Introduction

Some years ago, I offered a course on the history of Judaism at a Protestant seminary in the midwestern United States. Both as a Jew and as a historian committed to studying the interdependence of Christian and Jewish civilizations, I found it gratifying that my course fulfilled a distribution requirement in church history at the seminary; the genuine interest of Christian divinity students in my Judaic subject encouraged me no less. Surprisingly, however, my interaction with the president, the dean, and some faculty colleagues at the school proved less gratifying. Although I understood my role in their community primarily as an academic one, to teach about Jewish civilization, they took but a secondary interest in my instruction. Instead, they habitually focused on the satisfaction they derived from my presence at their seminary, from having, as they put it, "a Jew in our midst." In their eyes, my Jewish identity—or what they believed that identity to be—somehow rounded out their picture of how their Christian community should properly appear. For these colleagues, who welcomed me onto their campus with genuine, memorable warmth, I functioned less as the historian I construed myself to be and more as a player on a theological stage set long before my arrival.

This book concerns that stage and its players. Throughout much of its history, in various manners and to differing extents, Christianity has accorded Jews and Judaism a singular place in a properly ordered Christian society. From the people who received God's Old Testament,

to those who parented, nurtured, and, allegedly, murdered Jesus, to those whose conversion will signal the second coming of Christ, Jews have had distinctive tasks in Christian visions of salvation history. The idea that Christendom needs the Jews to fill these special roles has, in fact, contributed to the survival of the Jewish minority in a Christian world, with varying results. On one hand, the Christian idea of Jewish identity crystallized around the theological purpose the Jew served in Christendom; Christians perceived the Jews to be who they were *supposed* to be, not who they actually *were*, and related to them accordingly. As Bernard of Clairvaux, one of the most prominent Christian theologians of the Middle Ages, put it in the twelfth century, "the Jews are not to be persecuted, killed, or even put to flight. . . . Indeed, the Jews are for us the living letters (*vivi . . . apices*) of Scripture, constantly representing the Lord's passion."[1] For Bernard, as for many medieval churchmen, the Jews embodied a particular reading of Holy Scripture, one that established the truth of Christianity in its own right and illuminated the contrasting Christian exegesis of the Bible. As such, the Jews' nature, their personality, and their historical mission derived directly from essential dictates of Christian doctrine and hermeneutics. On the other hand, when Christian theologians awakened to the disparity between the Jew they had constructed and the real Jew of history, they could construe the latter's failure to serve the purposes allotted him as an abandonment of his Judaism. This, in turn, might render him less suited for the protection granted Jews who did function "properly" in Christian society.

In order to meet their particular needs, Christian theology and exegesis created a Jew of their own, and this book investigates the medieval history of such a hermeneutically and doctrinally crafted Jew, from Augustine of Hippo to Thomas Aquinas. In prior publications I have studied the contribution of Dominican and Franciscan friars to Christian perceptions of Jews and Judaism in the High Middle Ages;[2] here I examine key chapters in the earlier history of the "hermeneutical Jew"—that is, the Jew as constructed in the discourse of Christian

1. See below, chapter 6.

2. Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), "The Jews as the Killers of Christ in the Latin Tradition, from Augustine to the Friars," *Traditio* 39 (1983), 1–27, and "Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom," *AHR* 91 (1986), 592–613.

theology, and above all in Christian theologians' interpretation of Scripture.[3] On what basis did a Bernard of Clairvaux come to identify the Jews as the living letters of biblical law, whose survival, not whose destruction, best served God's plan for the triumph of the Catholic Church? How did this idea take shape in the thought of Augustine, and how did early medieval churchmen adapt the Augustinian idea to the changing world of European Christendom? What happened in the twelfth century to undermine, however gradually, the presuppositions of Augustine's idea, even as theologians like Bernard did not hesitate to reaffirm it, and where, set against this background, do the thirteenth-century friars and their attack on rabbinic literature fit into our story?

In addressing these questions, this book does not survey the oft-studied policies of the Catholic Church and of secular rulers toward European Jewish communities, nor does its focus fall primarily on the interactions of medieval Jews and Christians. Beyond demonstrating the phenomenon of the hermeneutically crafted Jew in Christian theology of the Middle Ages, I have not dedicated my book to advancing any particular thesis concerning the chronology or the key figures of the Jewish-Christian dispute. Rather, I attempt a threefold contribution to an understanding of the place of the Jews in the cultural and intellectual history of medieval Christendom. First, by analyzing the developing ideas of the Jew in medieval Christian thought, I hope to add to our appreciation of the theologians responsible for these ideas; in some cases, existing scholarly treatments of their doctrine concerning the Jews remain incomplete. Second, as a whole, my book maps evolving

3. I first proposed the formulation of the "hermeneutical Jew" in papers on "Anti-Jewish Discourse and Its Function in Medieval Christian Theology," presented to the New Chaucer Society in August 1992, and on "The Muslim Connection: On the Changing Role of the Jew in High Medieval Theology," presented at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, Germany, in October 1993 and subsequently published in *FWW*, pp. 141–62. The term has since found explicit acceptance in Paula Fredriksen, "*Excaecati occulta justitia Dei*: Augustine on Jews and Judaism," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995), 321 n. 61, and "Divine Justice and Human Freedom: Augustine on Jews and Judaism, 392–398," in *FWW*, p. 52 n. 52. Cf. also the usage of "theological Jew" in Gilbert Dahan, *Les Intellectuels chrétiens et les Juifs au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1990), p. 585; the approach to seventh-century Byzantine texts proposed by David M. Olster, *Roman Defeat, Christian Response, and the Literary Construction of the Jew* (Philadelphia, 1994); and the new perspective on Gregory the Great offered by Robert A. Markus, "The Jew as a Hermeneutic Device: The Inner Life of a Gregorian *Topos*," in *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, ed. John C. Cavadini (Notre Dame, Ind., 1995), pp. 1–15. I am grateful to Professor Markus for sharing his paper with me in advance of its publication.

attitudes toward Jews and Judaism among Christian intellectuals from late antiquity until the High Middle Ages. Although I have made no attempt to provide an all-inclusive survey, I have endeavored to highlight the most interesting and influential patterns in the theological mentality of the period. Third, I elaborate a new basis for dealing with these issues that will, I believe, allow us to advance beyond the conclusions of previous scholarship.

That Christianity accorded the Jews theological importance is hardly a recent discovery; as we shall see, medieval Jews themselves recognized that importance and occasionally pointed it out to their Christian overlords. With the growth of medieval and Jewish studies at modern universities, many investigators of the past century have identified, catalogued, edited, annotated, summarized, and described the literature of medieval religious polemic. Some have moved beyond avowedly polemical texts and authors to mine large collections of Christian sources for all of their comments on Jews and Judaism. Still others have written valuable monographic studies of particular polemical texts or of actual disputations. As this book proceeds, students of the field will readily discern my indebtedness to the efforts of numerous predecessors and colleagues. Yet I believe that much of this prior research has stopped short of a sufficiently comprehensive analysis of the Christian thought in which Jews and Judaism figure significantly, an analysis which accurately gauges the depth and complexity of that significance. Specifically, it does not suffice to comb through the works of a Christian theologian, to amass all of his comments concerning Jews and Judaism, to organize the citations according to their ostensive subjects, and then to assess these data relative to the statements of other theologians—prior, contemporary, and later. Although such a procedure may track the impact of the Christian doctrine on the Jews that one author may have bequeathed to his successors, it is incapable of elaborating the meaning of a given text or attitude within its own historical setting. For it unfairly assumes that Christian writers and readers of the past shared the concerns of the modern historian—that is, the topical categories of anti-Judaism used to classify the data amassed—and deliberately formulated their respective attitudes accordingly. This method of study typically overlooks the broader matrix of theological issues in which that of the Jews assuredly took its place, but only as one cog in a larger wheel. One ought not simply to ask how the intellectual background of a particular writer, the events of his life, and the climate of his times may have resulted in his contribution to our story. Where the

data permit, one must struggle to analyze that contribution against the referential system defined by the larger corpus of the theologian's writings and by related texts that afford them an instructive cultural context.

I therefore proceed from the premise that the origins, the character, and the role of the hermeneutical Jew derive from a theological agenda encompassing much more than the Jews themselves; and I devote my energies here to pinpointing the place of the Jews within that agenda. New Testament and patristic scholars have already recognized the value of such an approach, which has also figured in Frank Manuel's recent study of Judaism in postmedieval Christian eyes. Yet the important advances made by recent historians, literary critics, and historians of art notwithstanding, a systematic study of the function of the Jew in medieval Christianity remains a desideratum. Regrettably, in his book Manuel merely devoted a brief introductory chapter to the subject—with not a single footnote!—and hastily discounted the Middle Ages as "a thousand-year estrangement" that severed any meaningful connection between Christian theological scholarship and Judaism.[4] Although the connections between medieval churchmen and the Jews (hermeneutically crafted or not) may not have struck Manuel as interesting or consequential, they deserve the historian's attention nonetheless. Even if, in his inception, in his function, and in his veritable power in the Christian mind-set, the hermeneutical Jew of late antique or medieval times had relatively little to do with the Jewish civilization of his day, his career certainly influenced the Christian treatment of the Jewish minority, the sole consistently tolerated religious minority, of medieval Christendom. Medieval Christian perceptions of this Jew's personality contributed amply to the significance of Judaism and anti-Judaism in Western intellectual and cultural history. Viewed more broadly, these perceptions shed light on the place and purpose of the "other" in the collective mentality of the medieval Christian majority.

Although my interest lies with the hermeneutically crafted Jew of the Middle Ages and his distinguishing characteristics, the medieval churchmen I discuss were clearly not the first—or the last—Christians to construct a Jew in accordance with the needs of their theology. Undeniably, our story begins *in medias res;* and, seeking an instructive

4. Frank E. Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992); pp. 15–29 concern the Middle Ages.

context for it, one might well situate it at the center of three concentric spheres of late ancient theological concern with the Jew. In two cases, considerations of time and space will allow neither for a comprehensive overview of the extant sources nor even for a hasty survey of recent scholarship. Still, these expressions of early Christianity's interest in Judaism constitute the foundation of the medieval intellectual history I relate, and they justly demand attention, however selective and limited.

First, the books of the New Testament—above all the Gospels and Acts, several of the Pauline epistles, and Hebrews—abound with representations of the Jews and Judaism, many of them hostile. Together, these characterizations in Christian Scripture attest to a process whereby first-century Christians began to assert the validity of their beliefs by negating those of "mainstream" Jews. Owing to the origins of Christianity within the Jewish community, much of this anti-Jewish discourse undoubtedly stemmed from disputes over biblical messianic prophecy between the earliest Christians—themselves Jews—and other Jews who refused to countenance their Christological convictions. Although countless passages throughout the New Testament give expression to such processes then at work, we shall here dwell briefly on the earliest and foremost of these Jewish Christians whose ideas have survived: Paul, Christianity's presumably first and self-proclaimed apostle to the Gentiles.

As Paul sought converts for the church from outside the Jewish community, he portrayed the Jews and Judaism with an ambivalence that would have far-reaching theological consequences, both in the very fact of its ambiguity and in the wide array of conflicting interpretations it invited. Whether its real opponents were Jewish Christians who required circumcision of Gentile proselytes entering the church or Jews with no Christian leanings, Paul's Epistle to the Galatians distinguishes sharply between faith in Jesus and the observance of the Torah. "We ourselves, who are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners, yet who know that a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus . . . , because by works of the law shall no one be justified" (2:15–16). Indeed, "all who rely on works of the law are under a curse" (3:10), and Paul seemed to suggest that the Jews' appreciation of Scripture had resulted in their rejection by God:

> For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman. But the son of the slave was born according to the flesh, the

> son of the free woman through promise. Now this is an allegory: These two women are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery; she is Hagar. . . . She corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother. . . . Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise. But as at that time he who was born according to the flesh persecuted him who was born according to the spirit, so it is now. But what does Scripture say? "Cast out the slave and her son; for the son of the slave shall not inherit with the son of the free woman." So, brethren, we are not children of the slave but of the free woman. (4:22–31)

Galatians reaches the conclusion (5:6) that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail," for which Paul soon provided a more elaborate theological argument in his Epistle to the Romans. Romans echoes and develops some of Galatians' central themes: the futility of the law in the achievement of salvation, the sinfulness of the Jews, and God's covenant of grace with those who descended spiritually from Abraham by emulating his faith. Romans (9:25) refers to the Gentiles who embrace Jesus with God's words to Hosea, "Those who were not my people I will call my people," while invoking the prophecy of Isaiah to proclaim the repudiation of the Jews: "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved."

Nevertheless, in an apparent about-face that has long perplexed New Testament scholars,[5] Paul proceeded immediately to endow his Jewish coreligionists with a critical role in the divine economy of salvation. For having deduced that a Gentile fares no worse than a Jew in the eyes of God, and having castigated the Jews for their rejection of Jesus, the Christological portion of Paul's epistle to the Gentile Christians of Rome concludes on a note of qualification regarding the nation of Israel:

> I ask, then, has God rejected his people? By no means! . . . So I ask, have they stumbled so as to fall? By no means! But through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous. . . . For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance mean but life from the dead? If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches. But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted

5. See the judicious overview of the state of the field in Heikki Räisänen, "Paul, God, and Israel: Romans 9–11 in Recent Research," in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Lee*, ed. Jacob Neusner et al. (Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 178–206.

> in their place to share the richness of the olive tree, do not boast over the branches. . . .
>
> For if you have been cut from what is by nature a wild olive tree and grafted, contrary to nature, into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these natural branches be grafted back into their own olive tree. Lest you be wise in your own conceits, I want you to understand this mystery, brethren: A hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved. . . . As regards the gospel they are enemies of God, for your sake; but as regards election they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers. (11:1–28)

No matter how one might ultimately choose to define Paul's intentions, our present interests would underscore several key aspects of this message. Presenting the Jews so as to facilitate his doctrinal instruction of Gentile Christians, Paul attributed momentous importance to the people of Israel. This importance bespoke a divinely ordained mission that found expression over the course of human history: before Jesus, during his lifetime, and subsequent to his death. Precisely in their identification with the sacred text of Scripture—"the Jews are entrusted with the oracles of God" (Romans 3:2); they are "the adherents of the law" (Romans 4:14)—the Jews had contributed to the salvation of the world and would continue to do so. God gave them the law "to increase the trespass," with the result that "where sin increased, grace abounded all the more" (Romans 5:20). The Jews' rejection of Jesus constituted the ultimate trespass and allowed the Gentiles to enter into God's covenant. Upon the completion of this process, the Jews will regain God's favor, and their conversion will signal the final redemption, "life from the dead" and all. The Jews have not entirely forfeited their election. They still serve a vital purpose, pedagogic and eschatological, which demands their survival until the end, when "all Israel [*pâs Israél*] will be saved."

Struggling to find consistency in Paul's attitudes regarding the Jews, modern Christian writers continue to debate the ramifications of these texts. Some have discerned a Pauline stratum at the base of Christian antisemitism; others have found his ideas virtually free of hostility toward Judaism, which they instead attribute to Paul's later interpreters.[6] For our purposes, Paul's undeniable ambivalence retains a primary im-

6. Cf., for example, the views of Rosemary R. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1974), pp. 95–107, with those of John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (New York, 1983), esp. chaps. 11–15, and Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver, B.C., 1987).

portance, as does his retention of Israel and Israel's relationship with Scripture within the divine economy of salvation. During the decades after Paul, these issues continued to exercise key voices in the formulation of primitive Christianity, including those of the evangelists, the author of Hebrews, and the apostolic fathers. Over the course of the centuries that followed, their ideas underwent further development and received more systematic expression in the *Adversus Iudaeos* polemic (arguments "against the Jews") of many church fathers—Justin Martyr, Melito of Sardis, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ephrem the Syrian, Aphrahat, John Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan, and others—which gave rise to a genre of Christian literary expression unto itself. Patristic concern with the Jew and his Judaism constitutes the second contextual sphere within which our story took shape.[7]

Paul's view of the error of the Jews as the obverse of the truth of Christianity lived on, encasing all subsequent reflection on Judaism in Christian theology. Yet as the Gentile constituencies of Christian churches increased and the intensity of direct interaction between Jews and Christians subsided, the teachings of *Adversus Iudaeos* shifted their emphasis. They now served chiefly to fuel attacks by Gentile Christians, who had never converted to Judaism, against Christians who still observed Jewish law. Seeking to justify the departure of the church from the synagogue, Christian preachers tried to demonstrate not only that observance of the old law without belief in Jesus was insufficient but that it was inherently wrong. The New Testament had replaced the Old; and just as the Gentile church had replaced the Jewish people as the community of God's elect, so too had the inauguration of a new gospel rendered the old law at least counterproductive if not thoroughly sinful.

7. Owing to the avowedly cursory and selective nature of this overview, I have sought to keep the notes to a minimum. For instructive overviews and ample bibliography on patristic attitudes toward the Jews, see Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135–425)*, trans. H. McKeating (New York, 1986), chaps. 5–6; A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge, England, 1935); Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, pp. 117–82; Miriam S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*, Studia Post-biblica 46 (Leiden, Netherlands, 1995); Samuel Krauss, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy from the Earliest Times to 1798, Volume I: History*, ed. and rev. William Horbury, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 56 (Tübingen, Germany, 1995), chap. 1; and Guy G. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity?" in *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa, Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism 10 (Tübingen, Germany, 1996), pp. 1–26.

Beyond Jews and Jewish Christians, Christian *Adversus Iudaeos* polemic soon found additional targets. Clamoring for acceptance in a hostile Roman world, early Christian teachers proclaimed both to their pagan detractors and to prospective pagan converts that Christianity was not a recently contrived distortion of biblical Judaism but the genuine continuation and fulfillment thereof. Ancients placed the highest value on antiquity, and Greco-Roman civilization typically respected the Jews as one of the oldest peoples of all. From an ancient Mediterranean perspective, why convert to Christianity if its novelty, perhaps the very source of its attraction, constituted prima facie evidence of its invalidity? The discourse of *Adversus Iudaeos* supplied the answer: Despite their literal observance of biblical law, the Jews had forsaken God's covenant of old, whereas the Christians, interpreting that law figuratively, had maintained it. Inverting the biblical typology of Israel's redemption from Egyptian bondage, commemorated in the very season of Passover during which Jesus was crucified, the second-century bishop Melito of Sardis reassigned the roles of oppressor and oppressed, damned and saved, in his *Peri Pascha* (On the Paschal Sacrifice),[8] presumably a liturgical poem for the celebration of Easter:

You killed your Lord at the great feast.
And you were making merry,
    while he was starving;
  you had wine to drink and bread to eat,
    he had vinegar and gall;
  your face was bright,
    his was downcast;
  you were triumphant,
    he was afflicted;
  you were making music,
    he was being judged;
  you were giving the beat,
    he was being nailed up;
  you were dancing,
    he was being buried;
  you were reclining on a soft couch,
    he in grave and coffin.
O lawless Israel, what is this unprecedented crime you committed,
  thrusting your Lord among unprecedented sufferings,
    your sovereign
    who formed you,

8. On alternative options for translating the title of this work, see Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha and Fragments*, ed. and trans. Stuart George Hall (Oxford, 1979), p. 3 n. 1.

who made you,
who honored you,
who called you 'Israel'?
But you did not turn out to be 'Israel';
you did not 'see God,'
you did not recognize the Lord.[9]

God had therefore disowned the Jews, annulled their ritual law, and transferred their inheritance to the church, which now constituted the only true Israel, not a recently arrived impostor.

Even after pagans had undergone Christian baptism, an incentive to preach to them against the Jews remained. Especially in the large metropolitan centers of the Eastern empire, where sizable Jewish and Christian communities intermingled freely, Christians frequently emulated Paul's Galatian correspondents and looked upon Judaism and its biblical rituals as the "real thing." Christianity might be a watered-down "Gentile's Judaism" in their eyes, whereas the truly authentic biblical religion belonged to the Jews; for rituals that surely mattered—a holy day like Passover or the New Year, a familial rite of passage, an oath to cement a major business transaction—a visit to a Jewish home or synagogue could make perfect sense. Alarmed by such Judaizing tendencies, churchmen disparaged the Jews in order to bolster Christian self-confidence: Christianity and Judaism did not lie on the same continuum, such that the former naturally directed its adherents toward the latter. On the contrary, as Melito explained to his parishioners, "in the same way as the model is made void, conceding the image to the truly real . . . , the [Jewish] people was made void when the church arose."[10] The rites of the Jews, once precious, have been rendered worthless, and the hermeneutical downfall of Israel has caused its disinheritance.

Casting old and new covenants as contradictory, however, may smack of dualism. The "heretic" Marcion and others like him argued that the savior-God of the New Testament could not possibly have created—or entered—the material world of the Old Testament or authored its inferior law. There were actually two cosmic powers, one supremely good and the other inferior if not utterly evil, who ruled over two worlds, one spiritual and the other material; the struggle between these powers and their respective realms determined the fate of

9. Melito, *Peri Pascha* 79–82, ibid., pp. 42–45.
10. Melito, *Peri Pascha* 43, ibid., pp. 20–21

the cosmos at large and that of every individual. In defense of their monotheism and in opposition to the dualists, orthodox fathers of the church sought to establish the divine authorship of the Old Testament on one hand and the incontrovertible superiority of Christianity over Judaism on the other. And once again, polemic against the Jews nourished the patristic argument. The deficiencies of the old law reflected not upon its divine legislator but upon its Jewish practitioners, and the guilt of the latter should not devolve onto the former. Jew and dualist heretic, ran the argument, thereby had much in common. Each understood—in fact, misunderstood—the old law entirely in its literal sense: One accepted it wholeheartedly on that basis; the other rejected it outright. Of the heretic who denied the incarnation of God in the body of Jesus, the North African Tertullian pleaded that he "now give up borrowing poison from the Jew—the asp, as they say, from the viper."[11] As for the Jews, Justin Martyr declared to his Jewish interlocutor Trypho in his famous *Dialogos* (Dialogue) of the second century, "you are a people hard of heart, and without understanding, and blind, and lame, and sons in whom there is no faith."[12] The precepts of the old law had no salvific value, but they constituted God's resulting punishment for Jewish sin, which ranged from their idolatry to their crucifixion of Jesus and to their persistent hatred of Christians. Circumcision, argued Justin, "was given for a sign, that you should be separated from the other nations and us, and that you alone should suffer the things that you are rightly suffering now, and that your lands should be desolate and your cities burned with fire, and that foreigners should eat up the fruits before your face, and none of you go up to Jerusalem."[13] So, too, the Sabbath, the sacrifices in the temple, and other cultic rites of ancient Israel condemn the Jews for their misdeeds. And, now that Jesus had proffered an entirely different sort of legislation, "the law given at Horeb is already antiquated. . . . A law set over against a law has made the one before it to cease, and a testament [*diathēkē*] coming into existence later has limited any previous one."[14]

11. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 3.7–8, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (Oxford, 1972), 1:188–91.

12. Justin Martyr, *Dialogos* 27.4, in Edgar J. Goodspeed, ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, Germany, 1914), p. 121; trans. in Justin Martyr, *The Dialogue with Trypho*, trans. A. Lukyn Williams (London, 1930), pp. 54–55.

13. Justin Martyr, *Dialogos* 16.2, in Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten,* p. 109; trans. in Justin Martyr, *Dialogue,* pp. 32–33.

14. Justin Martyr, *Dialogos* 11.2, in Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten,* p. 102; trans. in Justin Martyr, *Dialogue,* p. 23, with slight modifications.

Only a genuinely Christian hermeneutic allowed for enjoying the true value of the law without suffering from its drawbacks. Interpreted properly in its Christological sense, the law was intrinsically good; those who misunderstood it were sinful.

When churchmen addressed their anti-Jewish polemic to non-Jewish audiences—to undercut the credibility of Jewish Christians, to legitimate Christianity in the eyes of pagans (whether hostile or sympathetic), to combat reverence for Jews and Judaism among Christians, and to counter the dualist biblical exegesis of heretics—they naturally depicted Jews in a fashion that would advance their own theological agenda. As one historian of this early period has written, "at the root of the matter lies, then, not the actual condition or behavior of the Jews, but rather the image of the Jews required for the purposes of Christian theology."[15] But note well: Throughout this process of self-definition and propagation, Christianity never dispensed with this hermeneutically crafted Jew. From the first stages in its development, the Jew *served a purpose*—or a mélange of purposes—in the new religion, purposes that rendered *Adversus Iudaeos* a basic medium for Christian self-expression, whose applications far exceeded direct confrontations between Christian and Jews. Simply put, the Jew had a particular role to play in a divinely ordained historical drama. His role stemmed from his failure to embrace Christianity when Jesus, his own kinsman, came to redeem him and his people before all others. This failure, in turn, had a chiefly hermeneutical basis; it derived from a deficient reading of the biblical covenant that God had revealed to him, an inability to discern the fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New.

As the church fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries formulated some of the vital presuppositions for medieval Christian constructions of Jews and Judaism, their work revealed a developmental trend that also set a precedent for things to come. Guy Stroumsa has recently highlighted the process whereby Christian anti-Judaism intensified, growing increasingly harsh and more intolerant, between the second and fourth centuries. In the wake of Constantine's conversion, churchmen envisioned a new Christian identity that would integrate the Roman polity and society, an identity the Jews did not share; it followed that "the Jews, together with the pagans and heretics, had to

15. David Rokeaḥ, "The Church Fathers and the Jews in Writings Designed for Internal and External Use," in *Antisemitism through the Ages*, ed. Shmuel Almog, trans. Nathan H. Reisner (Oxford, 1988), p. 64.

be publicly vanquished and humiliated."[16] *Adversus Iudaeos* polemic grew more ad hominem, casting slurs on contemporary Jews, depicting them in demonic terms, and displaying less concern for the nexus between the Jew, his Scripture, and his literalist interpretation of it. Bewailing the attraction that contemporary Judaism still exerted upon Christians in Antioch, for example, John Chrysostom focused his *Adversus Iudaeos* sermons much less on the didactic and eschatological role of the Jew than his predecessors had, and he emphasized the radical disjunction of Judaism and Christianity much more:

> Where Christ-killers gather, the cross is ridiculed, God blasphemed, the father unacknowledged, the son insulted, the grace of the Spirit rejected. Indeed, is not the harm even greater than where demons are present? In a pagan temple the impiety is open and obvious and can hardly seduce or deceive one who has wits about him and is soberminded. But in the synagogue they say that they worship God and abhor idols. They read and admire the prophets and use their words as bait, tricking the simple and foolish to fall into their snares. The result is that their impiety is equal to that of the Greeks, but their deception is much worse. They have an altar of deception in their midst which is invisible and on which they sacrifice not sheep and calves but the souls of men. In a word, if you admire the Jewish way of life, what do you have in common with us? If the Jewish rites are holy and venerable, our way of life must be false. But if our way is true, as indeed it is, theirs is fraudulent. I am not speaking of the Scriptures. Far from it! For they lead one to Christ. I am speaking of their present impiety and madness.[17]

Chrysostom minimized the link between the Jews and their Bible; emphasizing the dissonance between the Judaism of Scripture and the Jews of his day, John constructed synagogue and church as mutually exclusive. He depicted the Jews as the bearers of evil intentions, insulting and dishonoring their biblical heritage, not misinterpreting it in ignorance. He demonized the Jews, elaborating their affinity with the devil, relegating them to the status of pagans, and at times, it would seem, even doubting their humanity. Though he called for Christians to abhor the Jews, not to attack them, he mapped out no place for Judaism in a properly ordered Christian world. Stroumsa has argued that the harsher, demonic anti-Judaism that I and other historians have deemed

16. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism," p. 23.

17. John Chrysostom, *Logoi kata Ioudaiōn* 1.6, PG 48:852; I have proposed but one modification of the translation in Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*, Society for Biblical Literature, Sources for Biblical Study 13 (Missoula, Mont., 1978), p. 97.

characteristic of the later Middle Ages thus had its origins in the fourth-century attitudes exemplified by Chrysostom.[18] I would agree that the pattern of development in patristic perceptions of the Jews adumbrates that of our ensuing medieval story with strikingly suggestive similarities. I believe, however, that the medieval history related in this book constitutes more than just a repetition of a familiar tale.

No less than anything else, that which distinguished the medieval career of Christianity's hermeneutical Jew was the formative influence of Augustine of Hippo, who received Christian baptism within months after John Chrysostom began to deliver his sermons against Jews (and Judaizers) in Antioch.[19] Augustine not only adopted a more moderate stance on the Jewish question than did his contemporary patristic colleagues like Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan, and Cyril of Alexandria; his own *Adversus Iudaeos* teaching, itself yet another explication of Paul, also endowed the Jews, their sacred texts, and their presence in Christendom with a new dimension to their purpose, one that has, in various ways, controlled the Western idea of the Jew ever since.

Augustine's teachings provide the third, most delimited sphere of contextual background to this study; but because of their formidable impact and authority among Christian theologians throughout the medieval period, the ideas of Augustine are an integral part of our story, and we must consider them at length. Part 1 of this book seeks to understand Augustine's acclaimed doctrine of Jewish witness in its Augustinian context. Part 2 considers how three prominent prelates of the early Middle Ages—Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, and Agobard of Lyons—construed the role of the Jew in a properly ordered Christendom: In markedly different ways, each of these men sought to adapt patristic theology and Roman legal precedent to the new Christian mentalities and environments of postclassical Europe. Each of them reacted outspokenly to the presence and proper function of the Jew in

18. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism," passim. Although Chrysostom aired his outrage over respect showed by Christians for Jews and for Jewish ritual in Antioch in his own day—and as Robert Wilken has shown in *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley, Calif., 1983), one must appreciate his sermons against the additional background of Emperor Julian's plan to rebuild the Jewish temple in Jerusalem—his portrayals of the Jew and Judaism are no less theologically crafted than those of other church fathers. For, as Wilken has observed, p. 159, John's vitriolic negation of Judaism was truly "an attempt to argue for the truth of the Christian religion."

19. J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995), p. 62; Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London, 1967), p. 124.

their society. To what extent did they adhere to or depart from established tradition? How can we appreciate them as complying with, modifying, or resisting the ideas of Augustine? The diversity of their ideas notwithstanding, I believe that the doctrine of Jewish witness and its postulates served them all as a pivotal point of departure. Part 3 treats changes in perceptions of the Jews during the twelfth century. I argue that the broadening cultural horizons of European civilization during the age of the Crusades served gradually to modify the prevailing Christian constructions of the Jew in a variety of ways. Even as Augustinian doctrine still found ample expression, Christendom's encounter with Islam, its new commitment to rational argument in matters theological, and its initial exposure to talmudic Judaism challenged hitherto prevalent assumptions. The presence of other infidels threatened the singularity of the contemporary Jew in Christian eyes, just as dialectic questioned his rationality and the Talmud raised doubts concerning his theological identity. Nevertheless, it took time for these processes to work significant change in the Christian mind-set, and outright condemnation of contemporary Judaism as unacceptable in Augustinian terms appeared only in the thirteenth century. Part 4 first reviews the thirteenth-century papal condemnations of rabbinic literature and the mendicant mission to the Jews in light of new and recently published documentary sources. It concludes with the notably ambivalent formulations of the Dominican friar Thomas Aquinas, whose writings testify both to a growing delegitimization of contemporary, postbiblical Judaism and to the lasting legacy of Augustine at one and the same time.

The ambivalent note on which this book closes comports well with the substance of its conclusions. The voices assembled here confirm that as the Middle Ages wore on, the culpability of the Jew steadily increased in Christian eyes. Medieval Christianity eventually demonized him; by the thirteenth century, some churchmen had come to view contemporary Judaism as a willful distortion of the biblical religion that the Jews should ideally have preserved and embodied. Yet at least two reservations are in order. As gradually as constructions of Jews and Judaism developed among Christian theologians, it could take longer—centuries longer, at times—for popes and canonists to translate the new ideas into the deliberate, official policy of the Catholic Church, or for the new ideas to alter the patterns of day-to-day relationships between Christians and Jews. Furthermore, the new ideas never displaced the old ones; rather, they took their place beside them.

The teachings of Augustine, of the church fathers who preceded him, and, above all, of Paul the apostle have retained a critical influence in Christian theology. Straying far afield from the purview of this book, one notes that Christian churches today still view the Jews as a unique textual community, defined by its biblical hermeneutic, bearing directly on the meaning of the Christian covenant. In Christian theologies, "the Jew in our midst" still has an essential role to play as the drama of salvation history continues to unfold.[20]

20. Throughout this book, full bibliographical citations appear at the first reference to a work in the footnotes to each chapter and in the bibliography. As frequently happens, the transliteration of Hebrew and the rendition of names in other languages present problems that defy an entirely consistent solution, especially if one seeks to avoid being overly awkward. I have tended to Anglicize personal names when referring to them discursively (e.g., Nachmanides, Yechiel of Paris, Raymond of Penyafort), but not when these names themselves appear in foreign-language phrases and titles (e.g., *Wikkuaḥ Rabbenu Yeḥiel*, "Chronologia biographica s. Raimundi"). When a Hebrew work includes a romanized title, I have cited it as such, noting the language of the text in brackets. I have generally followed the new Jewish Publication Society translation of the Hebrew Bible and the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. Although I have regularly consulted available translations of ancient and medieval sources, all other translations are my own unless noted otherwise.