

⁶⁶ Ibid. “captiuos uinctosque Christi”

⁶⁷ Ibid. “Quod fructuose simulque salubriter interdum a sanctis patribus actum est, scilicet ut patrimoniorum suorum rusticos Iudaeos ad Christum venire minime consentientes tanto pensionis onere grauarent ut ex ipsa actionis suae poena compellerentur ad fidem festinare, et econtra perductis ad Christi gratiam pensionis onera releurent, quia et si ipsi minus fideliter ueniunt, hi tamen qui de eis nati fuerint iam fidelius baptizantur. Aut ipsos ergo, inquit, aut filios ipsorum lucrabimur.”

their slaughter of the Rhineland Jewish communities, their efforts still went a long way toward accomplishing a feat for which generations of churchmen had longed. When Christian authorities, led by the German emperor (who was, of course, already despised by reform-minded clerics like Rupert), shunted aside canon law in allowing Jews to return to their mother religion, Rupert and many of his brothers felt frustration at best and betrayal at worst. Hence, the kinds of tactics Rupert advocated are not really surprising, given the circumstances under which he wrote.

The harsh, impatient Rupert seems a very different monk from the one who debated with Hermann of Schara (then known as Judah) in Münster in January or February of 1128.⁶⁸ According to Hermann's description of their debate, Rupert patiently answered all of his opponent's objections and attempted to confront the Jews on their terms. Debates about the authenticity of that text or the historicity of the debate it detailed aside⁶⁹, it may well be the case that Rupert adopted a different stance when interacting with real Jews than he did when writing to his fellow monks, or to a wider Christian audience, about Jews.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, his view of Jewish conversion spelled out in his commentary on Genesis was much harsher; there was certainly no room for amicable relations in his suggested program of coerced conversion. So, in that text at least, Rupert's attitude toward the conversion of the Jews constitutes a striking example of the harsh view of the earlier of the two periods, wherein, according to the Christian at

⁶⁸ Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 243.

⁶⁹ On the historicity of this debate, see Anna Abulafia, "The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas Concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Judeus," 43-63.

⁷⁰ Van Engen points this out during his discussion of the Hermann-Rupert encounter: "It is important to recognize that in personal encounters Rupert could adopt a friendly attitude and debate on common ground, whereas in his commentaries, written for Christian readers, he assumed toward Jews and Judaism that same combative stance he took toward all 'enemies of Christ and His Church.'" Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 244.

least, Jews frequently reneged on past, forced conversions and bolstered their preventive measures against future conversions. Rupert's frustration is representative of the generation of churchmen who struggled with the challenges to canon law that mass forced conversion presented and who felt general frustration over the Jews' failure to convert to Christianity.⁷¹

Also in contrast with the belligerent tone of the Genesis commentary stands the still judgmental but nevertheless softened stance of Rupert's most systematic exploration of the Jews: the *Anulus sive Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum*. Requested by Rupert's friend Rudolph of St. Trond and written in 1126, this work constitutes the only Christian work on the topic of Judaism to come out of a Rhineland monastery in the half-century following the First Crusade massacres.⁷² Although at times it remained quite belligerent, this dialogue took a much more measured view of Jews in general, and of Jewish conversion specifically, than did the Genesis commentary, written fifteen years earlier when memories of mass Jewish apostasy were still fresh. As Van Engen notes, in the *Anulus* Rupert actually "attempted to take account of particular Jewish interpretations." The result was a work that was "friendly but sometimes hard-hitting in tone." The Christian's closing speech in particular, a heartfelt plea for the Jews to reclaim the standing they had before God in the days of Moses, contains no trace of the hard-line rhetoric on Jewish conversion featured in some of Rupert's earlier works. The Jews,

⁷¹ See the discussions of this frustration in Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, 84-93 and Langmuir, "Doubt in Christendom," in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 100-133. Langmuir describes this mind-set well when he writes, "To protect their faith, Christians not only had to develop their own expressions of it, they had to explain why most Jews had not believed. And the need only became greater when Christians sought to persuade non-Jews of the truth of their gospel and had to explain why most Jews rejected it." Ibid., 103.

⁷² Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 246-48.

declared Rupert, must not stand obstinately admiring the gifts given to the Christians. Instead, they should “come inside and be a companion of blessedness, a sharer in the banquet.”⁷³ It may well be that the controversies that arose in the years following the massacres had calmed down significantly by the time Rupert wrote this work in the 1120s. Rupert’s move from Liège, where he wrote the Genesis commentary, to Cologne, where he wrote the *Anulus*, almost certainly brought him into actual contact with more Jews. This real interaction may have effected a subtle but significant shift in his stance on Jewish conversion as well.

7.4 Hermann of Scheda and the Importance of Christian Example

The conversion account of Hermann of Scheda marks an important shift in monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion. This is the first extant monastic text that displays the characteristics of the second period described above. That is, Hermann did away with the judgmental and impatient aspects of the works of Rupert of Deutz and Guibert of Nogent. His stance toward the conversion of the Jews contained no talk of force and indeed even jettisoned in large part the emphasis on convincing Jews of their error through reasonable arguments. While one detects a remnant of earlier attitudes (particularly in the description of his debate with Rupert), the dominant attribute he displayed was patience. Christian example, he proposed, constitutes the best remedy for Jewish unbelief.

Before launching into a close discussion of Hermann’s text, it is necessary to discuss his identity briefly. First, although he was not a monk in the strictest of terms, he did live in a cloister (the Premonstratensian house of Scheda) and thus qualifies for

⁷³ Rupert, *Anulus* 3: Haacke, 242. “ueni intus et esto socius gaudii, particeps conuiuii.”

examination here. Hermann's account has been the subject of some amount of debate among scholars, mostly over the authenticity of his recorded "debate" with Rupert of Deutz in Münster.⁷⁴ While I do find the arguments of Aviad Kleinberg and Anna Abulafia compelling and believe that Hermann was an actual Jewish convert who engaged in a real debate with Rupert, the factuality of that event is really of secondary concern here. Hermann's Jewish identity, however, is of great interest; if Hermann was really a former Jew, it stands to reason that his lineage would have affected his attitudes and colored his account in fundamental ways. As his work was the first text after the First Crusade massacres to revise substantially the vehement arguments against the validity of Jewish conversion, it may be suggested at the very least that his tender feelings for his former people, along with his own conversion experience, led him to pull back from the harsh stance of the previous generation. While his text was almost

⁷⁴ In the camp of scholars who believe the text to be a Christian forgery: Avrom Saltman, "Hermann's *Opusculum de Conversione Sua*: Truth or Fiction?" *Revue des études juives* 147 (1988): 31-56 and Simon Schwarzfuchs, "Religion populaire et polémique judéo-chrétienne au 12e siècle," in *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman*, ed. Bat-Sheva Albert, Yvonne Friedman, and Simon Schwarzfuchs (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1995), 189-206. Among those who argue for the real Jewish identity of Hermann: Aviad Kleinberg, "Hermannus Judaicus's *Opusculum*: In Defence of its Authenticity," *Revue des études juives* 151 (1992): 337-53 and Anna Abulafia, "The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Iudeus," 50, 55. Perhaps the most sophisticated reading of this text is Jean-Claude Schmitt's *La Conversion d'Hermann le juif: Autobiographie, Histoire et Fiction* (Paris: Seuil, 2003). While Schmitt falls into the camp of those who doubt the authenticity of this conversion account, he largely sets aside that issue in favor of exploring the intellectual context of this text—especially the prerogatives of the Premonstratensian Order that it seems to betray. For Schmitt, the *Opusculum* is a collective enterprise to accomplish institutional ends. This refocusing of the discussion on this text is a welcome one, since historical or biographical texts like this one were not written to provide factual accounts *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*. Such works were written in the medieval setting to express theological truth and to advance the author's institutional program. Also of interest is Karl F. Morrison's discussion of Hermann's text in *Conversion and Text: The Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992), 39-75. Like Schmitt, Morrison mostly sets aside the question of historical authenticity and in fact argues that the author of the account purposefully obscured certain historical elements—inconsistencies, asserts Morrison—so that his conversion account would appeal more to a Jewish audience, in whose intellectual modes he was well-versed. Morrison shows, however, that the author also sought to disengage himself from his "old life" in order to show the authenticity of his conversion for his Christian readers. As Morrison interprets him, Hermann sought a balance in his text between his former and current religious identities.

certainly influenced more by his monastic training than by any desire to depict his early life (or Judaism for that matter) accurately, the attitudes it evinces about Jewish conversion make it an invaluable source for this inquiry.

According to his account, Hermann was raised in a wealthy Jewish family in Cologne. The expectations of wealth that characterized his family and their peers make their appearance in the Jews' reaction to young Hermann's dream about receiving a kingdom from the German emperor; one of Hermann's relatives convinced him that the dream portended great wealth and influence among the Jewish community. He seems to have been involved in the family money-lending business as a young man, for the first major event he narrated was his decision to lend money to the bishop of Mainz without demanding a pledge. When his angry relatives forced him to remain in Mainz until the debt was paid (under the supervision of one Baruch, who was tasked with keeping him out of trouble), Hermann became exposed for the first time to the doctrines of Christianity through his association with Bishop Egbert, whom Hermann called "a scribe instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven to bring forth out of his treasure new and old things."⁷⁵ Although he was swayed to some extent by the bishop's preaching, he persisted in his Jewish attitude toward Christianity, taking particular exception to the idolatrous use of the crucifix in Christian churches.⁷⁶

His attitudes were shaken to their core during his debate with Rupert of Deutz. According to the text, this clash took place at Hermann's behest in the town of Münster, where, it seems, both Hermann and Rupert had business to conduct. He noted that Rupert

⁷⁵ Hermann of Scheda, *Opusculum de conversione sua*, ch.2: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.73. "scribam doctum in regno celorum de thesauro suo nova et vetera proferentem." Hermann's characterization of Egbert was derived from Matthew 13:52.

⁷⁶ See the discussion in Morrison, 49-50.

met all his accusations with great patience and produced convincing arguments for his side from the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, Hermann remained committed at least outwardly to his Jewish tradition, although he continued to fraternize with Christian churchmen. Presumably his continued business brought him into further contact with both regular and secular clergy, for he mentioned his associations with various churchmen. Particularly memorable for him was his first visit to a monastery—the Benedictine abbey of Cappenberg—which experience convinced him that Christians lived a godly life, one that was perhaps holier than that lived by the Jews.

His confusion over religion continued, he explained, after he had collected his debt from Bishop Egbert and returned to Cologne, yet, despite prayer, fasting, and more disputations with Christian clergy, he still was not able to make the choice to leave behind his ancestral religion. This state of affairs came to a head when he was betrothed to a Jewish maiden and pressured by the Jewish community, wherein many suspected him of apostasy, to enter into marriage forthwith. Though he tried to delay this course of action, other members of the community forced his hand, and he submitted under pressure to the marriage. For a time, his marriage, the accompanying “corruption of the flesh,” and his care for the concerns of his wife quenched his curiosity about Christianity.⁷⁷ After three months, however, he returned to his former confusion of spirit, and, concerned he had committed grievous errors in turning away from Christianity, he succumbed to a serious bout of depression. This led him eventually to resume his disputations with Christian clergy, in an effort to convince himself through reason of the truth of one side or the other. He gradually adopted more and more Christian customs

⁷⁷ Ibid., ch.10: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.102. “carnis corruptionem”

and rites (e.g., making the sign of the cross over his breast), but he remained in a state of confusion. Finally, through the righteous prayers and example of two Christian women, Bertha and Glismut, he became fully convinced of the truth of Christianity.

After his conversion, he practiced Christianity in secret for a time, biding his time until he could make a complete break from his fellow Jews. In the meantime, both Hermann and his fellow Jews began to plot. Hermann planned to remove his younger half-brother and give him to the Christians for baptism; the Jews, now fully convinced of his apostasy, plotted to have him punished (presumably murdered). Miraculously, however, he managed to intercept the letters instructing the Jews of Mainz to carry out this treacherous plan. After preaching Christianity, still furtively, to the Jews of Worms (thus fulfilling his obligation to share his knowledge with his own people), he kidnapped his half-brother, deposited him in the monastery of Flonheim, and journeyed to the monastery of Ravengiersburg, where he was catechized. Although his baptism in the Basilica of St. Peter in Cologne was marked by some amount of confusion, he completed the necessary rites and became, fully, a Christian. In order to renounce completely his former life and avoid further carnal temptations, he entered into a house of canons regular. The narrative concluded with a final reference to his childhood dream, which he interpreted, naturally, as presaging his conversion to Christianity.

Before exploring Hermann's well-informed attitudes toward Jewish conversion, it should be noted that this text displays nearly all of the stock images detailed in earlier chapters. Despite his apparent Jewish background, Hermann was certainly still a product of the cloister. Perhaps the most obvious examples of stock images are Hermann's repeated remarks about Jewish carnality. The first such reference comes in his

description of the Jewish interpretation of his seminal, childhood dream; he mentioned that Isaac, the interpreter, knew “only those things ‘that are of the flesh,’” and he thus “produced an interpretation for me that was based on carnal happiness.”⁷⁸ On several occasions, he drew explicit, condemnatory reference to the Jewish obsession with money. He held his own family particularly guilty of this, explaining that his parents reacted to his pledge-free loan to the bishop “with an attack that was sufficiently harsh, saying that I had been grossly negligent.”⁷⁹ His reflections on his brief, abortive marriage betray perhaps his most profound thoughts on the threat of Jewish carnality. He described his family’s plot to marry him off in order to prevent his continued investigation of Christianity as nothing less than a design of the devil. One description of his father was particularly judgmental: “Consumed by deep hatred of the victories I had won against his attacks, he assailed me with the weapons of his ancient fraud.”⁸⁰ In the fashion of a committed monk, he went on to disparage the domestic life in no uncertain terms, referring to the married state as “false happiness,” “destructive calamity,” “hell of perdition,” “superstition,” “corruption of the flesh,” and “deceitful pleasure.”⁸¹ As Karl Morrison explains, “Herman-Judah titillated his readers with the conflicting stereotypes of laziness and rampant sexuality among Jews when he described how he succumbed to

⁷⁸ Ibid., ch.1: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.71-72. “Qui ea sola que carnis sunt sapiens quondam mihi secundum carnis felicitatem dictavit coniecturam.” Hermann’s quote is from Romans 3:5.

⁷⁹ Ibid., ch.2: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.72-73. “dura me satis invectione obiurgant, nimium me negligentem dicentes”

⁸⁰ Ibid., ch.10: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.98. “gravi super his meis profectibus invidia contabescens, antique me fraudis sue armis aggreditur.”

⁸¹ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.101-02. “false iocunditati . . . exitalibus casibus . . . perditionis baratrum . . . superstitione . . . carnis corruptionem . . . lubrica delectatio”

lust in his marriage.”⁸² He also included numerous references to Jewish blindness—that other major aspect of their apostate condition, according to both patristic and medieval authors. In his prefatory letter to the work, he noted, for instance, that Jesus “called me *out of darkness* into his wonderful light.”⁸³

Although Hermann drew from the repertoire of stock images of Jews invoked almost ubiquitously in the cloisters of Germany in this period, he nevertheless offered a more subtle, more empathetic, and certainly more personal view of Jewish conversion than those views found in the earlier monastic authors who dealt at some length with Jewish conversion.⁸⁴ First of all, he offered no suggestion, so common in earlier works, that Jews were incapable of becoming upstanding, pious Christians. Hermann’s own conversion story, and his subsequent life as a Premonstratensian canon, effectively dispelled that notion. More importantly, the narrative of his conversion, it appears, was meant to convey to his readers a program for converting other Jews. As Hermann saw it, Christians should seek to persuade Jews not, or at least not solely, by rational debate, neither should they force the issue by seeking after signs and miracles. Rather, they should use kindness and pious example, along with debate and conversation, to convince receptive Jews gradually. As Hermann explained, Christians should emulate those

⁸² Morrison, 51.

⁸³ Hermann, *Opusculum*, ch.10: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.70. “de tenebris vocavit in admirabile lumen suum.” Emphasis added. Hermann here modified 1 Peter 2:9.

⁸⁴ In other words, those who dealt with Jewish conversion more fully than merely referring to the stock image of the converted, eschatological Jew.

Christians who guided him, each of whom was “a splendid example of perfect charity and genuine faith, and one to be emulated.”⁸⁵

In stark contrast to Guibert’s account in the *Tractatus de incarnatione*, Hermann eschewed the coercive use of signs and miracles as a means of conversion. This attitude makes Hermann somewhat unique among late twelfth-century authors who commented on Jewish conversion. To illustrate the problems with this tactic, he told of a Christian named Richmar, presumably a cleric at the court of Bishop Egbert, who took it as his personal task to guide Hermann toward Christian truth. Although he was already setting a pious example, recounted Hermann, Richmar decided that he needed to employ a more convincing form of persuasion. Knowing, “as the Apostle bears witness in a certain passage, ‘that the Jews seek signs,’” Richmar offered to undergo trial by hot iron, in the same vein as the Laon cleric in Guibert’s account, in order to prove the truth of Christianity to Hermann: “With the utmost resolution he proposed to me this agreement: that if, as proof of his faith, he should carry a red-hot iron in his bare hand (as is the custom) and feel no burning, I would submit faithfully to the remedy of holy baptism, the fog of all unbelief removed from my heart.”⁸⁶ However, when Richmar went to the bishop to obtain the iron, Egbert rejected the proposal, “although he marveled at and praised [Richmar’s] great firmness of faith.”⁸⁷ He counseled against this course of action because such sign-seeking does not engender real faith in God; Egbert taught that “God

⁸⁵ Ibid., ch.5: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.83. “perfecte caritatis et fidei non ficto preclarum imitandumque legentibus conferre potest exemplum.”

⁸⁶ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.84. “quod quodam loco testatur apostolus, quia iniqui Iudei signa querunt, hanc mihi constantissime proposuit conditionem, ut si ferrum ignitum nuda, ut fieri solet, manu in fidei sue argumentum baiolans nullum sensisset incendium, ego de corde meo totius infidelitatis deteresa caligine sacri baptismatis fideliter subirem remedium”

⁸⁷ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.85. “tametsi magnam . . . fidei constantiam mirabatur atque laudabat”

ought not under any circumstances be tested by examinations of this sort.”⁸⁸ When God was ready to convert the Jews, he would bring it about “by the secret visitation of his grace alone, without any miracle.”⁸⁹ After all, “a sign which is exhibited visibly, in the open, would be ineffectual if God did not work invisibly through grace in the heart of man.”⁹⁰ Egbert’s explanation seems to have convinced both Richmar and Hermann of the fruitlessness of their suggested venture.

This does not mean, however, that Hermann found his association with Richmar to be of little worth. On the contrary, he suggested that all Christians should follow Richmar’s example when interacting with Jews. One of Richmar’s deeds that stood out in Hermann’s recollection occurred during a meal in the bishop’s court. On that occasion, Egbert sent Richmar fine dishes from his own table—“half a loaf of white bread and a portion of roast pike.”⁹¹ Motivated by “a feeling of tenderness” and by “the highest ardor of charity,” Richmar passed the meal on to Hermann and “remained satisfied with only bread and water, according to religious life customary to him.”⁹² This made a deep impression on Hermann; he recalled being “wonderstruck that a man whom thus far I thought beyond the law and without God could have the virtue of charity in such great measure, especially toward me.” Hermann remarked more than once on the fact that Richmar treated him as a friend rather than an enemy, even though he would have been

⁸⁸ Ibid. “huiusmodi examinationibus Deum nullatenus temptandum esse”

⁸⁹ Ibid. “absque omni miraculo sola occulta gratie sue visitatione”

⁹⁰ Ibid. “otiosum sit signum, quod visibiliter foris exhibetur, si ipse per gratiam in corde hominis invisibiliter non operetur.”

⁹¹ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.83. “dimidiam similam assamque esocis portionem”

⁹² Ibid. “pietatis affectu . . . summa caritatis alacritate . . . ipseque pane tantum et aqua iuxta consuetudinariam sibi religionem contentus permansit.”

justified, at least according the prescriptions of the Law of Moses, in doing the latter. So, when Egbert canceled the planned trial by hot iron, Hermann still found himself moved deeply by Richmar's love and care. After recounting the story, he counseled his readers to imitate "the example of great discretion in the bishop and moreover the example of extraordinary faith and, even more importantly, of perfect charity in his steward."⁹³ He found it particularly commendable that Richmar "did not curse me as a perfidious man, undeserving of Christian sympathy; instead, with the highest devotion, he imparted to me works of charity and tenderness as if I were his brother in Christ."⁹⁴ Hermann's message, or rather his program for the conversion of the Jews, is clear. Like Richmar, Christians should not curse, castigate, or humiliate the Jews; they should instead demonstrate love, patience, and a perfect example of Christian piety. Only this will deliver Jews from error into the light of Christian truth.

Richmar was not the only supporting example of Hermann's suggested conversion program. He was particularly impressed, for instance, by the behavior of the monks he met during a visit, in the company of Bishop Egbert, to the monastery of Cappenberg.⁹⁵ He marveled at their self-denial, their obedience to superiors, and their all-consuming devotion to God, all the while pitying them for being excluded from God's law and His chosen people. Their example of holiness led him ultimately to doubt the

⁹³ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.86. "in episcopo magne discretionis, in eius autem dispensatore admirande fidei et precipuum perfecte caritatis imitentur exemplum"

⁹⁴ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.86-87. "ipse non me velut perfidum et christiano consortio indignum execratus est, sed mihi potius ac si conchristiano suo caritatis ac pietatis opera devotissime communicavit"

⁹⁵ This was a house of Premonstratensian canons. On the community, see Manfred Petry, "Die ältesten Urkunden und die frühe Geschichte des Prämonstratenserstiftes Cappenberg in Westfalen (1122-1200)," pt.1, *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 18 (1972): 143-289, pt.2, *ibid.*, 19 (1973): 55-64, 137-50 and Herbert Grundmann, *Der Cappenberger Barbarossakopf und die Anfänge des Stiftes Cappenberg*, Münstersche Forschungen 12 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1959).

justice of his own tradition. He wrote, “Groaning within myself, I contemplated these things and . . . contended with God for a judgment on behalf of these monks, [and] immediately a huge weight of confusion arose in my heart concerning the self-contradictory and diverse laws of Jews and Christians.”⁹⁶ It was on that occasion that he first prayed for God to reveal to him the truth of Christianity, a desire which, in his description, God “deferred for a long time but did not snatch away.”⁹⁷ The pious example of the monks thus led him, like Richmar’s kindness, to question his tradition and seek for Christian truth. As a canon writing about the process of his conversion long, cloistered years after the fact, Hermann’s message to his fellow monks and canons was simply that living the monastic life of self-denial and obedience could actually bring about the conversion of the Jews, perhaps more quickly and effectively than active debate, political pressure, or legal disparagement.

Still, even after witnessing Richmar’s example, Egbert’s teachings, Rupert’s debate, the admirable life of the canons of Cappenberg, and a number of other profound experiences, Hermann remained unconvinced of the wisdom of departing from his ancestral religion to join with the Christians. It was during this time, as he recalled with horror, that he gave into carnal desires and married the woman his parents had arranged for him. For a time, the connubial state eased his mind, but he soon returned to the searching, doubt, and despair he had experienced previously when weighing the virtues and faults of the two religions. He was rescued from his anguished state, he recalled, by the examples of two religious women. Concerning this “Bertha and Glismut,” whom he

⁹⁶ Hermann, *Opusculum*, ch.6: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.91-92. “ista mecum gemebundus tractarem, et pro illis claustralibus . . . cum Deo iudicio contenderem, grandis continuo cordi meo de contrariis atque diversis a se Iudeorum et Christianorum legibus ambiguitatis ortus est scrupulus.”

⁹⁷ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.93. “diu . . . distulit, sed non abstulit desiderium”

had met, we may assume, during his rounds with Bishop Egbert in Cologne, he wrote, “Their holy manner of life had spread the sweetest aroma of good reputation throughout the entire vicinity of that city.”⁹⁸ Hoping that they could bring enlightenment in the midst of his darkness and doubt, “I hurried to them with all haste and revealed to them, with many tears, the degree to which I was threatened by the torments of temptation. I beseeched them humbly that they would find it in their hearts to direct their prayers to God for my enlightenment.”⁹⁹ Their prayers and piety succeeded where others had failed: “Not at all long after this, due to their merits and prayers, so great a brightness of Christian faith shone suddenly in my heart that it completely drove away from it the darkness of all former doubt and ignorance.”¹⁰⁰ At this seminal point in his narrative, Hermann again referred to his suggested program for converting Jews, directing his observations specifically at women like his own Bertha and Glismut: “O you devout and holy women . . . know that the quieter your prayers are, the purer they are, and thus the more effective they are in the sight of God for procuring whatever one seeks.”¹⁰¹ As a final comment on his now-complete conversion, he exhorted, “Look at me, whom neither the reasoned argument [*ratio*] on faith laid out for me by many, nor the debate with great clerics, could convert to the faith of Christ; it took the devout prayer of simple women to

⁹⁸ Ibid., ch.12: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.107. “sancta conversatio suavissimum bone opinionis odorem per totam civitatis illius diffuderat viciniam.”

⁹⁹ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.107-08. “ad ipsas omni cum festinatione perrexi eisque, quantis temptationum stimulis perurgerer, multis cum lacrimis aperui, et ut pro mea illuminatione suas ad Deum preces dirigere dignaretur, suppliciter exoravi.”

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.108. “Haud multo enim post tempore meritis ipsarum et precibus tanta repente cordi meo christiane fidei claritas infulsit, ut ab eo totius pristinae dubietatis et ignorantie tenebras penitus effugaverit.”

¹⁰¹ Ibid. “O vos . . . devote et sancte mulieres . . . scientes orationes vestras quanto quietiores, tanto esse sinceriores tantoque esse ante Dei conspectum ad impetranda quolibet efficaciores.”

draw me in.”¹⁰² By pointing to the example of these women, Hermann spelled out clearly his prescription for bringing about the conversion of his former coreligionists.

Still, despite these very measured sentiments about the process of conversion, Hermann still did not entirely rule out the prospect of forced conversion, although he expressed his opinion on the matter in very different terms than either Rupert or Guibert. The forced conversion displayed in his narrative is that of his seven-year-old half-brother, whom he stole away from his house in Cologne and subsequently deposited as an oblate in a monastery when he made his final break from the Jewish community. His thoughts on the matter illustrate his optimism that Jews are able to convert sincerely to Christianity and, indeed, that many of them are simply in need of a guide (not an enforcer) to lead them to the truth. He remarked, for instance, that he “did not wish to depart from Egypt—that is, from the darkness of Jewish unbelief—empty-handed.”¹⁰³ He wished for his brother “to be, with me, co-heir of divine grace through baptism.”¹⁰⁴ The potential grief of the boy’s family did give him brief pause (he notes that upon finding him gone, the boy’s mother became “as one mad”), yet he obliterated that fleeting sentiment by exhorting that “one should by no means resist the ordinance of God.”¹⁰⁵ His conviction that he was “serving that ordinance” gave him enough motivation to carry out this deed, despite the negative consequences for those he once considered family. In his mind, he was saving the willing soul of one trapped in iniquity by family circumstances not of his

¹⁰² Ibid. “Ecce enim me, quem ad fidem Christi nec reddita mihi a multis de ea ratio nec magnorum potuit clericorum convertere disputatio, devota simplicium feminarum attraxit oratio.”

¹⁰³ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.109. “nolebam . . . de Egipto, tenebris videlicet iudaice infidelitatis, vacuus exire”

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. “divine mecum gratie per lavacrum regenerationis fieri optabam coheredem”

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.115. “Dei ordinationi nequaquam resistere”

own choosing. This was not the coerced, potentially unwilling conversion prescribed by Rupert in his Genesis commentary, nor did Hermann share Guibert's conviction that Jews, even when converted as children, do not make good Christian converts. On the contrary, his conviction that his half-brother was, like him, a willing participant and a ready-made Christian led him to attempt the deed in the first place. Moreover, his confidence in his brother's future as a Christian led him quickly to leave the boy in the care of the monks of Flonheim, "so that he might instructed in holy letters by them."¹⁰⁶ Having reclaimed an innocent soul from Jewish error, he moved on (both in the narrative and in his own life) to work on his own salvation.

7.5 The Patient Stance, or Waiting for God's Miracles

Many monastic authors in the second half of the twelfth century followed Hermann in adopting a patient approach to Jewish conversion. Some joined Hermann in stressing the importance of Christian example in the quest to convert Jews. More commonly (and this diverged a bit from Hermann) they settled down to the thought that the Jews' conversion would only come through God's miraculous intervention. Miracles, they opined, had led and would continue to lead a few individual Jews to convert, and miracles would, of course, be the main catalyst in the wholesale conversion of the Jews at the end of the world. Put another way, the monastic authors of the late twelfth century were usually content simply to follow the aforementioned trope of the eschatological Jew (of which miraculous conversion was a major component) in their writings about Jewish converts, even when treating actual conversion stories. It is important to stress that this patient stance did not overturn the continued insistence among monastic writers that Jews

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.: MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.116. "ut sacris per eos litteris imbueretur"

were apostate enemies of Christianity or that they were still guilty for the crucifixion of Christ. Indeed, late twelfth-century authors remained just as insistent as their earlier counterparts that the Jews were every bad thing the patristic fathers, and their medieval imitators, accused them of being. Still, they stopped carrying on the notion that Jews did not make good Christians once converted, especially if a miracle precipitated their conversion, and they stopped calling for forced conversion altogether.

Two works written in the mid-twelfth century—that is, a generation or so after Hermann of Scheda—display attitudes toward Jewish conversion that are similar to those revealed in Hermann’s account of his own conversion. Unlike Hermann’s account, however, neither of these works were explicitly about the conversion of the Jews; rather, they treated that topic in the context of a broader story. Consequently, to piece together the views on conversion revealed therein, one must read between the lines when interpreting these texts.

The first of these texts—already examined by Haverkamp and others—was produced in the Benedictine monastery of Egmont some time in the 1170s or 1180s.¹⁰⁷ Although that house lay in Friesland, the Annal purported to cover events that took place in Bavaria. As Haverkamp points out, Egmont was so remote that the monks of that abbey probably had no interaction with Jews or much knowledge of Jewish society in Germany.¹⁰⁸ However, the annalist claimed to have heard the tale in question from a Jew who had converted to Christianity, which may have contributed to the relatively open-

¹⁰⁷ Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 279-82.

¹⁰⁸ Haverkamp explains, “No doubt, no member of the convent would ever have seen a Jew, let alone known a Jewish community.” Ibid., 280. The text refers to certain aspects of Jewish education that did not exist in this period, a feature that leads Haverkamp to conclude that the author “was not acquainted with Judaism in German lands.” Ibid., 282.

minded stance the text evinced toward its Jewish characters.¹⁰⁹ In any case, the annalist's opinion of Jewish conversion seems to have been much more in line with that of Hermann of Scheda than the texts of the early crusade era.

The passage most relevant to this discussion recounted events that supposedly took place in Regensburg in 1137. The narrative of the story followed, to some extent at least, *exempla* that had been in existence since Late Antiquity. Its resemblance with the oft-repeated tale of the Jewish boy pushed into the oven by his father, for example, is obvious.¹¹⁰ However, it departed enough from stock tales, and it reveals enough about twelfth-century monastic opinions on Jewish conversion, to be of interest here.

According to the Egmont annalist, there lived in Regensburg a certain Jewish youth who, like the subjects of many such tales and a bit like Hermann of Scheda himself, was convinced by the doctrines of Christianity and attracted to the Christian community. Although he longed for baptism, he was afraid of his father, a notorious Jewish financier of great wealth, and he dreaded falling into the poverty that characterized the lives of many Jewish converts to Christianity. Consequently, he kept his desire for baptism hidden as he gradually secreted a large sum of gold and silver from his father's fortune. Once he had accumulated enough money to live comfortably after baptism, he approached an archdeacon of one of the Regensburg churches, handed over to him part of his collected money, and asked him for help in attaining baptism.¹¹¹ The cleric, however, fell prey to greed and put off the youth's baptism while he came up with a plot to secure

¹⁰⁹ *Annales Egmondani*: MGH SS 16.454. "ex ore cuiusdam Iudei christiani"

¹¹⁰ See the discussion of this tale in Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 8-39.

¹¹¹ The payment seems to have been a kind of "good faith" deposit or "earnest" money. As the son of a financier, the Jewish youth in this instance may have been imitating the business practices of the medieval financial realm—that is, offering an up-front payment to initiate a relationship.

the boy's fortune for himself. To that end, he sought out the Jewish father and offered to hand over the son in exchange for the money already entrusted to him. With this agreement reached, the cleric turned the boy over to his father, despite the boy's "groaning and wailing" for his lost opportunity to be baptized.¹¹² The Jewish mother and father then tried desperately ("daily with flattery, daily with threats"¹¹³) to convince their son to renounce his faith in Christ, but the youth refused utterly. Rebuffed completely, the Jewish father saw no other alternative but to put his son to death; he thus bound the boy's legs with chains, weighted him down with lead, and cast him clandestinely into the Danube.

The didactic purpose of this text was to demonstrate that miracles come through faith in Jesus Christ, so the murder in the story was followed by a faith-promoting miracle. Some time after the murder, a certain very pious, blind widow, who often attended services at an abbey located next to the river, heard matins being sung before the set time for that office. Wanting to be present for the liturgy, she inquired at the monastery and was told that the office had not yet begun. This process repeated itself two more times. After her third trip to the abbey, the widow stopped by the Danube to wet her eyes with water from the river. Upon doing this, her sight was restored miraculously, and she saw the Jewish boy's corpse suspended in the river, surrounded by a light. She reported this vision to the convent, and the news quickly found its way to the bishop. The bishop then led a procession of monks and other clerics to the river, where they managed to bring the luminous body—the *corpus martiris*—to the riverbank,

¹¹² *Annales Egmondani*: MGH SS 16.454. "gemitu et ululatibus"

¹¹³ *Ibid.* "cotidie blandiciis, cotidie minis"

whence it was translated into the cathedral. News of the miracle spread quickly, and the next day the entire town went to the cathedral to see the corpse, which was soon hailed as a holy relic. Included in their number were the town's Jews, since, as the annalist puts it, Jews are "ever seekers of signs."¹¹⁴ Recognizing the corpse's identity, the Jews reported that he was a certain "Iacob, filium Ysaac Iudei." Upon learning this, the bishop interrogated the boy's father, who claimed initially that he had sent his son to study in Spain but finally, under pressure due to the testimonies of the other Jews, admitted to drowning his son. He also revealed the role of the greedy archdeacon who betrayed the boy for money. Subsequently, the bishop ordered this cleric to be defrocked and turned over for further punishment to the local castellan. He was ultimately paraded in shame through the city before being burnt to death. Even after its honorable interment, the boy's body continued to evince "signs and wonders."¹¹⁵ The annalist detailed the fate of the Jews, including the murderous parents, in his concluding remarks about this story: "But his father and mother and an abundant multitude of Jews believed in Christ, and his martyrdom is today in that place the cause and impetus for the Jews to believe in Christ."¹¹⁶

Given its resemblance to earlier *exempla*, its miraculous content, and its second-hand nature, it is not likely that this represents a portrayal of actual events and instead constitutes a pious wish for God to bring about Jewish conversion through miraculous means. However, the author took this story seriously; he treated it as an authentic case of

¹¹⁴ Ibid. "signorum ab antiquo quesitores" That Jews would turn out to witness a supposedly Christian miracle is interesting.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 455. "signis choruscat et prodigiis"

¹¹⁶ Ibid. "Pater autem eius et mater et Iudeorum copiosa multitudo in Christum credidit, et est hodie in illis locis martyrium eius causa et fomes in Christum credendi Iudeis."

Jewish conversion, so it is fitting to compare his attitudes with those of other authors who wrote about actual Jewish conversion in this era. Like Hermann, this annalist adopted a patient, cautious stance toward Jewish conversion, although his understanding of how that conversion would take place diverged starkly from that of Hermann. Rather than wait for the Jews to amend their wicked ways, the author asserted, God could in his due time simply transform them immediately and miraculously. Indeed, in the conclusion of the story, that is precisely what happened. Before their conversion, the Jewish characters in the story displayed many of the worst attributes often ascribed to Jews in this period. The father was greedy (i.e., accumulated his fortune through usury), insidious (i.e., plotted secretly with the avaricious cleric), and so unwavering in his determination to prevent his son's baptism, despite the boy's sincere faith, that he ultimately murdered him (thus unwittingly effecting his redemptive baptism). The annalist even stated that he "returned happy" after perpetrating this horrific crime.¹¹⁷ Moreover, when questioned about his son's death, the father confessed to the crime and placed himself at the mercy of the law. Nevertheless, both the former perfidious way of life and the unspeakable crimes of these Jewish parents seem to have been forgiven and forgotten at the end of the narrative when the miracle convinced them of the truth of Christianity and prompted their and the other Jews' conversions.

At first glance, it may seem strange that the cleric, whose guilt lay in avarice, not murder, was executed while the Jews who killed their own son in cold blood went free, but that puzzling element was absolutely essential to convey the two-fold message of the

¹¹⁷ Ibid. "laetus rediit"

story.¹¹⁸ On the one hand, the tale was supposed to caution its monastic audience about the consequences of greed—the avaricious cleric served as an obvious negative example to expected behavior. More importantly for our purposes here, the story was meant to instruct its audience on the subject of Jewish conversion. Specifically, it declared that the Jews, even in spite of all their character flaws and wicked deeds, could and would convert through the direct intervention of the divine. In the meantime, suggested the annalist, monks and other clerics should limit their interaction with Jews, lest they fall prey to greed and end up like the cleric in the story. They should also aid those Jews who seek their help to convert and trust that God will deal with the rest of them in his due time. With that message, the Egmont Annal falls firmly into the tradition of Hermann of Scheda in recommending a patient stance on the subject of Jewish conversion.

Also assuming this more patient stance toward the Jews of Christendom was the *Ludus de Antichristo*, a liturgical play written most likely at the monastery of Tegernsee in the late 1150s or early 1160s and already discussed briefly in an earlier chapter.¹¹⁹ Although this work did not address actual conversions directly and was concerned with the Jews of the *Eschaton*, the attitudes that it evinces toward Jewish conversion in general fit well with other texts from the second half of the twelfth century, including Hermann

¹¹⁸ Even Haverkamp seems perplexed by this, noting in a parenthetical comment that “the father’s crime seems to have been forgotten.” Haverkamp, “Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century,” in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Signer and Van Engen, 281.

¹¹⁹ There exist several printed editions of this text, including Karl Young, ed., *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2.369-96, Gerhard Günther, *Der Antichrist: Der staufische Ludus de Antichristo* (Hamburg: F. Wittig, 1970), Stefano Piacenti, ed., *Ludus de Antichristo: Rappresentazione dell’Anticristo*, *Classici Christiani* 295 (Siena: Cantagalli, 2001), and the English translation by John Wright, *The Play of the Antichrist* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1967). The citations here will come from Young’s edition. For descriptions and examinations of this text, see, in addition to the introductory material in the critical editions, Horst Dieter Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1973), 365-415 and Bernard McGinn, *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 133-35.

of Scheda, and thus make it worth discussing here. That this is a monastic work is beyond doubt; still, some scholars have argued that the play was performed for large audiences, perhaps in a town square or other public setting, and possibly even in the court of Frederick Barbarossa.¹²⁰ The stage directions, however, suggest a more intimate setting, most likely a monastic church.¹²¹ The size of the audience does not impact the argument here; suffice it to say that the play is the work of a monk who had both access to works detailing the Antichrist tradition and the creativity to contribute his own unique perspective to that tradition. The author appears to have drawn upon various works of eschatology, most notably Adso's *Libellus de Antichristo*.¹²² Despite the obvious influences, the Tegernsee author exhibited a number of original ideas about the rise of the Antichrist and the *eschaton*. His depiction of Jews, in particular, departed in significant ways from Adso's book and other authoritative works.

The action of the play proceeds as follows. The various peoples of the earth—personified as *Gentilitas*, *Synagoga*, and *Ecclesia*—begin the play by proclaiming their spiritual positions in respective songs. Essentially, *Gentilitas* (paganism, in other words) touts the worship of many gods, *Synagoga* declares salvation through one God, and

¹²⁰ Rauh, 368. The argument for public performance of the *Ludus* is largely based on the apparent criticism of the play, or rather of the clerics who wrote and performed the play, by Gerhoh of Reichersberg in his *De investigatione Antichristi* 1.5: MGH Ldl 3.315. Gerhoh condemned clergymen who spend their time not in service to God, but rather “in practices of avarice, vanities, and spectacles, to such an extent that they transform their very churches, those houses of prayer, into theatres and fill them with extravagant spectacles of plays.” Gerhoh went on to express concern, both because women watch these spectacles and because some of the plays deal with the topic of the Antichrist. “Et sacerdotes, qui dicuntur, iam non ecclesie vel altaris ministerio dediti sunt, sed exercitiis avariciae, vanitatum et spectaculorum, adeo ut ecclesias ipsas, videlicet orationum domus, in theatra commutent ac mimiciis ludorum spectaculis impleant. Inter que nimirum spectacula, astantibus ac spectantibus ipsorum feminis, interdum et Antichristi.” Still, as McGinn points out, we cannot be certain that Gerhoh was referring to this particular play. See McGinn, 320, n.77.

¹²¹ See the discussion in the introduction of Wright, *The Play of the Antichrist*, 52-56.

¹²² Andrew Gow, *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 105-06, 112.

Ecclesia proclaims redemption through Christ. After these speeches, all of which continue to be chanted throughout the play, the Roman (i.e., German) emperor proceeds to conquer the entire world. He first subdues the king of the Franks by the sword, then afterward receives the fealty of the king of the Greeks (i.e., the Byzantine emperor) and the king of Jerusalem (still controlled in this period by the Crusaders), thus consolidating his control over the western, Christian world. When the king of Babylonia attacks Jerusalem, the Roman emperor defeats him in battle. After the battle, the emperor enters the temple and renounces his kingdom, placing his crown and scepter on the altar as gifts to God. His well-meant abdication unfortunately creates a space into which the Antichrist emerges as the world's dominant power.

Both by conquering with the sword and by employing hypocrisy and heresy to beguile and convince the kings of the world to join with him, the Antichrist easily subdues the kings of Jerusalem, of the Greeks, and of the Franks before turning his attention to the king of the Teutons. Though he fails to woo that king and, afterward, loses to him on the battlefield, the Antichrist still manages to win the Germans to his cause by performing several apparent, though fake, miracles, including raising of one of his knights from the dead. Ultimately, the German king gives his fealty to the Antichrist, who then orders his new vassal to convert the Gentiles by the sword. This task accomplished, the Antichrist finally turns his attention to *Synagoga*. The hypocrites convince her by proclaiming that the Antichrist is the long-promised Messiah and, echoing Julian the Apostate, by granting her the ancient promised land. With the Jews on board, the Antichrist holds the entire world in his grasp.

Into this dismal situation, the Old Testament prophets Enoch and Elijah emerge. Surprisingly, they go first to *Synagoga* and expose the Antichrist as a fraud. Their words convince the Jews of his deception and convert them finally to a belief in Christ. When the Antichrist fails to turn them back to his side, he orders his servants to kill them, along with the aforementioned prophets. Although he succeeds in this task, his plot is exposed and his hold over the nations is broken completely. While *Ecclesia* exhorts the various peoples to rise up and overthrow him, the heavens conspire against him as well, leading to his downfall and the eternal ascendancy of the church and kingdom of God.

As scholars have pointed out, the depiction of the Jews in the *Ludus de Antichristo* is almost completely devoid of the anti-Jewish sentiment that appears so frequently in works of the high Middle Ages.¹²³ Moreover, the sinister connections drawn between the Jews and the Antichrist that show up frequently in medieval depictions of the *eschaton* do not make an appearance in this text. The reason for this lack of acrimony is both puzzling and open for debate. Andrew Gow suggests that such connections did not begin to be drawn explicitly until the later Middle Ages.¹²⁴ However, as we have seen in the earlier exploration of monastic writings from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the close tie between the eschatological Jews and the Antichrist had been described earlier than Gow posits. It was even hinted at, though not well-developed, in some of the monks' patristic sources. While this does not mean that the association

¹²³ In an introductory essay to his translation, for instance, John Wright states, "The sympathetic role played by Synagoga and the Jews in the *Play of the Antichrist* is unusual and striking enough to merit special attention even in a brief discussion of this drama." Wright, 57. Wright concludes the same essay by proclaiming that "the inescapable fact remains that in his treatment of the Jews the author of the *Play of the Antichrist* showed a broadly based, tolerant humanity which for his time, and in fact for most periods in history, is unfortunately very rare." Ibid., 61.

¹²⁴ Gow, *The Red Jews*, 107-12. This is not to say that Gow is entirely incorrect in his assertions about the way this connection evolved over time. Late medieval texts were certainly more explicit in uniting the idea of the Antichrist with the idea of the treacherous Jew.

with the Antichrist was an essential part of the perceived Jewish identity in medieval Christian society, it is certain that many Christian thinkers considered that sinister connection when thinking about Jews.

So, despite the existence of this pejorative conception in other works from this period, the play's depiction of the Jews, and particularly the portrayal of their conversion to Christ, still remained free of even a hint of acrimony. In fact, the playwright depicted them as spiritual heroes. Over the course of the play, the Jews are the last people to join the side of the Antichrist, and, more significantly, they are the first, and actually the only (at least in the chronology covered by the play), people to oppose him once the prophets reveal his true nature.¹²⁵ Moreover, the Jews not only convert but also do so at the peril of their own lives, even as the other allies of the Antichrist, most of them former Christians, fail to follow their example. Their conversion is immediate, sincere, and binding. As soon as they realize their error in following the Antichrist, they testify of the Trinity, the very doctrine they were thought to be most against, by exclaiming, "We give thanks to you, Adonai, King of glory, Trinity of Persons, one in substance. The Father is truly God, as is His only-begotten; the spirit of both is the same God."¹²⁶ Centuries of conflict over this issue are dispelled in a moment, with no lingering reluctance or lack of commitment. So utter is their commitment to Christ that the converted Jews are perfectly willing to

¹²⁵ In his commentary on the text, Wright pays particular attention to this feature. He notes, "Despite the obvious humanity and sympathy of the *Antichrist* playwright, there remains something of a mystery in the fact that he should allow the Jews along among all men on earth (the Prophets of course are sent from Heaven) to be the possessors of God's truth at the End of the world." He points out that this feature differs fundamentally from the playwright's main source, Adso's *Libellus*. Wright attempts to account for this by offering two possible explanations: either the playwright was employing simple dramatic economy or he had misread Adso. Wright, 60.

¹²⁶ *Ludus de Antichristo*: Young, 2.385-86. "Tibi gratias damus, Adonay, Rex glorie, / Personarum trinitas eiusdem substantie. / Vere pater Deus est, cuius unigenitus / Deus est. Idem Deus est amborum spiritus."

suffer martyrdom at the hands of the Antichrist. In this vein, *Synagoga* proclaims, “ Having repented of error, we convert to the faith, prepared to endure whatever the persecutor inflicts on us.”¹²⁷ After this declaration, the Jews, along with the heaven-sent prophets, are the only ones to be killed for their belief by the Antichrist. Their sacrifice seems to atone for their previous unbelief and purchase their salvation.

One wonders what motivated the Tegernsee monk who penned this play to include such a favorable account of the Jews’ dealings with the Antichrist and their eventual conversion to Christianity, especially given the obvious influence of Adso’s treatise on this text. It may be that he simply rejected the negative elements of Adso’s portrayal and chose instead to focus on the more positive elements of the eschatological narrative of the Jews. However, that does not account for his treatment of Jews as heroic martyrs, a characteristic this narrative shares with the text of Honorius Augustodunensis discussed in an earlier chapter. Both authors—contemporaries in time and place—seem to have taken the most optimistic portrayals of the converting synagogue from the *Gloss* on the Canticle and pressed that depiction even further.

Whatever the author’s motivation, the portrayal of the eventual conversion of the Jews in the *Play of the Antichrist* is certainly representative of the second period identified in this chapter. Most obviously, there exists in the text no suggestion that Jews cannot convert sincerely to Christianity. Their response to the teachings of the Old Testament prophets, and their loyalty to Christ even in the face of certain death, dispels any such doubt. Moreover, like the Egmont Annal and other texts from this period, the *Play of the Antichrist* portrays a miracle—in this case, the appearance of Enoch and

¹²⁷ Ibid.: Young, 2.387. “Nos erroris penitet, ad fidem conuertimur; / Quicquid nobis inferet persecutor, patimur.

Elijah—as the key catalyst for Jewish conversion. While the playwright expressed some skepticism about miracles by including the false wonders of the Antichrist in the narrative, the miraculous appearance of heavenly messengers is still the factor that sways the Jews to adopt Christianity. Finally, the text displays the kind of patience in waiting for that promised eventuality that characterizes the writings of Hermann of Seda and other authors of the second half of the twelfth century. While several factors may account for this attitude, it seems important to suggest that the increasingly-favorable position of the Jews in the political, social, and economic spheres of the high medieval empire contributed to the monastic author's interpretation of this story. The very fact that the Jews stand on the same stage with the church and kings of the world in the opening scenes of the play hints at the status they occupied in this world.

In addition to these compelling sources, other monastic authors seem to have thought about Jewish conversion along similar lines. With his inclusion of three miracle stories about Jewish conversion in his sermon collection, the *Speculum Ecclesiae*, Honorius Augustodunensis falls into this category. These three narratives were not original to Honorius. Like many high medieval *exempla*, they came from patristic sources. However, their inclusion in this collection of sermons intended for monastic audiences still provides further evidence of this shift in emphasis from general skepticism of Jewish converts to patient expectation of Jewish conversion through direct, divine intervention. As Michael Signer explains, Honorius, despite his mockery and condemnation of the Jews in other instances, held “the hope for the conversion of the Jews” to be “another form of *caritas*.”¹²⁸ These narratives represent Honorius's attempt

¹²⁸ Signer, “The *Speculum Ecclesiae* by Honorius Augustodunensis on Jews and Judaism: Preaching at Regensburg in the Twelfth Century,” in *Crossroads of Medieval Civilization*, ed. DuBruck and Göller, 128.

to exercise that all-important virtue and to encourage his brother monks to cultivate it as well.

The first and briefest example in Honorius's collection concerns St. Basil of Caesaria, a monastic saint, and comes from a sermon for the Octave of Christmas. After recounting some of the other miracles from the life of Basil, including his preservation of Caesarea from the wrath of Emperor Julian the Apostate, Honorius reiterated a tale about Basil's interaction with a Jewish physician. This Jew, according to the story, had foretold Basil's immediate death. The text does not elaborate on how the Jew came by this knowledge, but it does accept this prediction as certain, at least without the intervention of a divine miracle. Honorius explained that Basil was able to "delay the hour of death through prayer," at least long enough to "add the Hebrew, through faith, to the number of the faithful." Having accomplished this, Basil "entered into the joy of his Lord."¹²⁹ While this narrative does not contain a lot of detail about the interaction between Basil and the Jew—other than to suggest that the Jew was a respected physician¹³⁰ and to note roughly that the Jew first predicted Basil's death, then converted when Basil managed to delay it--Honorius's point was nevertheless clear. The prayer of the faithful monk brought about a divine miracle, which in turn convinced the Jew of the truth of Christianity.

Honorius drove this point home again by imparting another patristic miracle tale, this one about St. Helen, the mother of Emperor Constantine, and her journey to

¹²⁹ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Speculum Ecclesiae*: PL 172.844B-C. "Quidam medicus Hebraeus ei instantem mortem praedixit; sed Basilius orando horam mortis distulit et Hebraeum per fidem numero fidelium addidit. Hoc peracto in gaudium Domini sui introivit."

¹³⁰ This would not have been surprising to monastic readers, since Jews were known for their work as physicians. The most thorough study of the medieval Jewish physician remains Joseph Shatzmiller, *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

Jerusalem to find the true cross of Jesus.¹³¹ Upon arriving, narrated Honorius, she inquired of the Jews where the sacred object was located. The Jews initially pleaded ignorance, so Helen threatened to execute them if they did not reveal what they knew. Frightened by this ultimatum, the Jews sent to Helen one of their leaders, a certain Judas, who also pleaded ignorance of the cross's location. However, after more coercion, Judas finally agreed to reveal the place. When the entourage of Christians and Jews arrived at the location, an earthquake opened up the ground, revealing the buried cross of Jesus, as well as those of the two thieves with whom he was crucified. After witnessing this miracle, "Judas together with all the Jews believed in Christ and were baptized."¹³² Judas himself later became the bishop of Jerusalem and suffered martyrdom for the Christian cause. At first glance, this story might appear to fit better with the negative views of Jewish conversion advocated by the monks of the early twelfth century. After all, the Jews only revealed the location of the cross to Helen after she threatened them. However, this coercion was not the cause of the conversion; the miracle was the impetus that turned the Jews from their unbelief. Moreover, there was no doubt of the sincerity of the Jews' conversion once the miracle convinced them of the truth of Christianity. That Judas became such a prominent Christian authority and died for his new faith banished any notion that the Jews could not become true Christians. While Honorius included and even expanded upon other standard, negative tropes of Jews in this story—particularly notable was his insistence that the Jews (not the Romans) drove the nails through the

¹³¹ Honorius, *Speculum Ecclesiae*: PL 172.947-48.

¹³² Ibid.: PL 172.948A. "Judas cum omnibus Judaeis Christo credens baptizatur"

hands and feet of Jesus¹³³—his view of conversion was still in line with other authors of the late twelfth century.

The last of Honorius's Jewish conversion narratives—called simply “the Jewish boy” by scholars—was one of the most popular miracle tales of the entire medieval period, particularly for monks.¹³⁴ Miri Rubin notes that “in the twelfth century the tale circulated in the exclusive circles of monastic devotions,” though with its translation into the vernacular in the thirteenth century it became even more popular and may have served as an inspiration for host desecration narratives.¹³⁵ Since it is a Marian miracle tale, it was often included in popular collections of that genre.¹³⁶ Honorius included it, not surprisingly, in his sermon for the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin. In the story, a Jewish boy attends Mass with his Christian friends and is inspired by the depictions of Mary and Jesus above the altar. During the distribution of the Eucharist, the boy sees the infant Jesus offering the communion to the congregation along with the priest. Impressed, the boy receives the wafer himself before leaving the church and returning home. When he tells his father about his experience, the father becomes enraged, stokes the furnace, and shoves his son into the flames. The boy's mother calls for help, prompting a crowd to hasten to the Jews' house. Upon opening the furnace, they discover the boy alive, completely unharmed by the fire. When asked how he survived the ordeal, the boy explains that “the lady whom I saw above the altar in the church” was in the furnace as

¹³³ Ibid. “clavos splendentes invenerunt quibus Judaei manus et pedes Domini foderunt”

¹³⁴ At least 33 instances of variations on this tale appear in medieval texts. Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Âge sur les juifs et le judaïsme*, 68, no.54.

¹³⁵ Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 8-39.

¹³⁶ Rubin notes that it became a standard part of the “Marian corpus in the 1120s.” Ibid., 9.

well; it was she protected him from the flames.¹³⁷ The witnesses rejoice at the miracle and ask the father if he will permit his son to be baptized. When the father refuses, the crowd pushes him into the furnace. The boy, his mother, and the other Jews who witnessed the scene are then baptized.

While this tale was not original to the late twelfth century, Honorius altered the basic story in ways that fit with the views of Jewish conversion that predominated in the mid to late twelfth century. Most obviously, all the Jews who witness the miracle, with the exception of the father, convert to Christianity immediately. Honorius insisted that this was the case for “all the Jews who were present.”¹³⁸ In earlier versions of the same story, this was not the case; the boy and his mother (and, due to the fame of the miracle, some other Jews) eventually convert in some versions, but it is not instantaneous.¹³⁹ As in other texts examined above, including Honorius’s other miracle tales, the miracle brings about the Jews’ conversion. Honorius’s most original contribution to the story is perhaps the most significant for our purposes. That is, even after witnessing both the attempted murder and the great miracle, the Christians assembled at the Jews’ house ask the father for permission to baptize his son. This minor, though unique and significant, detail of the story seems to have arisen from Honorius’s acquaintance with the privileged position of the Jews in the Empire of this period, specifically the strictures placed on the baptism of Jews: the three-day waiting period and other checks on forced or hasty

¹³⁷ Honorius, *Speculum ecclesiae*: PL 172.852C. “Dominam quam super altare in ecclesia vidi”

¹³⁸ Ibid.: PL 172.852D. “omnes qui aderant Judaeos”

¹³⁹ Compare, for instance, with the version found in Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine domini* 9.8: CM 16.60-61. Paschasius included the conversion of the boy and his mother and noted that some Jews in the same city were converted by the story, but Paschasius seems to indicate that this happened some time after the actual miracle.

baptism. That this element is not found in earlier versions of the story, including the versions propounded by such influential authors as Gregory of Tours¹⁴⁰, Paschasius Radbertus¹⁴¹, and Sigebert of Gembloux¹⁴², lends credence to this observation. Finally, there is no question of the sincerity of the Jews' conversion in Honorius's version. The only obstinate Jew—the father—is removed, and, like the converts in the other tales Honorius recounted, the former Jews proceed with their lives as Christians.

Evidence thus shows that monks' attitudes toward Jewish conversion experienced a significant shift in the middle of the twelfth century. Perhaps at least partially due to the influence of former Jews in the monastic ranks—men like Hermann of Scheda—monks in this era ceased to worry about the sincerity of Jews who converted. Moreover, they seem to have experienced less consternation over the failure of Jews to convert in large numbers. They were instead content to wait patiently either for the power of Christian example to take its effect on the Jews or, failing that, for God to work miracles that would bring about their conversion. These monks occupied a world wherein social and political relations between Jews and Christians were more stable than they had been in the aftermath of the First Crusade, a world wherein privileges provided protection and opportunity for Jews, including a secure defense against coercive conversion.

7.6 Caesarius of Heisterbach and Thirteenth-century Attitudes

The stability of Jewish-Christian relations in twelfth-century Germany thus appear to have influenced monastic opinions about Jewish converts in profound ways.

¹⁴⁰ Gregory of Tours, *De gloria beatorum martyrum*, ch.10: PL 71.714B-715B.

¹⁴¹ Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine domini* 9.8: CM 16.60-61.

¹⁴² Sigebert of Gembloux, *Chronica*: MGH SS 6.317.

But what happened to these attitudes in the thirteenth century, when the social and political status of Jews began to shift, albeit gradually, due to papal pressure, repeated irrational murder accusations, and ultimately the downfall of the imperial office after the death of Frederick II? The short answer is that they remained complicated; in fact, the clarity of mind on this issue that marked the early twelfth-century authors never returned. The fact that conversions of Jews to Christianity appear to have increased in number during this period may have had an influence on opinions and perhaps have offset the increasingly negative depictions of Jews that came from ritual murder and host desecration accusations, as well as other cultural stimuli.¹⁴³ Still, thirteenth-century monastic writings on this subject appear to have been a bit harsher toward the prospects of Jewish conversion than were the texts from the second half of the twelfth century. The complicated, slightly less friendly nature of monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion in this period will be viewed primarily through the lens of the *Dialogus Miraculorum*, a popular collection of *exempla* compiled by Caesarius of Heisterbach, a Cistercian monk, in the 1220s.

The *exempla* collected by Caesarius of Heisterbach constitute a compelling set of sources on the subject of Jewish conversion, and on general monastic attitudes toward Judaism, for several important reasons. Perhaps most importantly, they portray in stark detail the social, economic, and political contexts in which Jews and Christians interacted in the high medieval empire; the privileged status of the Jews—with its advantages and disadvantages—is on open display in these tales, as has been shown in the earlier

¹⁴³ Artwork, especially on and inside of churches, contained a number of highly pejorative images of Jews that may have influenced monastic and general attitudes toward Jews. On this trend, see Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) and Isaiah Shachar, *The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and its History* (London: Warburg Institute, 1974).

discussion of Jewish-monastic social interactions. In addition, one of the major points of this collection, it seems, was to inspire the hearers of these tales to convert, whether, in the case of non-Christians, to Christianity outright or, in the more common case of those who were already Christian, to a higher form of the Christian life. In many of the tales, not surprisingly, the protagonist or other characters end up converting to the monastic life. In fact, Caesarius titled the first book (out of twelve) in the collection “On Conversion,” and therein he explored the theological definition of conversion in addition to providing several exemplary tales on the subject.¹⁴⁴ However, since Caesarius defined “conversion” as an acceptance of the monastic life—“religious conversion” by its medieval definition—none of the tales in this part of the collection even involve Jews, much less describe the conversions of Jewish people. Other tales in the collection do describe conversions of Jews, but they invariably occur in the context of stories that have other moral lessons.

Four stories in Caesarius’s collection involve Jewish conversion, and each serves in its own way to demonstrate both the social and political aspects of conversion and the evolution of monastic ideas on this subject in the thirteenth century. The most straightforward of the tales concerns a Jewish maiden who, as Caesarius described her, “was inflamed by divine inspiration with a desire for baptism.”¹⁴⁵ When she expressed her desire to a Christian woman, the matron advised her to confide in a local knight named Conrad. The knight was delighted by her request and offered to help her achieve

¹⁴⁴ DM 1.2: Strange 1.7-8. He defined conversion as “a change of the heart, either from bad to good, or from good to better, or from better to best.” [“*Conversio est cordis versio, vel de malo in bonum, vel de bono in melius, vel de meliori in optimum.*”] Such a definition could feasibly include conversions of Jews, although Caesarius would likely have said their conversions were of the lowest variety—the “change . . . from bad to good.”

¹⁴⁵ DM 2.26: Strange 1.98. “*baptismi desiderio divinitus accensa*”

her desire. The girl's greatest fear was that her father would convince her to remain a Jew, so she asked the knight to prevent her father from seeing her for three days, a likely reference to the mandatory three-day wait before baptism stipulated in the privileges.¹⁴⁶ With this protection, she managed to avoid her father and go through with the baptism. A few days afterward, the girl's mother approached her and begged her to return to her ancestral faith. The girl refused, explaining that she had already been baptized. The mother claimed that she could undo the baptism by a kind of black magical procedure: "Said the Jewess, 'I will pull you up through the opening of a latrine three times, and thus the power of your baptism will remain there.'"¹⁴⁷ This offer so disgusted and frightened the girl that she cursed and spit at her mother before fleeing to the protection of her patron knight, who took her in as his own daughter.

The chief characteristic of this story, as with Caesarius's other tales about Jewish conversion, is ambivalence; it agrees in some aspects with the skeptical early twelfth-century of Jewish conversion and in other aspects with the more patient stance of Hermann of Scheda and other mid to late twelfth-century monastic authors. As we have seen, both views considered Jews to be depraved and wicked, and the mother's suggestion that the girl undo the baptism through a scatological, black magical rite certainly continues that line of thinking. The story also acknowledges the power Jews held in this world to hinder the conversions of their people—an aspect it shares in common with the late twelfth-century conception of the well-connected, privileged Jew. At the same time, it does express some skepticism, or at least acknowledges that some

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. The text is ambiguous here. While it mentions that the girl wanted to be protected for three days, it also says that she made this request of the knight "die quando baptizanda erat."

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. "Ego, inquit Judaea, tribus vicibus te sursum traham per foramen latrinae, sicque remanebit ibi virtus baptismi tui."

Christians would be skeptical, about the prospects of a Jewish convert like the girl in the tale, given her upbringing and proximity to such evil influences as are detailed in the story.

This ambivalent combination of skepticism and patience can also be seen in Caesarius's other miracle tales that involve Jewish conversion. Two of these tales are closely related; in fact, Caesarius included the second in his collection to prove a point that arose in the telling of the first. The first story details a love affair between a Jewish maiden and "a certain young cleric living in the same neighborhood, who fell in love with her, deflowered her, and impregnated her; for their houses were quite close together, and the cleric was able to enter all the time, without drawing attention, and to speak with the maiden whenever he pleased."¹⁴⁸ This, of course, constitutes yet another piece of evidence for the proximity between Christians and Jews discussed in an earlier chapter. In any case, the cleric, upon discovering the pregnancy, plots to conceal his misdeed and, at the same time, to humiliate the Jews. After instructing the Jewish maiden to continue to claim virginity, he manages, through trickery, to convince the girl's parents that she had conceived the child without coitus and that the child is the promised Jewish Messiah.¹⁴⁹ The parents spread the word among their fellow Jews, such that "as the time of the birth approached, many Jews assembled at the girl's house, eager to rejoice in this

¹⁴⁸ DM 2.24: Strange 1.94. "Hanc iuvenis quidam clericus, in vicino habitans, adamavit, devirginavit et impraegnavit. Erant enim domus illorum satis contiguae, et poterat idem clericus sine nota frequentius intrare, et pro libitu loqui cum virgine."

¹⁴⁹ As Caesarius recounted, the cleric stood outside the parents' window in the night and spoke through a reed inserted into the window, declaring, "your virgin daughter has conceived a son, and he will be the deliverer of your people Israel." The parents became convinced that the cleric's voice was that of an angel. Ibid. "filia vestra virgo concepit filium, et ipse erit liberator populi vestri Israel"

new nativity they had so long desired.”¹⁵⁰ Alas for the Jews, the girl gives birth to a daughter. Upon witnessing the baby’s gender, one of the Jews dashes it against the wall in a fit of rage. After hearing this disturbing ending to the tale, Caesarius’s novice in the dialogue asks what happened to the Jewish girl. The monk replies that her father tortured her until she confessed to every detail of the plot. At this point, Caesarius made his point about Jewish conversion by remarking, “It was pitiable that an infidel maiden who was seduced and ruined by a Christian man was not brought to the grace of baptism.”¹⁵¹ He concluded the tale, however, by remarking, “Perhaps the cleric was unable to bring this about, or, more likely, he did not take the trouble to pursue it, preferring to rejoice rather at the confounding of the Jews than at the enlightenment of the maiden.”¹⁵² This tale thus presents a much less confident view of Jewish conversion than Hermann’s text or other works from the second half of the twelfth century. Hope for Jewish conversion may still exist, but it is subordinated to other concerns. Most notably, the humiliation of the Jews takes precedence over the effort to convert them.

The shocking conclusion to the previous tale led Caesarius to remark, as a preface to his next story, “If . . . it was pitiable that the unbaptized was not enlightened through baptism, it is much more pitiable that in our own day one who had been baptized was

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.: Strange 1.95. “Instante tempore pariendi, multi ad domum puellae confluerunt Judaei, cupientes nova nativitate diu desiderati laetificari.”

¹⁵¹ Ibid. “Miserabile fuit, quod virgo infidelis ab homine fideli seducta ac corrupta, non est ad baptismi gratiam . . . perducta.”

¹⁵² Ibid. “Forte clericus hoc efficere non potuit, vel potius non curavit, magis gaudens de Judaeorum confusione, quam de puellae illuminatione.” While it may be simply the expression of a common, clerical desire to scorn Jews and other enemies, Caesarius’s comment about the cleric not being able to effect the girl’s baptism may also be a reference to the Jews’ power to stop the conversion and baptism of their fellow Jews. This comment may thus constitute further proof of the privileged position the Jews occupied in the Empire of this period.

compelled by a Christian bishop to return to Judaism.”¹⁵³ The next tale shows that, in Caesarius’s day, the Jews continued to possess some ability—through bribes and close relations with Christian authorities—to challenge and overturn even sincere conversions to Christianity. That ability, however, was far weaker than it had been only decades before. Like Caesarius’s other tales that address this subject, this one displays a more complicated and ambiguous opinion about Jewish conversion than the attitudes evinced in either of the earlier periods discussed above.

In this story, a young Jewish girl becomes convinced of the truth of Christianity while listening to her father’s frequent debates with a Christian cleric.¹⁵⁴ This cleric teaches the girl in secret and eventually helps her escape her father’s house, whereupon she is baptized and placed in a Cistercian convent.¹⁵⁵ At this point, the Jewish father begins a desperate quest to secure the return of his daughter. Of course, he has access to powerful Christian authorities, probably through the privilege or financial networks of which the Jews were a part in this period. The father approaches the duke and finds him initially willing to help, but the same cleric who had debated the father and aided the girl’s conversion threatens him with damnation to the point that he reneges on his commitment to the Jew. After searching unsuccessfully for another Christian advocate, the father finally manages to bribe the bishop of Liège, “who supported the Jew to such an extent, that he sent letters to the convent of nuns at Parc-aux-Dames, ordering them to

¹⁵³ Ibid. “Si . . . miserabile est, non baptizatam non illuminari per baptismum, multo miserabilius est, quod hodie ab Episcopo compellitur baptizata redire ad Iudaismum.”

¹⁵⁴ Caesarius noted that this cleric “was in the habit of entering the house of a Jew of that city and debating with him about the Christian faith.” Like the tale that precedes it immediately, this story provides more evidence of the social and intellectual proximity of Jews and Christians in this era. DM 2.25: Strange 1.96. “solitus erat intrare domum Iudaei eiusdem civitatis, et disputare cum eo de fide Christiana.”

¹⁵⁵ The fact that she belonged to Caesarius’s own order may have been the primary cause of his indignation over the subsequent attempts to return the girl to her family.

restore the girl to her father.”¹⁵⁶ The father even travels to the convent, confident in his ability to return home with his daughter in tow. The girl, now called Catherine, not knowing any of the machinations of her father or the bishop, senses that something is amiss when she “began to perceive a horrible stench, such that she said to everyone, ‘I do not know whence it comes, but a Jewish stench oppresses me.’”¹⁵⁷ Upon being informed that her parents have arrived and wish to see her, the girl comprehends the source of the noisome odor and refuses to hand herself over or even to grant her parents an audience. The matter is subsequently taken up by various legal entities, and the rest of the story centers on the bishop’s continued attempts to obtain the girl for her father, despite being chastised for his efforts by other churchmen. Finally, two Cistercian abbots, including the prominent abbot of Clairvaux, take up the girl’s case and obtain letters from the pope himself commanding the bishop to cease his harassment of the girl. The abbot of Clairvaux, upon being asked by the bishop why he has taken a personal interest in a case that, in the bishop’s estimation, has nothing to do with him, appears to sum up Caesarius’s own opinion on the matter by declaring, “‘It means a lot to me for two reasons; first because I am a Christian man, and second, because the convent in which she abides is of the lineage of Clairvaux.’”¹⁵⁸

Two features of this tale seem significant. Like the first of Caesarius’s stories discussed here, this tale hints at a skeptical Christian attitude of the prospects for Jewish

¹⁵⁶ Ibid. “Qui Iudaeo in tantum favebat, ut conventui sanctimonialium de Parco literis suis mandaret, quatenus illi filiam restituerent.” The fact that the villain of the story, at least the one from the Christian camp, is a secular cleric is not surprising, considering Caesarius’s obvious conviction that the secular clergy were easily corrupted and given to temptation and misdeed.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. “sentire coepit foetorem magnum, ita ut palam diceret: Nescio unde sit, foetor Iudaicus me gravat.”

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.: Strange 1.97. “Bene ad me, duplici ex causa. Primo, quia homo Christianus sum; secundario, quia domua illa, in qua deget, de linea Claraevallis est.”

converts. The source of the skepticism here is not the notion, propounded in the early twelfth century by Guibert and others, that Jews simply cannot overcome their Jewishness when they become Christians through baptism. Rather, it comes from the acknowledgement that Jews are well-placed enough in this society—that their power to bribe and corrupt is so considerable—that even some Christian authorities are willing to overturn legitimate conversion out of greed. Though the substance of the vexation is different, this story contains echoes of the frustrations expressed by early twelfth-century monks over the permitted return of the Jews to their mother religion in the aftermath of the First Crusade massacres. Still—and this is the second point—the Jews in this story have to approach several authorities before they find a willing partner; in other words, their ability to achieve their desired ends seems less certain than it was in the previous century. Caesarius’s tale appears to betray a world wherein the privileged Jewish position was beginning to be compromised. As discussed in the first chapter of this work, this was happening even as Jews were securing more and more detailed privileges from an array of Christian authorities. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the privileges had declined by the time Caesarius wrote in the 1220s and 1230s.

The difference in attitude between Caesarius and the monastic authors of the later twelfth century can perhaps be viewed best by comparing their respective treatments of a single *exemplum*: a story that appears, with slight variations, in both the twelfth-century Egmont Annal and the *Dialogus Miraculorum*. Like the story of “the Jewish boy,” this seems to have been a tale that achieved a fairly wide circulation in the high Middle Ages. In both its twelfth- and its thirteenth-century forms, the story contains the same basic plot. A cleric falls in lust with a young Jewish woman, and the pair engage in a sexual tryst on

Good Friday. Upon finding out about the illicit liaison, the Jews plot to bring shame on both the cleric and Christianity in general by revealing the cleric's sin at the church's Easter service. The errant cleric is assigned to participate in the service, and, upon seeing the Jews enter the church and understanding their sinister intent, he prays to God for forgiveness. God hears the prayer and miraculously takes away the voices of the Jews before they can inform the bishop and bring shame upon the cleric and the entire church. Both versions also contain some resolution to the story, although these differ in important ways. The differences between the two versions of the tale suggest, in subtle yet compelling ways, that a change in attitude toward Jews and Jewish conversion occurred between the mid-twelfth and mid-thirteenth centuries.¹⁵⁹

The first major difference involves the motivations of the Jews. In the earlier source, the girl consults with her father and the other Jews after entertaining the advances of the lustful cleric but before she agrees to the tryst. The Jews as a collective body then proceed to plot against the cleric in order to bring shame on the whole Christian church, even though they have to allow the girl to have sex with the cleric in order to do so. In contrast, Caesarius makes their affair a secret one, involving only the two lovers. In fact, the Jewish girl in Caesarius's version insists on keeping the liaison secret from her father—hence the need to meet for the tryst on Good Friday, when Jewish men like her father suffer from the bloody flux and are thus preoccupied.¹⁶⁰ It is only after discovering the illicit relationship that the Jewish father seeks revenge, and even then his primary

¹⁵⁹ Of course, some differences matter very little. For instance, the Egmont Annal placed the story's location in eastern France, near the Rhine River, while Caesarius claimed it took place in England.

¹⁶⁰ The belief that Jewish men suffered from a kind of menstruation on Good Friday, as a mark of their complicity in the crucifixion of Christ, seems to have been fairly common among Christians in this period. The most thorough study of the subject remains Willis Johnson, "The Myth of Jewish Male Menses," *Journal of Medieval History* 24 (1998): 273-95.

target is the offending cleric, not Christianity in general. In fact, when he finds the couple sleeping, he accuses the cleric of violating the honor of his religion. Nevertheless, this indignation directed against only a single individual is thwarted by God's miracle.

Another difference concerns the aftermath of the tryst and the Jews' attempt to reveal the cleric's sin to the local bishop. In the Egmont Annal version, the Jews show no fear at bringing this accusation to light in full public view. In fact, public exposure is an integral part of their plot. As the annalist described it, "They agreed that on the day of Easter observance, *in the presence of all the people*, with even the bishop standing by, they would 'declare arms,' as the expression goes, and, having revealed so great a crime on such an important occasion, they would bring shame not only on the cleric, but on all Christendom."¹⁶¹ In the privileged state that characterized mid-twelfth century Jewish life, the Jews were confident that they could take public action in such a manner as this, without fear of legal reprisal. Indeed, when the Jews in the story are finally able to make their case after the Easter service and its accompanying miracle, the bishop has the guilty cleric brought in "prostrate at [his] feet."¹⁶² This action suggests that the bishop probably would have sided with the Jews had the miracle not intervened to change the entire state of affairs. That is precisely the element of the story that, for the Egmont annalist, makes the miracle significant. With their insidious plots, the Jews of the story have the Christians backed into a corner from which only God can deliver them. The situation was apparently much different in Caesarius's period. The Jewish father in Caesarius's story is understandably outraged at the deflowering of his daughter, but he is also

¹⁶¹ *Annales Egmundani*, MGH SS 16.458: "condixerunt ut in ipsa die paschalis sollempnitatis, coram omni populo, astante etiam episcopo, ut vulgo dicitur arma clamarent, et deprehendo tali tempore tanto facinore, non modo clericum sed totam christianitatem confunderent."

¹⁶² Ibid. "diaconus et ipse prostratus episcopi pedibus"

frightened of the legal and social ramifications of making a public accusation against his daughter's lover. Caesarius recounted, "Seeing this young man lying at her side, he was horrified and bellowed with rage, and he considered killing him. However, when he realized that he was the bishop's kinsman, he restrained his hand out of fear of that man."¹⁶³ Furthermore, when the Jews actually enter the church, the bishop treats them with scorn; after they are unable to voice their accusations, he "indignantly ordered all of them to be driven out of the church."¹⁶⁴ Unlike the bishop in the Egmont Annal, he gives them no second chance to explain themselves. This reflects a mid-thirteenth world wherein the privileges and consequent close relations with authorities that Jews had once enjoyed were becoming more uncertain. Given that context, the father's fear of the bishop is understandable, since the hope of victory in a legal dispute remains uncertain, even if he has an ironclad case against the cleric.

One finds a final significant difference between the two texts, and, by extension, the attitudes of their authors toward the Jews and Jewish conversion, in their respective explanations of the effects of the miracle. While the nature of the miracle—the repentance of the lustful cleric followed by God striking the Jews dumb before they can reveal his crime—remains consistent across both accounts, the ultimate results differ starkly. In the Egmont Annal, as noted, the bishop gives the Jews a chance to explain themselves after the service during which the miracle occurred. The offending cleric then enters and confesses his deed with humility. After describing the cleric's confession, the annalist concluded the narrative by declaring that "by everyone together, Christians as

¹⁶³ DM 2.23: Strange 1.92. "Vidensque ad latus eius iam dictum iuvenem cubantem, expavit et infremuit, utrumque occidere cogitans. Cognoscens tamen quod esset cognatus Episcopi, timore illius manum cohibuit"

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.: Strange 1.93. "cum indignatione omnes de atrio ecclesiae expelli praecepit."

well as Jews, the name of Christ, the name blessed above all, was glorified with shouts, with sighs, and with prayers.”¹⁶⁵ In other words, the miracle turned the Jews from their wickedness to a belief in Christ. The purpose and sentiment of this narrative seem to fit with the attitudes evinced by other authors from the second half of the twelfth century. Like many of his contemporaries, the Egmont annalist envisioned the conversion of the Jews being accomplished by God himself through miracles.

Caesarius recounted a much different conclusion to the story. In his version, after casting the Jews out of the church and concluding the Easter service, the bishop receives the confession of the cleric. Instead of discussing this with the Jews like the bishop in the earlier text, Caesarius’s bishop simply marvels privately at the miracle and counsels the cleric “to marry lawfully the girl whom he had deflowered, after she was renewed through the grace of baptism.”¹⁶⁶ This seemed to the bishop the best course of action; he “preferred that the young man should forego ecclesiastical benefices, than that the girl should remain in her wicked, ancestral traditions and thus be exposed to many dangers.”¹⁶⁷ According to Caesarius, the cleric did marry the Jewish girl, and they both eventually joined the Cistercian Order, a turn of events that Caesarius certainly found very positive, perhaps the best of all possible outcomes. Since secular clerics seem to be the ones always getting into trouble in Caesarius’s stories, the fact that this one ended up in a monastery surely increased his potential for righteousness, at least in Caesarius’s

¹⁶⁵ *Annales Egmondani*: MGH SS 16.458. “ab omnibus in commune christianis et Iudeis, clamoribus, gemitibus, oblationibus glorificatum est nomen Christi, quod est super omne nomen benedictum.”

¹⁶⁶ DM 2.23: Strange 1.93. “persuasit, ut puellam a se defloratam, per baptismi gratiam renovatam, legitime duceret”

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. “malens illum . . . ecclesiasticis carere beneficiis, quam illam multis expositam periculis in paternis manere delictis.”

eyes. Caesarius's conclusion to this narrative reveals a different attitude toward Jewish conversion than prevailed in the previous era, a skeptical approach to the notion, propounded by Hermann, the Egmont annalist, and others, that miracles and Christian patience were the perfect remedy to continued Jewish unbelief. Caesarius himself identified three significant points to this miracle tale: "Thus you see how much good was brought about by this man's contrition. It restored the lapsed, silenced the Jews, and brought an infidel woman to faith."¹⁶⁸ The young cleric had to take action—a marriage that ended his promising career as a secular clergyman—to save his beloved from Jewish perfidy; the miracle was not sufficient to quell the animosity between the two communities. The results of the tale, like thirteenth century monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion, were ambivalent and complicated.

7.7 Later Attitudes

By the second half of the thirteenth century, the social and political position of the Jews of the empire had deteriorated even further. As discussed in the first chapter, the downfall of the power of the emperor, combined with more pervasive and libellous accusations against Jews, served to weaken the Jews' position significantly and left them open to more frequent and more deadly depredations at the hands of their Christian neighbors. This situation was reflected in monastic accounts of Jewish conversion. The authors of these accounts continued to acknowledge that Jews should and would convert to Christianity, but it appears they did not care so much whether this actually happened, since in their minds contemporary Jews had ceased, at least in part, to resemble their

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. "Ecce vides, quantum boni operata sit in hoc homine contritio. Lapsus erexit, Judaeos elingues fecit, puellam infidelem ad fidem provexit."

biblical ancestors and had even exceeded them in wickedness and perfidy. A monastic chronicle already described in chapter 3—the *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*—illustrates this line of thinking. In his account of the “second crucifixion” of Christ—that is, the desecration of a painting of the crucifixion by the Jews of Cologne—the chronicler mentioned the conversions of several Jews who either were involved in or at least witnessed the wicked deed. He noted simply, “If anyone of them wanted to convert, they were baptized, but others were slaughtered, and the rest took to flight and were not seen any more in the city.”¹⁶⁹ The tone of this passage is important. The monastic author, it appears, did not care very much that such a miracle—blood issuing forth from a desecrated painting of Christ—produced conversions in the Jews who witnessed the scene unfold. The contrast with the aforementioned narrative from the Egmont Annal, wherein a Jewish father perpetrates the similarly heinous crime (by medieval standards) of killing his son but is forgiven upon conversion, is stark. Over the century between the writing of these two texts, monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion shifted significantly.

The violent pogroms that wracked the Jewish communities of Germany starting in the 1280s altered irrevocably the social position of the Jewish communities of that realm. These events surely had an impact on attitudes toward Jewish conversion as well. While these events move beyond the chronological focus of this dissertation, it still seems fitting to look at a couple of brief examples of such attitudes from this later period, in order to show both continuity and change over time. The two texts in question both narrated the Rintfleisch massacres of 1298. The authors of these texts still expressed some of the

¹⁶⁹ *Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae* 4.36; MGH SS 25.323. “Si qui eorum converti voluerunt, baptizati sunt, alii vero trucidati; ceteri enim fuga lapsi, in civitate ultra non sunt visi.”

ambivalent attitudes that marked the earlier thirteenth century, but the sheer violence of the events they described added a new dynamic to their opinions about Jewish conversion. The first text comes from Sifried of Balhuisen, author of the *Compendium historiarum*. Writing in the immediate aftermath of the Rintfleisch massacres, Sifried furnished a grisly narrative of a host desecration in Röttingen and of the massacres in various cities that followed exposure and publication of this crime. One of the stories associated with this broader narrative contains information relevant to the subject of Jewish conversion. This tale concerns the effort of some Jews to survive the attacks by secreting themselves in a castle—a likely indication that the Jews sought protection through privilege relationships with lords. In any case, as the Christians besieged the castle, “a certain Jewish virgin” cried out to the Christian attackers “to snatch her away from there and baptize her.”¹⁷⁰ Hearing her pleas, the other Jews became angry and tried to kill her by casting her off the castle wall, seemingly in imitation of the Jewish martyrs of the First Crusade. God intervened at this point, sending angels to catch her fall. Once she was safe, noted Sifried, she quickly accepted baptism. He did not finish his account of the castle siege, but the story leaves little doubt that the rest of the Jews were killed.

The attitudes toward Jewish conversion evinced in Sifried’s chronicle are complex and ambivalent. They were obviously influenced in profound ways by the violent events of 1298. During the widespread massacres of that year, Jews were not given the choice of converting, as had happened in 1096 and during some of the localized persecutions of the intervening years. But the miraculous story of the Jewish maiden demonstrates that Sifried still saw conversion as possible, if unlikely. Only God’s direct

¹⁷⁰ Sifried of Balhuisen, *Historia universalis et compendium historiarum*, ch.246: MGH SS 25.715. “quedam virgo Iudea . . . ut ipsam inde eriperent et baptizarent.”

intervention allowed the maiden to survive the massacres and be baptized. The window of opportunity for Jews to convert, in other words, was very narrow and likely required miraculous intercession. Sifried thus displays a mixture of earlier attitudes, although recent circumstances cast these attitudes in a new light.

The second example of attitudes toward Jewish conversion in the early fourteenth century is Peter of Zittau, a monastic chronicler from Prague. After narrating in stark detail the host desecration accusation and resulting massacres of Jews at the hands of the mob led by Rintfleisch—of whose actions Peter did not necessarily approve—he addressed the Jews directly:

This king Rintfleisch has inflicted sad destruction on you, O Jewish people, insomuch as he has repulsed you suddenly and just about obliterated you. For God has despised you as well and has given you a torturer, that he may entice you thereby to love Him, that his grace may be effectual for you. Grieve, O Jews! For you will always be oppressed by a double burden; you will be tormented both here and there.¹⁷¹

Peter thus interpreted the massacres as God's attempt to "entice" the Jewish people to accept Christianity. However, he immediately followed this explanation with a very pessimistic statement about the potential for Jewish conversion, suggesting that the Jews were doomed to suffer at all times and in all places. Conversion persisted as an ideal in the mind of this monastic author, but, under the very violent circumstances of the early fourteenth century, he could not possibly envision how such a conversion would take place.

This evolution of monastic attitude that resulted not only from the weakening of Jewish privilege but surely from the buildup of animosity that accompanied repeated

¹⁷¹ Peter of Zittau, *Chronicon aulae regiae*, ch.55: *Die königsaller Geschichtsquellen mit den Zusätzen und der Fortsetzung des Domherrn Franz von Prag*, ed. Johann Loserth, *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* 1.8 (Vienna: K. Gerold's Sohn, 1875), 138.

ritual murder and host desecration accusations was carried to its ultimate extreme in those texts that described the mass persecutions of Jews in the fourteenth century. Those authors who narrated the massacres of Jews during the Black Death, for instance, never even brought up the possibility of Jews converting.¹⁷² By the time of those events, the desire for and expectation of the conversion of the Jews was relegated entirely to the hermeneutic realm. In the minds of these late medieval authors, it appears, the real Jews who met their doom in the pogroms that erupted throughout Germany were not eligible for conversion or baptism. God had lost patience with them and allowed them to be put to death in mass numbers. The only possible response to the threat they posed to Christianity was to exterminate them.

7.8 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to bring together the two major strands of this dissertation—contact between monks and real Jews on the one hand and interaction between monks and ideas about Jews on the other hand—by examining a single, important issue that brought monks into contact with both kinds of Jew at the same time. Monastic attitudes toward the conversion of Jews to Christianity—the issue that forced them to reckon with both real and textual Jews—evolved in significant ways over the period covered in this study. In the aftermath of the First Crusade massacres, when many Jews were returning to their ancestral religion with the permission and even the aid of Christian authorities, monks in Germany and other places affected by the massacres took a skeptical approach to this topic. Their texts reveal a mistrust of Jewish converts, not

¹⁷² See, for instance, the account of the massacres in Germany by the Constance canon Heinrich von Diessenhoven in *Fontes rerum germanicarum*, ed. J.F. Böhmer (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta'scher, 1868), 4.68-71.

surprising considering the human and sacramental conundrum posed by these forced conversions. As time passed and blunted the memory of the Jews' return to their mother religion, some monastic authors began to take out their frustrations over this subject on the perpetrators of the forced massacres as much as they did on the Jews themselves. A substantial shift in attitude occurred in the middle of the twelfth century as the Jews' privileged status became a defining component of Christian-Jewish relations and monks grew familiar with and began to trust some Jews who had converted sincerely to Christianity and, in some cases, the number of which is impossible to determine, took up the monastic life. The monks' approach thus became one of patience, putting the responsibility for conversion in the hands of God and simply trying to live the best Christian life they could in the hope that some Jews would be swayed by their righteousness. Hermann of Scheda's account of his conversion is perhaps the best example of this shift, but similar attitudes appeared in other monastic texts as well. As Jewish privilege and social status began to weaken in the thirteenth century, and as ritual murder and host desecration accusations began to appear with regularity, altering Christian opinions in the process, monastic attitudes toward Jewish conversion became more mixed and ambivalent. The expectation that real Jews would convert—or even that they should be allowed to convert to atone for their sins—began to disappear in the late thirteenth century and completely disappeared, apart from persistent echoes of earlier traditions, during the early fourteenth century as Rintfleisch, Armleder, and the Black Death jeopardized the Jews' very existence in the German Empire.

CONCLUSION

The most generic conclusion that can be drawn from this investigation is that Jewish-Christian relations in the high Middle Ages were a bit less rosy than, for instance, Jonathan Elukin posits but certainly less grim than the purveyors of the persistent persecution narrative have described. More specifically and within its imposed institutional and geographic boundaries, this study has advanced the following arguments. First, the relatively peaceful conditions Jews enjoyed in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Empire provided space for monks to interact with Jews in a variety of ways. In fact, the two communities occupied similar positions in the social and political landscape of the high medieval Empire, since they were both dependent on privileges and accompanying protections offered by secular and ecclesiastical authorities and were both involved in the same kinds of economic activities. Second, largely as a result of the prevailing, peaceful environment, the social, political, and economic interactions between monasteries and Jews were both frequent and routine in this period. Monks lived in close proximity to Jews in the emerging cities of the Empire, and, in that urban environment, they formed a variety of business partnerships with their Jewish neighbors. Third, not only did monks absorb a set of standard ideas and images about Jews that they found in authoritative biblical commentaries and other sources, but they also actively took up the discussion of these ideas, enhancing and modifying them to suit the needs of their monastic audience. While this intellectual activity responded to extraordinary

contemporary events like the Crusades and the murder accusations leveled at Jews, it did not often take into account the workaday relations that existed between monks and Jews. There was a disconnect, in other words, between the common experience monks had with Jews and the ideas about Jews that monks developed in scriptorium and choir. Fourth, the monks' development of these tropes or images of Jews in almost all cases arose from and spoke to the fundamental values and experiences of monastic life. While most of these constructions could be called pejorative and even hostile, that hostility was not their defining characteristic. Rather, they were defined in the cloister by their relationship to the monks' experience. Monks employed each of these tropes to inspire themselves and their fellow monks to magnify their monastic vocations more fully. Fifth and finally, the overall relationship between monks and Jews (comprising both real and imagined elements) was for the most part ambivalent. Even when circumstances or issues like conversion forced monks to confront both kinds of Jew—the real Jew and the Jew of the text—at the same time, the monks' overall attitude toward Jews remained, with a few exceptions, ambivalent. They did not jettison one in favor of the other, nor did they often try to blend the two. Like Winston Smith, they seem to have been comfortable holding two contradictory images in their minds at the same time. Hence, it is difficult to fit the monks of Germany into the prevailing narratives and explanations of high medieval Christian-Jewish relations, since these explanations tend to emphasize animosity and uniformity as the prevailing features of that relationship, without taking into account the myriad ways that Christians could think about and interact with Jews.

Beyond these specific arguments about monastic-Jewish interaction, this work suggests ways to reevaluate in a more general way the understanding of Jewish-Christian

relations in the high Middle Ages. The balance of this conclusion focuses on a few of these revisionist ideas in a reflective, and at times speculative, manner. Scholars have begun to move, albeit haltingly, toward a thorough reexamination of this topic, and this section forms a prod to keep it moving in that direction. In my estimation, the most important step in that reexamination is to question the dominant notions of persecution and uniformity, and this section maps the beginnings of interpretive paths that bypass those restrictive portrayals.

The study has focused closely on monasteries and their relations with Jews in an effort to sharpen the picture of Jewish-Christian coexistence; this adjustment of the lens has revealed in stark detail its splotches, gaps, and imperfections. Coexistence, it appears, was neither the result of a process of assimilation (which interpretation assumes automatically that Jews were outsiders) nor a top-down system imposed on Jews by the dominant culture. Such characterizations obscure what was actually a very messy, ad-libbed process of competition and compromise. Indeed, the picture of coexistence captured by this dissertation displays a patchwork of *ad hoc* measures cobbled together by various parties—Jews, monasteries, secular clergy, nobility, burghers, etc.—all of whom were seeking some advantage and were thus willing to form partnerships of varying levels of stability to bolster their respective positions. Working within this atmosphere, Jews made decisions and pursued actions that served their own interests; they did not exist—either in their minds or in the opinions of their business partners—merely to serve the interests of Christians.¹ Their ability to provide valuable goods and services made them welcome within the system, apart from a few protests that normally

¹ On this notion of Jewish “servitude,” see Anna Sapir Abulafia’s recent monograph *Christian-Jewish Relations 1000-1300: Jews in the Service of Medieval Christendom* (Harlow, UK: Longman, 2011).

had no effect on quotidian affairs. Monks, Jews, local and regional authorities, townsmen, and others were thus components of and co-participants in a world of change, experimentation, and emerging political, social, and cultural systems. Although the rapid pace of change sometimes produced unfriendly results—for Jews as for other participants—this was not at its root a “persecuting society.”

With this fresh characterization of coexistence in mind, we may begin to reconstruct the narrative or timeline of Jewish-Christian relations, a narrative that has been dominated for a long time by the perception of escalating and unrelenting persecution. In brief outline, the eleventh century comes across in the sources as an uncertain but fairly friendly period of Jewish-Christian relations, a time when privileges—or at least written records of privilege—were being formed, and Jews and other communities and institutions were working out their positions in this system. The new, mutually-beneficial privilege arrangements appear to have generated a significant amount of goodwill between Jews and Christian authorities, as evidenced in the descriptions of Jews mourning the deaths of episcopal protectors like Walthard of Magdeburg and Anno of Cologne² or the accounts of the close relations between Jews and monastic figures like Rudolph of St. Trond.³

The First Crusade massacres appear to have brought most of this goodwill to an end. While these episodes did not destroy or alter irrevocably the character of Jewish life in Germany—life went on as it had before, that is—the massacres accelerated processes that were already in motion. After these events, Jews sought privileges with greater

² See Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* 6.45: MGH SS 3.827 and *Vita Annonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis* 3.15: MGH SS 11.503.

³ *Gesta abbatum Trudonensium* 11.16: MGH SS 10.304.

urgency and from a variety of authorities. They were no longer content to rely solely on the local bishop or the emperor for protection; they wanted multiple, ironclad layers of protection and economic privilege, and bishops, counts, dukes, monasteries, emperors, and popes all helped them, in various degrees, to obtain such provisions. These partnerships, at least on the part of the Jews, came more from necessity and even desperation than from any kind of spirit of cooperation. There are few references in sources from this period to the closeness between Jews and Christian authorities that characterized the era before the massacres. Moreover, the Jews' increasingly privileged position, coupled with the memory of forcibly-converted Jews returning to their mother religion, seem to have created in the minds of some Christians a greater level of mistrust of Jews. Paradoxically, then, Jews' position became more secure while both Jewish and Christian opinions of each other became less friendly. However, as the memories of the massacres faded on both sides and as privileges came to define the Jewish place more fully in the mid- to late-twelfth century, Jewish-Christian relations in Germany reached a period of relative stability. Jews and Christians interacted freely in a civil atmosphere, with only a very few localized outbreaks of persecution marring the otherwise peaceful record. Negative ideas about Jews still circulated in various Christian circles, but the relative peace and prosperity of the empire—surely at least partially due to the long, successful reign of Frederick Barbarossa—found a parallel in the period's Jewish-Christian relations.

Evidence shows that tensions between Christians and Jews in Germany began to build in the early thirteenth century and that it proceeded apace from that point. It would be foolish, however, to attribute the rise of this antipathy to the influence of a specific

event or the workings of a particular personality. Many factors played a role in the gradual worsening of relations. Increased papal concern about issues like Christian servitude and usury, growing friction between German emperors (especially Frederick II) and popes, the slow decline of the institution of privilege, and, perhaps most pervasively, the escalating indebtedness of the Christian population (both institutions and individuals) to Jewish creditors all seem to have played a role in the shifting of Christian opinions and the intensification of animosity. Relations did not turn on the actions of a single individual like Pope Innocent III or on a single event like the 1235 Fulda blood libel⁴, the 1241 Frankfurt murder accusation⁵, or even the Rintfleisch massacres of 1298. In my view, these troubling events and the unfriendly actions of influential persons in this era must be interpreted as symptoms of systemic changes, rather than as catalysts of change themselves. Shifting from the event- and individual-centered analysis that characterizes much of the scholarship on this topic to an investigation of structures thus seems a necessary recalibration.

Perhaps even more important than this study's refinement of the persecution narrative is its challenge to the perception of uniformity: the notion that Christian attitudes toward and ideas about Jews were relatively homogeneous in the medieval period. It has done this both by examining the values of the monastic environment (as opposed to a general study of thinkers) and by reevaluating the relationship between the products of the intellectual sphere and the social and political realities on the ground. For the most part, previous studies of the Jewish-Christian relationship have taken one of

⁴ As argued in Langmuir, "Ritual Cannibalism," in *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 281.

⁵ Such an argument in Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, 287-91.

three methodological paths. The vast majority of these works have either focused on the “ideas” part of that relationship—the imaginary and theological constructions about Jews created by Christians (and by Jews about Christians)—or have trained their eyes on the social and economic contact between the two communities. A few have tried to do both at the same time, but these studies (including Moore’s work and Chazan’s recent monograph) have all been very general and have carried the basic and mostly unsubstantiated assumption that the ideas produced in the intellectual sphere also pervaded and largely set the agenda for relations in the social realm. In other words, they have propounded the aforementioned principal of uniformity. This study has tried to resist this assumption and in the process has produced arguments that challenge it in fundamental ways.

The evidence marshaled in this study suggests first of all that intellectual constructions of Jews—the major tropes and their sub-points gleaned from ancient and patristic sources as well as more recent commentaries like the *Glossa Ordinaria*—were inconsistent and continuously-evolving. If the monks and other intellectuals who supposedly set the cultural agenda could not pin down specific opinions about Jews—and figures like Rupert of Deutz, Honorius Augustodunensis, and even Bernard of Clairvaux seem to have changed their minds about Jews at various points in their careers as circumstances changed—and, moreover, if the thinkers in one institutional or regional setting produced views that differed from those formulated in other institutional or regional milieux, then how could they possibly have passed on a uniform corpus of beliefs to the larger population? To ask this is not to eliminate the notion that ideas passed from elite intellectual centers to the surrounding populations, but it is to recognize

that the ideas themselves lacked uniformity. It is also to argue, perhaps more importantly, that there was not a single center (e.g., the church or the educated elite) for the production of ideas about Jews. These ideas developed in a more diffuse manner, in diverse locations, and they continued to evolve as they reached new audiences and percolated through specific events and circumstances. Moreover, ideas about Jews in high medieval society were not always—and perhaps not primarily—imposed on the masses from the top down. Ideas flowed in multiple directions—from the peasants and townsmen to the church and the rulers, from one segment of the clergy to another, and so forth. Some of the most influential ideas seem to have originated among the common people before being picked up by the *literati*. While such ideas as the Christ-killer trope—the clarion call for crusaders during the pogroms of the First Crusade—were worked out in the cloisters and schools and passed via sermons and artwork to the masses, the evolving ideas about ritual murder and perhaps even the blood accusation may very well have originated among the commoners: in some cases surely the townsmen who competed with Jews in business. It is also apparent that practical concerns heightened the power of the intellectual and cultural constructions. Growing indebtedness in particular—a problem that monks and other elites shared with their unprivileged co-religionists—seems to have exacerbated the impact of the ideas, no matter their origin. While pathways of transmission and routes of influence are difficult to trace and thus reveal the limitations of this study, merely acknowledging this mutual influence and diffuse transmission seems a necessary corrective to the problematic and ubiquitous assumption of uniformity.

In addition to bringing monks *qua* monks into the discussion of Jewish-Christian contact, this study enhances our general understanding of the lives and works of these essential figures in medieval society. The daily lives and mental assumptions of monks were different from those of other medieval people, including other clergymen, and it is important to acknowledge that first of all before examining the intellectual and cultural products produced in the monasteries. This work shows not only that monks were original thinkers in their own ways, but also that institutional concerns lay behind many of the ideas produced in this period—including conceptions of Jews. Taking institutional concerns and questions of audience into account allows us to see that Christian thinkers did not conceive of Jews only, or perhaps even primarily, as general foils for all of Christendom. They—or rather ideas about them—could be employed within specific institutional contexts to accomplish specific institutional ends. When monastic authors wrote about Jews—usually for monastic audiences—they were not primarily concerned with the broader threat to Christendom writ large that Jews supposedly represented. Rather, they were interested in advancing the definition of a good monk, of highlighting for their fellow monks the key features of the monastic life. Jews became anti-monks in this context much more than general anti-Christians. It was only by extension that, just as monks were held up as the ultimate Christians, Jews became the ultimate counter to the proper Christian life.

Beyond enhancing our broad understanding of the monastic environment, this study has also revealed some important information—or at least supported and sharpened arguments made previously by other scholars—about specific developments in monastic life in this period. It has shown, as mentioned, that monasteries were highly integrated

into the political and economic systems that were defined and established in this era. Monks were even on the forefront of some of these developments. Of course, their reasons for getting involved in these systems were different from those of other players, but in their participation in these systems—and in their interactions with Jews that accompanied that participation—they stood alongside, and perhaps imitated, other powerful actors in high medieval society, including emperors, dukes, bishops, and popes. To underscore a point made vehemently both by John Van Engen and echoed in several places in this work, monasteries were not standing still as the world passed them by.⁶ They were adapting in ways that they believed would benefit their interests and enable them to continue pursuing their prerogatives.

Despite this evidence of integration and advancement, however, one senses in monastic sources—especially those sources that address Jews—a growing insecurity about their position in this emerging society. This insecurity surfaced alongside a persistent confidence about the fundamental role they played in the Christian world. The prayers of monks remained in demand, after all, particularly with the rise of the doctrine of purgatory. But other religious options—both heretical and orthodox—were beginning to appear, especially after twelfth-century reform had lost its impetus and even more so with the rise of the Mendicants in the thirteenth century. Such developments had practical consequences in addition to cultural ones: less patronage meant less income, thus necessitating further loans from Jewish and other lenders. The monks' growing, fearful recognition of the problem of indebtedness is palpable in thirteenth-century sources. As monks were pushed deeper and deeper into the arms of Jewish lenders, their

⁶ I.e., in Van Engen's article "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered."

protests about Jewish existence and privileges became louder, the vehemence of their pejorative constructions of Jews—the increasing modification of the inherited tropes, in other words—more profound. It seems no coincidence that the late thirteenth century—the very period when many monastic authors feared that their houses might collapse under the weight of debt—produced such texts as the “second crucifixion” story from the *Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*.⁷ These contentions about monastic insecurity constitute a reassessment, or rather a sharpening, of Langmuir’s influential “doubt” thesis discussed in the introduction to this work. Langmuir’s assertion that doubt fueled the development of irrational inventions like the blood libel and host desecration charges seems to cohere with the evidence presented here, but this evidence also illustrates that this doubt did not emerge solely from crises in the intellectual sphere. Doubt and insecurity, at least in the case of high medieval German monks, had a strong practical component to it—in the form of economic vulnerabilities and social anxieties. Concerns in the social and economic sphere thus influenced intellectual and cultural constructs.

Ultimately—and unfortunately—the story of monastic-Jewish interaction in high medieval Germany is a tragic one, not because the monks’ ideas led constantly to the persecution and mass murder of Jews, but rather because the close contact monks and Jews had with one another in this place and time did not breed greater familiarity and understanding. Proximity and coexistence did not often equal friendship or real, meaningful dialogue; the limitations were simply too great, the basic assumptions and values too powerful on both sides. There seem to have been a few exceptions—figures like Rudolph of St. Trond, for instance. Yet apart from these extraordinary examples and

⁷ Richeri *Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae* 4.36: MGH SS 25.322.

outside of their workaday contact in street and marketplace, most monks still viewed the Jews as the incorrigible enemies of Christianity. Their task, as they saw it, was to contend with Jews in order to prove them wrong. Winning debates both real and imagined, as the monks saw it, would accomplish the twin goals of converting the Jews and, more importantly, demonstrating to their fellow monks and other Christians that their religious positions were correct. Put more simply, monks were close to Jews, but they took care not to get too close, at least when it came to theological matters. They tolerated their existence because Augustine said they should and because it made good business sense to have Jews around, but they did not try to learn from them or work with them to solve social and moral challenges that existed in medieval society. This strategy for dealing with Jews produced the ambivalence discussed in this work and the accompanying stagnation in the Christian-Jewish relationship. It also made possible the larger conflagrations that erupted at the end of the period examined here.

I do not see it as the historian's primary task to judge the actions of past peoples. This dissertation has attempted to grasp the monks' experience with Jews on the monks' own terms. This methodology has led to some surprising conclusions, some of which challenge in important ways the prevailing notions about Jewish-Christian relations in the high Middle Ages. However, given the influence of Michael Signer and other modern examples of interreligious dialogue and toleration on my scholarly and personal outlook, I must admit that the monks' missed opportunities to dialogue with and learn from their Jewish neighbors frustrates and saddens me. Given the tragic massacres of Jews that unfolded in the late Middle Ages and in subsequent period—and seeing modern examples of dialogue between Jews and Christians, an activity in which Michael Signer stood at the

forefront⁸—it seems all the more unfortunate that the monks of the high Middle Ages did not discover the notion of tolerance when opportunities for such were all around them.

⁸ On Michael Signer's participation in this dialogue, see the articles in *Coming Together for the Sake of God: Contributions to Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Post-Holocaust Germany*, ed. Michael A. Signer and Hanspeter Heinz (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007). See also the essays collected in *Transforming Relations: Essays on Jews and Christians throughout History in Honor of Michael A. Signer*, ed. Franklin T. Harkins (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), especially the essay by John T. Pawlikowski on pp.385-404.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- Acht, Peter, ed. *Die Traditionen des Klosters Tegernsee*. QE, n.f. 9.1.
- Adso of Montier-en-Der. *De ortu et tempore antichristi*. CM 45.
- Albert of Aachen. *Historia Ierosolimitana*. Ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.
- Andreas of Regensburg. *Chronica pontificum et imperatorum Romanorum*. QE, n.f. 1.
- Annales Egmondani*. MGH SS 16.442-479.
- Annales Ephordenses*. MGH SS 16.26-40.
- Annales Herbipolenses*. MGH SS 16.1-12.
- Annales Marbacenses*. MGH SS 17.142-180.
- Annales Rosenveldenses*. MGH SS 16.99-104.
- Anemüller, Ernst, ed. *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Paulinzelle, 1068-1534*. Jena: Fischer, 1905.
- Anselm of Havelberg. *Liber de ordine canonicorum regularium*. PL 188.1091-1118.
- Aronius, Julius, ed. *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im fränkischen und deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1970.
- Augustine of Hippo. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. CC 38-40.
- Baldric of Dol. *Historia Ierosolimitana*. In *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol.4. Paris: L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1879.
- Benedict of Nursia. *Regula Sancti Benedicti*. SC 182.
- Berengus of Trier. *Libellus insignis de mysterio ligni dominici*. PL 160.981-1010.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sancti Bernardi Opera*. 8 vols. Ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot, and H.M. Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957-77.

Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the editio princeps of Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81. 4 vols. Ed. Karlfried Fröhlich. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.

Binterim, A.J. and J.H. Mooren, eds. *Rheinisch-Westphälischer diplomatischer Codex oder Urkunden-Sammlung zur Geschichte der Erzdiözese Köln*, vol.1. Mainz: Müller, 1830.

Böhmer, Johann Friedrich, ed. *Acta Imperii Selecta*. Aalen: Scientia, 1967.

_____. *Fontes rerum germanicarum*. 4 vols. Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta'scher, 1843-1868.

Brilling, Bernhard and Helmut Richter, eds. *Westfalia Judaica: Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Westfalen und Lippe*, vol. 1: 1005-1300. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1967.

Brugger, Eveline and Birgit Wiedl, eds. *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Österreich im Mittelalter*. 2 vols. Innsbruck: Studien, 2005-10.

Caesarius of Heisterbach. *Dialogus miraculorum*. 2 vols. Ed. Joseph Strange. Cologne: J.M. Heberle, 1851.

Cassiodorus. *Expositio Psalmorum*. CC 97-98.

Chazan, Robert, ed. *Church, State, and Jews in the Middle Ages*. West Orange, N.J.: Behrman House, 1980.

Chronici Magni Presbiteri Continuatio. MGH SS 17.523-534.

Chronicon montis sereni. MGH SS 23.130-226.

Cosmas of Prague. *Chronica Boemorum*. MGH SS 9.1-209.

Dolch, Martin and Michael Münch, eds. *Die Urkunden des Zisterzienserklosters Otterberg 1143-1360*. Beiträge zur pfälzischen Geschichte 8.2. Kaiserslautern: Institut für pfälzische Geschichte und Volkskunde, 1995.

Eidelberg, Shlomo, ed. and trans. *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades*. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.

Ekbart of Schönau. *Stimulis amoris*. PL 158.748-761.

Ekkehard of Aura. *Chronicon universale*. MGH SS 6.33-231.

_____. *Hierosolymita*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Tübingen: Fues, 1877.

Ellenhard of Straßburg. *Chronicon*. MGH SS 17.118-141.

Eltester, Leopold and Adam Goerz, eds. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der jetzt die Preussischen Regierungsbezirke Coblenz und Trier bildenden mittelrheinischen Territorien*. Coblenz: Hölscher, 1874.

Ex inventione et miraculis S. Mathiae. MGH SS 8.226-234.

Fichtenau, Heinrich and Erich Zöllner, eds. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich*, vol. 2. Vienna: Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger, 1955.

Fischer, Maximilian, ed. *Merkwürdigere Schicksale des Stiftes und der Stadt Klosterneuburg*, vol.2. Vienna: L. Grund, 1815.

Friderici I. Constitutiones. MGH Const. 1.191-463.

Friderici II. Constitutiones. MGH Const. 2.54-389.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg. *De investigatione Antichristi*. MGH Ldl 3.

Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium. MGH SS 8.504-564.

Gesta abbatum Trudonensium. MGH SS 10.213-448.

Gesta Treverorum, additamentum et continuatio prima. MGH SS 8.111-200.

Glossa Ordinaria. In Canticum canticorum. Ed. Mary Dove. CM 170.

Grayzel, Solomon. *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, vol.1. New York: Hermon Press, 1966.

Gregory of Tours. *De Gloria beatorum martyrum*. PL 71.705-800.

Guibert of Nogent. *Autobiographie [Monodiae]*. Ed. Edmond-René Labande. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981.

_____. *Dei gesta per francos*. In *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol.4. Paris: L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1879.

_____. *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Judaeos*. PL 156: 489-528.

- Habermann, Abraham, ed. *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Zarfat*. Jerusalem: Sifre Tarshish be-siyu 'a Mosad ha-Rav Kuk, 1945.
- Haimo of Auxerre. *Commentarium in cantica canticorum*. PL 117.295-358.
- Hamann, Manfred, ed. *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Reinhausen*. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens 14. Hannover: Hahn, 1991.
- Haverkamp, Eva, ed. *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs*. MGH Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterliche Deutschlands 1. Hannover: Hahn, 2005.
- Heinrici IV. diplomata*. MGH DD 6.1-3.
- Hermann of Scheda. *Opusculum de conversione sua*. MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 4.
- Hildegard of Bingen. *Scivias*. CM 43-43A.
- Historia Monasterii Marchtelanensis*. MGH SS 24.660-683.
- Hoeniger, Robert and Moritz Stern, eds. *Das Judenschreibsbuch der Laurenzpfarre zu Köln*. Berlin: L. Simion, 1888.
- Hoeniger, Robert, ed. *Kölner Schreinsurkunden des zwölften Jahrhunderts. Quellen zur Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Stadt Köln*. 2 vols. Bonn: E. Weber, 1884-94.
- Hoffman, Hermann, ed. *Urkundenregesten zur Geschichte des Zisterzienserinnenklosters Himmelspforten, 1231-1400*. QFW 14.
- Homiliae dominicales*. PL 174.21-632.
- Homiliae in diversos scripturae locos*. PL 174.1059-1134.
- Homiliae in festa totius anni*. PL 174.633-1060.
- Honorius Augustodunensis. *Elucidarium*. PL 172.1109-1176.
- _____. *Expositio in cantica canticorum*. PL 172.347-496.
- _____. *Gemma Animae*. PL 172.541-738.
- _____. *Speculum Ecclesiae*. PL 172.807-1108.
- Idung of Prüfening. *Dialogus duorum monachorum*. In *Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages: "Argumentum super quatuor questionibus" et "Dialogus duorum*

- monachorum.*” Ed. R.B.C. Huygens. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1980.
- Knipping, Richard, ed. *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, vol.2. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1901.
- Ludus de Antichristo.* In *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, vol.2. Ed. Karl Young. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. 369-96.
- Mai, Hardo-Paul, ed. *Die Traditionen, die Urkunden und das Älteste Urbahrfragment des Stift Rohr 1133-1332.* QE, n.f. 21.
- Mayer, Anton, ed. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, vol.2. Vienna: Verlag und Eigenthum des Alterthums-Vereines zu Wien, 1896.
- Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz.* 4 vols. Ed. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Munich, 1918-1989.
- Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs.* 5 vols. Ed. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna, 1915-1971.
- Monumenta episcopatus Wirziburgensis.* MB 37.
- Monumenta Formbacensia.* MB 4.1-212.
- Monumenta Monsterii Schönthal.* MB 26.
- Monumenta Priflingensia.* MB 13.
- Monumenta Raitenhaselacensia.* MB 3.97-228.
- Monumenta San-Nicolaitana.* MB 4.213-400.
- Monumenta Steingadensia.* MB 6.475-632.
- Monumenta Understofensia.* MB 14.111-170.
- Origen. *Homiliae in Canticum Canticorum.* PL 23.1117-1144.
- Otto of Freising. *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris.* MGH SS rer. Germ. 46.1-161.
- Otto of St. Blasien. *Ottonis Frisingensis continuatio Sanblasiana.* MGH SS 20.302-337.
- Paschasius Radbertus. *De corpore et sanguine domini.* CM 16.

- Peter of Zittau. *Chronicon aulae regiae*. In *Die königsaaler Geschichtsquellen mit den Zusätzen und der Fortsetzung des Domherrn Franz von Prag*. Ed. Johann Loserth. *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* 1.8. Vienna: K. Gerold's Sohn, 1875.
- Pez, Bernard, ed. *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova*. 12 tomes republished in 3 vols. Farnborough: Gregg, 1967.
- _____. *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*. 6 vols. Augsburg: Ph. M. et J. Veith frères, 1721-29.
- Piacenti, Stefano, ed. *Ludus de Antichristo: Rappresentazione dell'Anticristo*. *Classici Christiani* 295. Siena: Cantagalli, 2001.
- Renier of St. Laurent. *Lacrymarum libelli tres*. PL 204.153-180.
- Richard of St. Victor. *Liber exceptionum*. Ed. Jean Chatillon. *Textes Philosophiques du Moyen Âge* 5. Paris: J. Vrin, 1958.
- Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*. MGH SS 25.249-345.
- Ried, Thomas, ed. *Codex chronologico-diplomaticus episcopatus Ratisbonensis*, vol.1. Regensburg: Schaupp, 1816.
- Rossel, K., ed. *Urkundenbuch der Abtei Eberbach im Rheingau*, vol.1. Wiesbaden: Roth, 1862.
- Rupert of Deutz. *Anulus sive Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum*. Ed. Rhabanus Haacke. In M.L. Arduini. *Ruperto di Deutz e la controversia tra Christiani ed Ebrei nel secolo XII*. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1979.
- _____. *Commentaria in canticum canticorum*. CM 26.
- _____. *Commentaria in evangelium sancti Iohannis*. CM 9.
- _____. *De operibus spiritus sancti*. CM 21-24.
- _____. *In Osee prophetam commentarium*. PL 168.11-204.
- Schmale, Franz Josef and Irene Schmale-Ott, eds. *Frutolfs und Ekkehard's Chroniken und die anonyme Kaiserchronik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- Schweitzer, C.A., ed. *Urkundenbuch des Abtes Andreas im Kloster Michelsberg*, vol.1. Bericht über das Wirken des historischen Vereins zu Bamberg 16. Bamberg: J.M. Reindl, 1853.

Sifried of Balhuisen. *Historia universalis et compendium historiarum*. MGH SS 25.679-718.

Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. MGH SS 6.300-374.

Simonsohn, Shlomo, ed. *The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 492-1404*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988.

Thiel, Matthias, ed. *Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Weltenburg*. QE, n.f. 14. Munich: Beck, 1958.

Thietmar of Merseburg. *Chronicon*. MGH SS 3.723-871.

Tomaschek, J.A., ed. *Die Rechte und Freiheiten der Stadt Wien*, vol.1. Vienna: A. Hölder, 1877.

Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns, vol. 2. Ed. Administrative Committee of the Francisco-Carolinum Museum of Linz. Vienna: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1856.

Vita Annonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis. MGH SS 11.462-518.

Vita Bardonis maior. MGH SS 11.321-342.

Von Lang, Karl Heinrich, ed. *Regesta sive rerum Boicarum autographa ad annum usque MCCC*. 13 vols. Munich: Impensis regii, 1822-1854.

Werner of St. Blasien. *Libri deflorationum*. PL 157.721-1256.

Will, Cornelius, ed. *Regesta archiepiscoporum maguntinensium*, vol.1. Aalen: Scientia, 1966.

Wittman, Franz Michael and Karl August Muffat, eds. *Schenkungsbücher bayerischer Klöster*. Quellen und Erörterungen zur Bayerischen und Deutschen Geschichte 1. Aalen: Scientia, 1969.

Wolbero of Cologne. *Expositio super canticum canticorum Salomonis*. PL 195.1001-1278.

Wright, John, ed. *The Play of the Antichrist*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1967.

Secondary Sources:

- Abulafia, Anna Sapir. *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- . “Christian Imagery of Jews in the Twelfth Century: A Look at Odo of Cambrai and Guibert of Nogent.” *Theoretische Geschichte* 16 (1989): 383-91.
- . *Christian-Jewish Relations 1000-1300: Jews in the Service of Medieval Christendom*. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2011.
- . “‘The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism’. Review Article on: J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*.” *Theoretische Geschichte* 11 (1984): 77-82.
- . “The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas Concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Iudeus.” *Jewish History* 7 (1993): 43-63.
- . “The Intellectual and Spiritual Quest for Christ and Central Medieval Persecution of Jews.” In *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews: Medieval Roots, Modern Perspectives*, edited by Anna Sapir Abulafia, 61-85. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- . “Jewish Carnality in Twelfth-Century Renaissance Thought.” In *Christianity and Judaism*, edited by Diana Wood, 59-75. Studies in Church History 29. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- . “Jewish-Christian Disputations and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance.” *Journal of Medieval History* 15 (1989): 105-25.
- . “St. Anselm and Those Outside the Church.” In *Faith and Identity: Christian Political Experience*, edited by David Loades and Katherine Walsh, 11-37. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- . “Theology and the Commercial Revolution: Guibert of Nogent, St. Anselm and the Jews of Northern France.” In *Church and City 1000-1500: Essays in Honour of Christopher Brooke*, edited by D. Abulafia, M. Franklin, and M. Rubin, 23-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . “Twelfth-Century Humanism and the Jews.” In *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, edited by Ora Limor and Guy Stroumsa, 161-75. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996.
- Abulafia, David. “The King and the Jews—the Jews in the Ruler’s Service.” In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 43-54. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.

- Anton, Hans Hubert and Alfred Haverkamp, eds. *Trier im Mittelalter*. 2000 Jahre Trier, vol.2. Trier: Spee, 1996.
- Arnold, Klaus. "Admont und die monastische Reform des 12. Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 89. Kanonistische Abteilung 58 (1972): 350-369.
- Astell, Ann W. *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Avneri, Zvi, et al., eds. *Germania Judaica*. 3 vols. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963-1990.
- Bachrach, Bernard S. *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.
- Baer, Yitzhak. *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1961-66.
- Baldwin, John W. *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Baron, Salo W. "Medieval Christendom." In *Economic History of the Jews*, edited by Nachum Gross, 36-47. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.
- _____. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. 18 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952-1983.
- Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- _____. *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Batany, Jean. "L'Autobiographie de Guibert de Nogent (vers 1115): identite sociale et identite langagiere." In *Die Autobiographie im Mittelalter*, edited by Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok, 1-10. Griefswald: Reineke, 1995.
- Beach, Alison I. "Listening for the Voices of Admont's Twelfth-Century Nuns." In *Voices in Dialogue: Reading Women in the Middle Ages*, edited by Linda Olson and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, 187-198. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.
- _____. "The Multiform Grace of the Holy Spirit: Salvation History and the Book of Ruth at Twelfth-Century Admont." In *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture: Reform and*

- Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany*, edited by Alison I. Beach, 125-137. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- _____. *Women as Scribes: Book Production and Monastic Reform in Twelfth-Century Bavaria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Ben-Sasson, H.H. "The Middle Ages." In *A History of the Jewish People*, edited by H.H. Ben-Sasson, 385-726. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Berger, David. "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jews Research* 40 (1972): 89-108.
- Bestul, Thomas. *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.
- Blumenkranz, Bernhard. *Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les juifs et le judaïsme*. Paris: Mouton, 1963.
- _____. *Juifs et chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430-1096*. Paris: Mouton, 1960.
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. *Die Investiturstreit*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1982.
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Borgehammar, Stephan. "The Admont Sermon Corpus." Paper presented at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Mich., 8 May 1993.
- _____. "A Monastic Conception of the Liturgical Year." In *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, edited by Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter, 13-44. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001.
- _____. "Who Wrote the Admont Sermon Corpus—Gottfried the Abbot, His Brother Irimbert, or the Nuns?" In *De L'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la predication médiévale*, edited by Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand, 47-51. Louvain: Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993.
- Boshof, Egon. *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon: Leben und Werke*. Kölner historische Abhandlungen 17. Cologne: Böhlau, 1969.
- Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-century Burgundy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Boureau, Alain. "Privilege in Medieval Societies from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries, or: How the Exception Proves the Rule." In *The Medieval World*, edited by Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson, 621-634. London: Routledge, 2001.

- Boynton, Susan. "Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education." In *Medieval Monastic Education*, edited by George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig, 7-20. London: Leicester University Press, 2000.
- Braun, Johann Wilhelm. *Die Überlieferung der Schriften Gottfrieds und Irimberts von Admont mit einem Lebesabriß Irimberts*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Giessen, 1967.
- Brooke, Christopher. *The Age of the Cloister: The Story of Monastic Life in the Middle Ages*. Mahwah, N.J.: HiddenSpring, 2003.
- Brown, Elizabeth A.R. "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe." *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 1063-88.
- Brundage, James A. "Intermarriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law." *Jewish History* 3,1 (1988): 25-40.
- Brunner, Otto. *Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*. 4th ed. Translated by Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Burgard, Friedholm, Alfred Haverkamp, and Gerd Mentgen, eds. *Judenvertreibungen in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*. Hannover: Hahn, 1999.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- _____. *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Chazan, Robert. "The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 36 (1968): 13-31.
- _____. "The Condemnation of the Talmud Reconsidered (1239-1248)." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 55 (1988): 11-30.
- _____. *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- _____. "Emperor Frederick I, the Third Crusade, and the Jews." *Viator* 8 (1977): 83-93.

- _____. *European Jewry and the First Crusade*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- _____. *God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Chronicles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- _____. *Medieval Jewry in Northern France*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- _____. *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Clanchy, M.T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Cluse, Christoph. "Stadt und Judengemeinde in Regensburg im späten Mittelalter: Das 'Judengericht' und sein Ende." In *Jüdische Gemeinden und ihr christlicher Kontext in kulturell-räumlich vergleichender Betrachtung. Von der Spätantike bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, edited by Christoph Cluse, Alfred Haverkamp, and Israel J. Yuval, 365-386. Hannover: Hahn, 2003.
- _____. *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in den mittelalterlichen Niederlanden*. Hannover: Hahn, 2000.
- _____. "Zur Chronologie der Verfolgungen zur Zeit des 'Schwarzen Todes'." In *Geschichte der Juden im Mittelalter von der Nordsee bis zu den Südalpen*, vol.1: *Kommentarband*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp, 223-242. Hannover: Hahn, 2002.
- Codreanu-Windauer, Silvia. "Regensburg: The Archaeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter." In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 391-403. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Cohen, Jeremy. *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big Screen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- _____. *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- _____. *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- _____. *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

- _____. "Synagoga conversa: Honorius Augustodunensis, the Song of Songs, and Christianity's 'Eschatological Jew.'" *Speculum* 79 (2004): 309-340.
- _____. "'Witnesses of our Redemption': The Jews in the Crusading Theology of Bernard of Clairvaux." In *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman*, edited by B.S. Albert et. al., 67-81. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1995.
- _____. "A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade in Jewish Historical Memory, Medieval and Modern." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 9-26. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Between Judaism and Christianity: The Semicircumcision of Christians according to Bernard Gui, his Sources and R. Eliezer of Metz." *Harvard Theological Review* 94,3 (2001): 285-321.
- Cole, Penny J. *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095-1270*. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1991.
- Colish, Marcia L. "Psalterium Scholasticorum: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis." *Speculum* 67 (1992): 531-548.
- Constable, Giles. "The Concern for Sincerity and Understanding in Liturgical Prayer, Especially in the Twelfth Century." In *Classica et Mediaevalia: Studies in Honor of Joseph Szövérfy*, edited by Irene Vaslef and Helmut Buschhausen, 17-30. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- _____. *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Csendes, Peter. "Die Stadtrechtsprivilegien Kaiser Friedrichs II. für Wien." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 43 (1987): 110-134.
- Cutler, Allen Harris and Helen Elmquist Cutler. *The Jews as Ally of the Muslim: Medieval Roots of Anti-Semitism*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.
- Dahan, Gilbert. "Cutlers' *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim*." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 79 (1989): 539-41.
- _____. *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les Juifs au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1990.
- De Hamel, Christopher F.R. *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade*. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1984.

- De Lubac, Henri. *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, translated by E.M. Macierowski. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998-2009.
- Despina, M. "Les accusations de profanation d'hosties portées contre les juifs." *Rencontre Chrétiens et juifs* 5,22 (1971): 150-73 and 5,23 (1971): 179-96.
- Dobson, R.B. *The Jews of Medieval York and the Massacre of March 1190*. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1974.
- Duby, Georges. *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, translated by Cynthia Postan. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- Edsall, Mary Agnes. *Reading Like a Monk: Lectio Divina, Religious Literature, and Lay Devotion*. Ph.D Dissertation, Columbia University, 2000.
- Elukin, Jonathan. *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Emmerson, Richard K. and Ronald B. Herzman. *The Apocalyptic Imagination in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1992.
- Epstein, Steven A. *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Faust, Ulrich. "Gottfried von Admont: ein monastischer Autor des 12. Jahrhunderts." *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige* 75 (1964): 273-359.
- Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, translated by Denise A. Kaiser. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- Flade, Roland. *Die Würzburger Juden: Ihre Geschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Würzburg: Stürtz, 1996.
- Flint, Valerie. "World history in the early twelfth century; the 'Imago Mundi' of Honorius Augustodunensis." In *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, edited by R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, 211-238. Oxford: Carendon Press, 1981.
- Freedman, Paul. "A Privilege of Pope Alexander III for Sant Pau del Camp (Barcelona)." *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 31 (1993): 255-63.
- Fried, Johannes. "Die Bamberger Domschule und die Rezeption von Frühscholastik und Rechtswissenschaft in ihrem Umkreis bis zum Ende der Stauferzeit." *Vorträge und Forschungen* (1986): 163-200.

- Fröhlich, Karlfried. "An Extraordinary Achievement: The *Glossa Ordinaria* in Print." In *The Bible as Book: The First Printed Editions*, edited by Paul Saenger and Kimberly Van Kampen, 15-21. London: The British Library, 1999.
- Fulton, Rachel. *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Funkenstein, Amos. "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages." *Viator* 2 (1971): 373-82.
- Gibson, Margaret T. "The Place of the *Glossa ordinaria* in Medieval Exegesis." In *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, edited by Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr., 5-28. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
- . "The Twelfth Century Glossed Bible." In *Studia Patristica* 23, edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, 232-244. Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987. Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989.
- Gilchrist, John. "The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades." *Jewish History* 3,1 (1988): 9-24.
- Glorieux, P. "Les deflorations de Werner de Saint-Basile." *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, vol. 2, 699-721. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1951.
- Goodwin, Deborah L. "*Take Hold of the Robe of the Jew*": *Herbert of Bosham's Christian Hebraism*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Gow, Andrew. *The Red Jews: Antisemitism in an Apocalyptic Age, 1200-1600*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Graetz, Heinrich. *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 11 vols. Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1853-1876.
- Graus, František. *Pest – Geissler – Judenmorde: das 14. Jahrhundert als Krisenzeit*, 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1994.
- Grayzel, Solomon. "The Papal Bull *Sicut Judeis*." In *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 231-259. New York: New York University Press, 1991.
- Grundmann, Herbert. *Der Cappenberger Barbarossakopf und die Anfänge des Stiftes Cappenberg*. Münstersche Forschungen 12. Cologne: Böhlau, 1959.

- Hage, Hermann, ed. *“Stadt and Mutter in Israel”: Jüdische Geschichte un Kultur in Regensburg*. Ausstellungskataloge zur Regensburger Geschichte. Vol. 2,3. Regensburg: Stadt Regensburg, 1995.
- Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Haverkamp, Alfred. “Baptised Jews in German Lands during the Twelfth Century.” In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 255-310. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- . “Erzbischof Bladuin und die Juden.” In *Balduin von Luxemburg, Erzbischof von Trier – Kurfürst des Reiches (1285-1354): Festschrift aus Anlaß des 700. Geburtsjahres*, edited by Franz-Joseph Heyen, 437-483. Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhheinischen Kirchengeschichte 53. Mainz: Verlag der Gesellschaft für mittelhheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1985.
- . “Die Juden inmitten der Stadt.” In *Trier im Mittelalter*, edited by Hans Hubert Anton and Alfred Haverkamp, 477-499. 2000 Jahre Trier, vol.2. Trier: Spee, 1996.
- . “Juden und Städte—Verbindungen und Bindungen.” In *Europas Juden im Mittelalter: Beiträge des internationalen Symposiums in Speyer vom 20. bis 25. Oktober 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 72-85. Trier: Kilomedia, 2004.
- . *Medieval Germany 1056-1273*, translated by Helga Braun and Richard Mortimer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Härdelin, Alf. “God’s Visiting: A Basic Theme in the Homilies Ascribed to Godfrey of Admont.” *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 27,1 (1992): 23-38.
- Harkins, Franklin T., ed. *Transforming Relations: Essays on Jews and Christians throughout History in Honor of Michael A. Signer*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.
- Head, Thomas and Richard Landes, eds. *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Hennemann, John Bell. “Nobility, Privilege and Fiscal Politics in Late Medieval France.” *French Historical Studies* 13 (1983): 1-17.
- Hiestand, Rudolf. “Juden und Christen in der Kreuzzugspropaganda und bei den Kreuzzugspredigern.” In *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp, 153-208. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1999.

- Hillaby, Joe. "Jewish Colonisation in the Twelfth Century." In *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Patricia Skinner, 15-40. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2003.
- Hirschmann, Frank G. "Civitas Sancta. Religiöses Leben und sakrale Ausstattung im hoch- und spätmittelalterlichen Trier." In *Trier im Mittelalter*, edited by Hans Hubert Anton and Alfred Haverkamp, 399-476. 2000 Jahre Trier, vol.2. Trier: Spee, 1996.
- Holtmann, Annegret. "Jewish Moneylending as Reflected in Medieval Account Books: The Example of Vesoul." In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 305-315. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Hsia, R. Po-chia. *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- _____. *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)*. Trans. Graham Robert Edwards. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Ordonner et exclure: Cluny et la société chrétienne face à l'hérésie, au judaïsme et à l'islam, 1000-1150*. Paris: Aubier, 1998.
- Johnson, Willis. "Before the Blood Libel: Jews in Christian Exegesis After the Massacres of 1096." M.A. Thesis, Cambridge University, 1994.
- Johnson, Willis. "The Myth of Jewish Male Menses." *Journal of Medieval History* 24 (1998): 273-95.
- Jordan, William Chester. "Adolescence and Conversion in the Middle Ages." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 77-93. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- _____. *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.
- Katz, Jacob. *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times*. New York: Behrman House, 1961.

- Kaufhold, Martin. *Deutsches Interregnum und europäische Politik: Konfliktlösungen und Entscheidungsstrukturen 1230-1280*. MGH Schriften 49. Hannover: Hahn, 2000.
- Kedar, Benjamin Z. "The Forcible Baptisms of 1096: History and Historiography." In *Forschungen zur Reichs-, Papst- und Landesgeschichte: Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht*, vol. 1, edited by Karl Borchardt and Enno Bünz, 187-200. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1998.
- Kempf, Friedrich. "Das Problem der Christianitas im 12.-13. Jahrhunderten." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 79 (1960): 104-23.
- Kienzle, Beverly M. "Hélinand de Froidmont et la predication cistercienne dans le Midi (1145-1229)." In *La predication en Pays d'Oc (XII^e-début XV^e siècle)*, 37-67. Cahiers de Fanjeaux 32. Fanjeaux, 1997.
- . "The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly M. Kienzle, 271-323. *Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental*, fasc. 81-83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Kisch, Guido. *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status*. 2nd ed. New York: Ktav, 1970.
- Kleinberg, Aviad. "Hermannus Judaeus's *Opusculum*: In Defence of its Authenticity." *Revue des études juives* 151 (1992): 337-53.
- Knapp, Fritz Peter. *Die Literatur des Früh- und Hochmittelalters in den Bistümern Passau, Salzburg, Brixen, und Trient von Anfängen bis zum Jahre 127*. Geschichte der Literatur in Österreich von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart 1. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1994.
- Koziol, Geoffrey. "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace in Eleventh-Century Flanders." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landes, 239-258. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Langmuir, Gavin I. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- . "The Tortures of the Body of Christ." In *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000-1500*, edited by Scott L. Waugh and Peter D. Diehl, 287-309. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

- Lauranson-Rosaz, Christian. "Peace from the Mountains: The Auvergnat Origins of the Peace of God." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landes, 104-134. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Lawrence, C.H. *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*. 3rd ed. London: Longman, 2001.
- Leclercq, Jean. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, translated by Catharine Misrahi. 3rd ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 1982.
- Lemeneva, Elena. "Preaching in a Rural Parish Community in Thirteenth-Century Styria." *Medieval Sermon Studies* 47 (2003): 21-32.
- Lemmers, Trudy. *Guibert van Nogents Monodiae: een twaalfde-eeuwse Visie op kerkelijk Leiderschap*. Hilversum: Verloren, 1998.
- Linder, Amnon. *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.
- Little, Lester K. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Lohrmann, Klaus. *Judenrecht und Judenpolitik im mittelalterlichen Österreich*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1990.
- _____. "Der Südosten des Reiches: Jüdische Gemeinden in Österreich, Böhmen und Mähren." In *Europas Juden im Mittelalter Beiträge des internationalen Symposiums in Speyer vom 20. bis 25. Oktober 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 274-286. Trier: Kliomedia, 2004.
- _____. *Die Wiener Juden im Mittelalter*. Berlin: Philo, 2000.
- Lotter, Friedrich. "Hostienfrevelvorwurf und Blutwunderfälschung bei den Judenverfolgungen von 1298 ('Rintfleisch') und 1336-1338 ('Armleder')." In *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: internationaler Kongress der MGH, München 16.-19. September 1986*, 533-583. MGH Schriften 33,5. Hannover: Hahn, 1988.
- _____. "Innocens virgo et martyr: Thomas von Monmouth und die Verbreitung der Ritualmordlegende im Hochmittelalter." In *Die Legende vom Ritualmord: Zur Geschichte der Blutbeschuldigung gegen Juden*, edited by Rainer Erb, 25-72. Berlin: Metropol, 1993.

- _____. "Die Judenverfolgungen des 'König Rintfleisch' in Franken um 1298. Ein endgültige Wende in den christlich-jüdischen Beziehungen in deutschen Reich des Mittelalters." *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 15 (1988): 385-422.
- _____. "The Scope and Effectiveness of Imperial Jewry Law in the High Middle Ages." *Jewish History* 4,1 (1989): 31-58.
- _____. "Talmudisches Recht in den Judenprivilegien Heinrichs IV.? Zu Ausbildung und Entwicklung des Marktschutzrechts im frühen und hohen Mittelalter." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 72 (1990): 23-61.
- _____. "'Tod oder Taufe.' Das Problem der Zwangstaufen während des Ersten Kreuzzuges." In *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp, 107-152. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1999.
- _____. "Zur Ausbildung eines kirchlichen Judenrechts bei Burchard von Worms und Ivo von Chartres." In *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte, Studien zu Ehren von Herbert A. Strauss*, edited by Rainer Erb and Michael Schmidt, 69-98. Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Autorenverlag, 1987.
- Maccoby, Hyam. *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages*. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1982.
- Magnou-Nortier, Elisabeth. "The Enemies of the Peace: Reflections on a Vocabulary, 500-1200." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landes, 58-79. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Manselli, Raoul. "La respublica christiana e l'Islam." In *L'Occidente e l'Islam nell'alto medioevo*, 115-147. Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1965.
- Marcus, Ivan G. "From Politics to Martyrdom: Shifting Paradigms in the Hebrew Narratives of the 1096 Crusade Riots." In *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 469-483. New York: New York University Press, 1991.
- _____. "Images of Jews in the *Exempla* of Caesarius of Heisterbach." In *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, edited by Jeremy Cohen, 247-256. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.
- _____. *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Matter, E. Ann. "The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. 1, edited by Irena Backus, 83-111. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- _____. *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- McCulloh, John M. "Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich, Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of the Myth." *Speculum* 72 (1997): 698-740.
- McGinn, Bernard. *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Mellinkoff, Ruth. *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Mentgen, Gert. "Kreuzzugsmentalität bei antijüdischen Aktionen nach 1190." In *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp, 287-326. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1999.
- _____. "Die Ritualmordaffaire um den 'Guten Werner von Oberwesel' und ihre Folgen." *Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte* 21 (1995): 159-98.
- Mezler-Andelberg, Helmut J. "Admont und die Klosterreform zu Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereines für Steiermark* 47 (1956): 28-42.
- Milis, Ludo J.R. *Angelic Monks and Earthly Men: Monasticism and its Meaning to Medieval Society*. Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1992.
- Miller, Maureen C. *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Moore, John C. *Pope Innocent III (1160/61-1216): To Root Up and to Plant*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Moore, Rebecca. *Jews and Christians in the Life and Thought of Hugh of St. Victor*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Moore, R. I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Morrison, Karl F. *Conversion and Text: The Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992.
- Muessig, Carolyn. "What is Medieval Monastic Preaching? An Introduction." In *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, edited by Carolyn Muessig, 3-16. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- Mulchahey, M. Michèle. *"First the Bow is Bent in Study. . . ." Dominican Education before 1350*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998.
- Müller, Jörg R. "Erez gezerah—'Land of Persecution': Pogroms against the Jews in the *regnum Teutonicum* from c.1280 to 1350." In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 245-260. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- . "Judenverfolgungen und –vertreibungen zwischen Nordsee und Südalpen im hohen und späten Mittelalter." In *Geschichte der Juden im Mittelalter von der Nordsee bis zu den Südalpen*, vol.1: *Kommentarband*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp, 189-224. Hannover: Hahn, 2002.
- Müller, Karlheinz. "Würzburg: The World's Largest Find from a Medieval Jewish Cemetery." In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries): Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20-25 October 2002*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 379-389. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- . *Die Würzburger Judengemeinde im Mittelalter: Von den Anfängen um 1100 bis zum Tod Julius Eichters (1617)*. Würzburg: Freunde Mainfränkischer Kunst und Geschichte, 2004.
- Mundill, Robin R. "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry." In *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Patricia Skinner, 55-70. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2003.
- . *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Murphy, Sean Eisen. "Concern about Judaizing in Academic Treatises on the Law, c.1130-c.1230." *Speculum* 82 (2007): 560-594.
- Mütschele, Sabine. *Juden in Augsburg: 1212-1440*. Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Stuttgart, 1996.
- Nahon, Gérard. "From the *Rue aux Juifs* to the *Chemin du Roy*: The Classical Age of French Jewry, 1108-1223." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 311-339. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Naughton, Joan. "Friars and their Books at Saint-Louis de Poissy, A Dominican Foundation for Nuns." *Scriptorium* 52,1 (1998): 83-102.
- Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

- _____. "The Rhineland Massacres of Jews in the First Crusade: Memories Medieval and Modern." In *Imagination, Ritual, Memory, Historiography: Concepts of the Past*, edited by Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick Geary, 279-309. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Pakter, Walter. *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews*. Ebelsbach: Gremler, 1988.
- Patschovsky, Alexander. "The Relationship between the Jews of Germany and the King (11th-14th centuries). A European Comparison." In *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages*, edited by Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath, 193-218. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Pawlikowski, John T. "Can We Speak of a Theological Bond between Christians and Jews? A Dialogue with Michael Signer." In *Transforming Relations: Essays on Jews and Christians throughout History in Honor of Michael A. Signer*, edited by Franklin T. Harkins, 385-404. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "A First Generation Anselmian, Guibert of Nogent." In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by F. Forrester Church and Timothy George, 71-82. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Petry, Manfred. "Die ältesten Urkunden und die frühe Geschichte des Prämonstratenserstiftes Cappenberg in Westfalen (1122-1200)." *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 18 (1972): 143-289 and 19 (1973): 55-64, 137-50.
- Phillips, Jonathan P. "Papacy, Empire and the Second Crusade." In *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, edited by Jonathan Phillips and Martin Hoch, 15-31. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Pixton, Paul B. *The German Episcopacy and the Implementation of the Decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council: Watchmen on the Tower*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "The Misfiring of German Cultural Leadership in the Twelfth Century: The Evidence from the Cathedral Schools." *Paedagogica Historica* 34 (1998): 347-63.
- Po-chia Hsia, R. *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

- _____. *Trent 1475: Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Poliakov, Leon. *The History of Anti-Semitism*. 4 vols. New York: Vanguard Press, 1965-85.
- Rauh, Horst Dieter. *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.
- Reynolds, Susan. *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- _____. *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The Crusades: A History*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Robinson, Ian S. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Papacy 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression." *Viator* 2 (1971): 129-158.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. and Lester K. Little. "Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities." *Past and Present* 63 (1974): 4-32.
- Rouse, Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse. *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979.
- Rubenstein, Jay. *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Rupp, Jean. *L'idée de Chrétienté dans la pensée pontificale des origines à Innocent III*. Paris: Les Presses modernes, 1939.
- Saltman, Avrom. "Hermann's *Opusculum de Conversione Sua*: Truth or Fiction?" *Revue des études juives* 147 (1988): 31-56.

- St. Emmeram in Regensburg: Geschichte, Kunst, Denkmalpflege: Beiträge des Regensburger Herbstsymposiums vom 15.-24. November 1991.* Kallmünz: M. Lassleben, 1992.
- Schmandt, Matthias. "Cologne, Jewish Centre on the Rhine." In *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages*, edited by Christoph Cluse, 367-378. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- . *Judei, cives et incole: Studien zur jüdischen Geschichte Kölns im Mittelalter.* Hannover: Hahn, 2002.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *La Conversion d'Hermann le juif: Autobiographie, Histoire et Fiction.* Paris: Seuil, 2003.
- Schwarzfuchs, Simon. "Religion populaire et polémique judéo-chrétienne au 12e siècle." In *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman*, edited by Bat-Sheva Albert, Yvonne Friedman, and Simon Schwarzfuchs, 189-206. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1995.
- Şenocak, Neslihan. "Circulation of Books in the Medieval Franciscan Order: Attitude, Methods, and Critics." *Journal of Religious History* 28,2 (2004): 146-161.
- Shachar, Isaiah. *The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and its History.* London: Warburg Institute, 1974.
- Shatzmiller, Joseph. *Jews, Medicine, and Medieval Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- . *Shylock Reconsidered: Jews, Moneylending, and Medieval Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Sherwood, Jessie. "A Convert of 1096: Guillaume, Monk of Flaix, Converted from the Jew." *Viator* 39:1 (2008): 1-22.
- Shoemaker, Stephen J. *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire Romain (135-424).* Paris: E. de Boccard, 1964.
- Signer, Michael A. "The *Glossa Ordinaria* and the Transmission of Medieval Anti-Judaism." In *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, edited by Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman, 591-605. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- . "God's Love for Israel: Apologetic and Hermeneutical Strategies in Twelfth-Century Biblical Exegesis." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*,

- edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 123-149. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- _____. "Polemics and Exegesis: The Varieties of Twelfth Century Christian Hebraism." In *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Allison Coudert, 21-32. Philadelphia, Penn.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- _____. "The *Speculum Ecclesiae* by Honorius Augustodunensis on Jews and Judaism: Preaching at Regensburg in the Twelfth Century." In *Crossroads of Medieval Civilization: The City of Regensburg and its Intellectual Milieu*, edited by Edelgard E. DuBruck and Karl Heinz Göller, 121-137. Detroit: Michigan Consortium for Medieval and Early Modern Studies, 1984.
- Signer, Michael A. and Hanspeter Heinz, eds. *Coming Together for the Sake of God: Contributions to Jewish-Christian Dialogue from Post-Holocaust Germany*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1964.
- Smith, Lesley. *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. *Masters of the Sacred Page: Manuscripts of Theology in the Latin West to 1274*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Southern, R. W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- _____. *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol.2: *The Heroic Age*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Stacey, Robert C. "The English Jews Under Henry III." In *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Patricia Skinner, 41-54. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2003.
- _____. "Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century England: Some Dynamics of a Changing Relationship." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 340-354. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Steinacker, Harold. "Zum Privileg Friedrichs I. für das Herzogtum Österreich (Privilegium minus)." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 11 (1929): 205-239

- Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Stow, Kenneth R. *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- _____. "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century." *Speculum* 76 (2001): 911-933.
- _____. "Hatred of the Jews or Love of the Church: Papal Policy Toward the Jews in the Middle Ages." In *Antisemitism Through the Ages*, edited by Shmuel Almog, 71-89. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988.
- _____. *Jewish Dogs: An Image and Its Interpreters: Continuity in the Catholic-Jewish Encounter*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- _____. "Papal and Royal Attitudes toward Jewish Lending in the Thirteenth Century." *AJS Review* 6 (1981): 161-184.
- Strauss, Raphael. *Regensburg and Augsburg*, translated by Felix N. Gerson. Jewish Communities Series. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1939.
- Synan, Edward A. *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Tellenbach, Gerd. *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*. Translated by R.F. Bennett. Oxford: Blackwell, 1940.
- Timmer, David E. *The Religious Significance of Judaism for Twelfth-Century Monastic Exegesis: A Study in the Thought of Rupert of Deutz, c.1070-1129*. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1983.
- Toch, Michael. "The Formation of a Diaspora: the Settlement of Jews in the Medieval German Reich." *Aschkenas* 7 (1997): 55-78.
- _____. "Jewish Migrations to, within and from Medieval Germany." In *Le Migrazioni in Europa secc. XIII-XVIII: Atti della XXV Settimana di Studi, 3-8 maggio 1993*, edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi, 639-652. Florence: Le Monnier, 1994.
- _____. *Die Juden im Mittelalterlichen Reich*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1998.
- _____. "Jüdische Geldleihe im Mittelalter." In *Geschichte und Kultur der Juden in Bayern: Aufsätze*, edited by Manfred Tremel and Josef Mirmeier, 85-94. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1988.

- Todeschini, Giacomo. "Franciscan Economics and Jews in the Middle Ages: From a Theological to an Economic Lexicon." In *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Edited by Susan E. Myers and Steven J. McMichael, 99-117. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Töpfer, Bernhard. "The Cult of Relics and Pilgrimage in Burgundy and Aquitaine at the Time of the Monastic Reform." In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, edited by Thomas Head and Richard Landes, 41-57. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Van Engen, John H. "The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 519-552.
- _____. "God is No Respector of Persons': Sacred Texts and Social Realities." In *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson*, edited by Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward, 243-264. London: Hambledon, 1992.
- _____. "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150." *Speculum* 61 (1986): 269-304.
- _____. "Ralph of Flaix: The Book of Leviticus Interpreted as Christian Community." In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, edited by Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, 150-170. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- _____. *Rupert of Deutz*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- _____. *Sisters and Brothers of the Common Life: The Devotio Moderna and the World of the Later Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Van Laarhoven, Jan. "Christianitas et la reform grégorienne." *Studi Gregoriani* 6 (1959/61): 1-98.
- Waddell, Chrysogonus. "The Liturgical Dimension of Twelfth-Century Preaching." In *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, edited by Carolyn Muessig, 335-349. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Weinfurter, Stefan. *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*, translated by Barbara W. Bowlus. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Whalen, Brett Edward. *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Wichner, Jakob. *Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Admont*. 4 vols. Graz: Vereinsdruckere, 1874-1880.

Wittmer, Siegfried. *Jüdisches Leben in Regensburg vom frühen Mittelalter bis 1519*. Regensburg: Universitätsverlag, 2001.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980.

Yuval, Israel. *Two Nations are in Your Womb: Perception of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, translated by Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Zier, Mark. "The Development of the Glossa Ordinaria to the Bible in the Thirteenth Century: The Evidence from the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris." In *La Bibbia del XIII secolo : storia del testo, storia dell'esegesi : Convegno della Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino (SISMEL) Firenze, 1-2 giugno 2001*, edited by Giuseppe Cremonesi and Francesco Santi, 155-184. Florence: SISMEL edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004.

Zier, Mark. "Peter Lombard and the Glossa Ordinaria on the Bible." In *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honor of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, edited by Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman, 629-641. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.