

UC Berkeley

LAUC-B and Library Staff Research

Title

Enemies of God and Killers of Christ

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2v77v3n6>

Author

Sherwood, Jessie

Publication Date

2024-09-19

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

KILLERS OF CHRIST AND ENEMIES OF GOD: INTENTIONAL DEICIDE IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

Jessie Sherwood
Robbins Collection and Research Center for Religious and Civil Law
University of California Berkeley, School of Law
Berkeley, CA 94720
jcsherwood@berkeley.edu
orcid: 0000-0003-4944-1600

INTRODUCTION

During the late second century, Melito, bishop of Sardis (d. ca. 180) upbraided the Jews for murdering God and celebrating the Passover while Christ suffered in his *Peri Pascha*, imprecations that were and that continue to be echoed in the *improperia*, recited on Good Friday.¹ For, despite Rome's admitted pre-eminence in the proceedings that led to Jesus of Nazareth's crucifixion and death, the church has blamed the Jews almost since its inception. Certainly, the gospels and epistles of the Christian New Testament held the Jews to be culpable or complicit, even as they acknowledged, directly or otherwise, that Roman officials and soldiers carried out Jesus's trial and execution. Then, as the early church "staggered its way to orthodoxy,"² and Jesus the Christ became the son of God, became God, his crucifiers became deicides, a unique and uniquely inflammatory accusation that has reverberated through the long, convoluted history of Christian attitudes toward and relations with Jews.³

Although the closely related accusations of ritual murder and host desecration continue to draw enormous scholarly attention,⁴ there are far fewer studies on the twin accusations of killing Christ (christicide) and killing God (deicide). Jeremy Cohen has, of course, written on the portrayal of Jews as killers of Christ, most notably his 1983 article, "The Jews as Killers of Christ," and later in his book, *Christ Killers*.⁵ Cohen focuses primarily on Augustine and the mendicant friars of the later Middle Ages, and the ways in which their views of Jewish guilt affected their ideas about the Jews' proper place, or lack thereof, within Latin Christendom. Similarly Jack Watt has discussed

responsibility for the crucifixion, among other questions, in the works of Augustine and scholastic theologians.⁶ More recently, J. Christopher Edwards has explored accusations of deicide in the context of early Christians' efforts to shift responsibility for the crucifixion from Rome to the Jews in order to evangelize and exist under Roman authority.⁷ Finally, several scholars, including Barbara Hurwitz, Andrew J. Scheil, John Tolan, and David Timmer, have examined specific authors' utilization of chirsticide and deicide within the context of those individuals' lives and works.⁸

In order to excavate medieval discussions of deicide and rejection further, here I shall focus on when and how Latin authors writing before 1200 developed and deployed the charge that the Jews had knowingly or intentionally killed Christ or Christ as God. After an overview of the scriptural and patristic traditions — that the Jews were indirectly responsible for Jesus's death, but ignorant of his identity as messiah and son of God — I will explore when and how this tradition began to fracture. Arguably, the Venerable Bede (673–735) was the first to break with the patristic consensus by intimating the Jews had crucified the son of God out of animus and envy. Facets of his definitions of Jewish culpability were adopted and adapted by several later exegetes, but arguably the work of Petrus Alfonsi (fl. 1106–1116) in the early twelfth century represents a second, larger fracture. Petrus not only asserted that the Jews had knowingly killed Christ and the son of God, he carried this act of intentional deicide into the present, arguing that his Jewish contemporaries would perpetrate this sin themselves were they able. Petrus, moreover, sat at the confluence of several major shifts in twelfth-century Latin Christendom: resurgent and more vitriolic anti-Jewish polemics; deteriorating perceptions of and escalating violence toward Jews; the emergent and deepening devotion to the human Christ; and evolving theological and legal understandings of intention and guilt. Though only two other twelfth-century authors, Rupert of Deutz (d. ca. 1129) and Robert of Melûn (d. 1167), would go so far as intentional deicide, others would charge the Jews with

intentional christicide, extend deicide or christicide into the present, and more viciously excoriate the Jews for their rejection and crucifixion of Christ.

By its nature, deicide was deeply enmeshed with how Christ could be simultaneously human and divine, and the origins and effects of the passion, the central act of Christian salvation. Deicide and christicide thus became inextricably entwined with ideas about Christ, eschatology, election, knowledge, intention, guilt, and myriad combinations thereof. These topics, christology especially, were so foundational, so fundamental to Christianity itself that medieval discourses on deicide, along with their discussions about rejection and christicide, tend to retain a maddening degree of ambiguity. Thus, while I will sometimes be more precise in distinguishing between rejection, homicide, christicide, and deicide than my sources — not least because these authors were often arguing that the crucifixion constituted all four simultaneously — readers may find that I am less precise than they would wish.⁹ Further, accusations of intentionality and deicide did not so much evolve, as they were borrowed, disassembled, and adapted to suit their authors' concerns and needs. There was not, I will suggest, a single engine driving the emergence of intentional deicide and christicide, but multiple streams of thought feeding and being fed by these charges.¹⁰

“THESE BLIND MEN, THESE KILLERS OF CHRIST”: DEICIDE BEFORE 1100

As Jeremy Cohen demonstrated in his seminal article, “The Jews as Killers of Christ,” the ways in which the Christian New Testament defined and discussed the Jews' purported role in and responsibility for Jesus's death tend towards ambiguity, in no small part because they were so thoroughly rooted in the needs and preoccupations of the nascent Christian community.¹¹ These passages include Luke 23.34, in which Jesus entreated forgiveness for his crucifiers on the grounds of their ignorance; Acts 3.17, in which Peter declared that the Jews of Jerusalem acted in ignorance; 1 Corinthians 2:7–8, in which Paul stated that had the princes of the world understood, they would

never have crucified the Lord; Matthew 21:33–39, Mark 12:1–8, and Luke 20:9–15’s parable of the wicked tenants; John 9:39–4, in which Jesus said that the Pharisees are guilty because they claim that they can see; and John 15:22–24, in which Jesus that “they” hated him and his father. In addition, later Christians not infrequently referenced Matthew 27:22–23, Mark 15:13–20, Luke 23:21, and John 19:6–15, wherein the crowd calls for Jesus’s crucifixion during his trial. The contradictions between these texts created the hermeneutic space for medieval theologians, polemicists, and jurists to employ the crucifixion to myriad ends and reach diverse conclusions.

Reading the New Testament’s accounts of the crucifixion and fault through the lens of their own theological priorities and opponents, patristic authors generally maintained a relatively static stance: although the Jews were to blame for Jesus’s death, they acted in ignorance. In Ambrose of Milan’s (339–397) influential summation: “The Jews did not see him, for their hearts were blinded (cf. Mark 6:52),” nor did those “who shouted ‘crucify, crucify him,’ because ‘if they had seen, never would they have crucified the Lord of majesty’ (1 Cor. 2:8).”¹² His famous protégé, Augustine of Hippo (354–430), offered at least three different explanations for the Jews’ rejection and crucifixion of Christ, but each of these readings maintained that, although they were indirectly culpable for his death, the Jews acted in ignorance of Christ’s identity as messiah and God.¹³ Commenting on the gospel of John, for example, Augustine argued that the Jews had killed Jesus with their tongues by clamoring for his death,¹⁴ but had acted in ignorance. In their ignorance, Augustine compared them favorably to the Arians, because unlike the Arians, “these blind men, these killers of Christ, yet understood the words of Christ. For they did not understand that he was Christ, nor did they understand that he was the son of God,” but they understood that he claimed to be “the son of God, who is equal to God,” which the Arians did not.¹⁵ Taking a slightly different tack, Pope Gregory I (c. 540–604) reached a similar conclusion. He held that the hearts of Jesus’s persecutors were clouded by wickedness. Thus, Paul said both that “a veil is over his heart” (cf. 2 Cor. 3:15) and

“if they had recognized him, never would they have crucified the Lord of glory” (1. Cor. 2.8).¹⁶

While far from exculpatory, the tradition exemplified by Augustine held that the Jews were to blame for Jesus’s death but had not been, indeed could not have known him to be the messiah or God.

As the Latin Church, its theology, its christology, and its enemies evolved, so too did its thinkers’ and theologians’ conclusions about Jewish culpability for rejecting and crucifying Christ. Writing in the late seventh or early eighth century, Bede advanced a new assessment of guilt and intention based on the parable of the wicked tenants¹⁷ and Luke 23:34 (“Father, forgive them, they do not know what they do”). Concerning the latter, hitherto read (not surprisingly) as evidence that Christ’s crucifiers had acted in ignorance, Bede argued that Jesus had not prayed “for those who, goaded by the spurs of malice and pride, preferred to crucify rather than confess the one whom they knew to be the son of God.”¹⁸ Christ entreated forgiveness, Bede asserted, only for those who acted in ignorance.

While Bede did not specify who had recognized Jesus as the son of God in his commentary on Luke, he was more explicit in his exegesis of Mark’s parable of the vineyard. Reading the parable as a history of disobedience, rejection, and election, Bede argued unequivocally that Jewish leaders had known Jesus to be the messiah. Of the tenants’ statement, “this is the heir, come let us kill him” (Mark 12:7), Bede stated “The Lord clearly demonstrates that the princes of the Jews crucified the son of God, not through ignorance, but through *invidia*. They understood that he was the one about whom it was said, ‘Ask me, and I will give you the nations as your inheritance’ (Ps. 2:8).”¹⁹

Accordingly, the son’s inheritance was acquired, not relinquished, by his death and thus did the vineyard pass to believers. Bede reiterated this argument in commenting on Mark 12:12 and added that the princes and priests and scribes who sought to kill the Lord thus revealed (*docebant*) that he spoke the truth, as Jesus is the heir whose unjust death he said would be avenged by the father.²⁰

While there were, in so far as we can now determine, no Jews then living in England, this

discussions of deicide fit snugly within Bede's larger arguments about supersession and election, of the church generally and the English church specifically.²¹ Within this context, the crucifixion arguably operated as a kind of rhetorical chiaroscuro, sharpening the hermeneutic contrast between the new Israel, an identity that Bede was staking for the English, and the old, that is the faithless Jews of Christian exegesis.

Several eighth- and ninth-century exegetes adopted or adapted Bede's charge. While this may indeed be attributable to their respect for the venerable monk, as Jeremy Cohen has suggested,²² Johannes Heil has shown that Carolingian exegetes were far from averse to adapting authorities to suit their ends.²³ Bede's commentaries on deicide were no exception. Writing amid new controversies over Christ's nature — most notably that sparked by theologians positing that Jesus was adopted as the son of God at his baptism²⁴ — several Carolingians selectively used Bede's exegesis of election for their own arguments about Christ's divinity. Rabanus Maurus (c. 780–850) incorporated Bede's reading of the parable of the wicked tenants directly into his commentary on Matthew,²⁵ but he parted ways with the monk of Jarrow in commenting on 1 Corinthians 2:8. Unlike Bede who read this passage in terms of election and rejection, Rabanus read it christologically. He declares that the princes of the world, who included Jews, knew Jesus to be the one who was promised by the law, but “they were yet ignorant of his divine mystery by which he was the son of God.”²⁶ This ignorance, Rabanus insisted, was not wholly exculpatory. Consistent with his focus on the simultaneity of Christ's humanity and divinity, however, Rabanus ended his commentary on Christ's plea for forgiveness: “still the Lord of glory was crucified, for such was that undertaking that made God man and man God.”²⁷

Deicide serves other ends in the exegesis of Paschius Radbertus (c. 785–c.860) and Walahfrid Strabo (c.809–849). In his commentary on Matthew and its version of the parable of the wicked tenants, Paschius followed the outlines of Bede's interpretation, but did so in an explicit

effort to refute heterodox assertions grounded in Matthew 24:36 (“No one knows that day and hour, neither the angels in heaven nor the son, but only the father”), and in so doing explicitly rejected what Cohen terms “the prevalent tradition of Jewish ignorance.”²⁸ Indeed, the abbot of Corbie argued that the Jews crucified Jesus, not because they did not know he was the son of God, “as some heedlessly assert,” but because — blinded by *invidia*, arrogance, and greed — they were obstinate.²⁹ Indeed, seeing the “signs and the portents, they understood that he was the Christ (John 7:31),” Paschius continued, but strove to kill him rather than confess or believe in him.³⁰ Walahfrid Strabo, a student of Rabanus, similarly argued that the chief priests killed Jesus out of *invidia*, not ignorance, because they knew him to be the one to whom Psalm 2:8 referred, namely the messiah.³¹ In his commentary on Luke, Walahfrid followed Bede in arguing that Jesus’s plea to forgive his crucifiers did not extend to those who had understood him to be the son of God, which presumes that some of them did, “when they denied and crucified him” out of *invidia* and pride.³² The monk of Reichenau was not so adamant or unequivocal as Bede, however. In his commentary on Corinthians, he declared that had the Jews recognized Jesus, “either the *minores* that he was the messiah or the *maiores* that he was God or the son of God,” they would never have crucified the Lord.³³

Carolingians exegetes were, however, no more inclined to consensus than their modern counterparts. Most maintained that the Jews had acted in at least partial ignorance. Alcuin (d. 840), one of Rabanus’s teachers, referred in passing to Jews, who “crucified him whom they did not believe,” within a polemic against adoptionism.³⁴ Similarly, Haimo of Auxerre (d. 855) and Sedulius Scotus (fl. 848–860), though far from exculpatory, implied that the Jews had been unaware of Jesus’s divinity.³⁵ Bede and later authors’ intimations of intentionality proved influential nonetheless. Perhaps most significantly, Bede’s readings of Jewish guilt were adopted by Anselm of Laon (d. 1117) and the *Glossa ordinaria*. Anselm borrowed Bede’s exegesis of the parable of the wicked tenants

and argued that the Jews had killed Christ, knowing him to be the son of God, because they feared him.³⁶ To those who would object on the grounds of Corinthians, Anselm maintained that Bede answered this objection, and “therefore, the Jew was not induced to crucify him because he thought that he was Christ or the son of God, but because he did not foresee that he would be damned by his death.”³⁷ More significantly for later medieval exegesis, the *Glossa ordinaria* also used Bede to explicate Luke 23:34 — “He prayed not for those who understood him to be the son of God but denied and crucified him through *invidia* and pride, but for those who, having zeal for God but not according to knowledge, did not know what they did”³⁸ — and Wahalfrid to gloss 1 Corinthians 2:8 — “If they had known, either the *minores* that he was the messiah promised in the law, or the *maiores* that he was God or the son of God: they never would have crucified the Lord of glory.”³⁹ Given the *Glossa*’s centrality to later medieval exegesis and polemic,⁴⁰ these “deviations from the Augustinian tradition,” as Cohen terms them,⁴¹ would prove significant.

“THAT THE JEWS CRUCIFIED HIM, WILLFULLY, AND BY DESIGN”: PETRUS ALFONSI

After 1100, questions about intention and guilt at the cross wended their way out of exegesis into polemics, treatises, chronicles, and *apologiae*. The crucifixion, already the archetype for rejecting Christ and killing God, became more “present” and so too did its perpetrators. Concomitantly, questions about the crucifiers’ cognizance and culpability grew more pressing and more pointed. Even Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109) who made the otherwise unexceptional claim that “no one could ever, knowingly at least, want to kill God,” did so in a chapter dedicated to the crucifiers’ sin within a treatise on redemption and incarnation.⁴² Several of the authors who followed him not only dedicated more ink to the question of deicide, they reached far more damning conclusions. First and arguably foremost among them was Petrus Alfonsi, who argued not only that Jesus’s Jewish crucifiers knew him to be the messiah and son of God, but they continued or would

continue, were they able, to crucify him into the present. Petrus, moreover, did so in dialogue with Moyses, the Jew he had been before his conversion.

Baptized in 1106 at the court of his godfather, Alfonso I of Aragon, in Huesca (the city had only recently reverted to Christian hands ten years prior), Petrus composed his *Dialogus*, one of the Middle Ages' most popular and enduring anti-Jewish polemics, sometime between 1108 and 1110.⁴³ Perhaps as a result of its dialectic nature, its author's liminality, contemporary violence, or some combination thereof, Petrus was more damning than earlier exegetes, including Bede and his followers. Petrus argued that some Jews had knowingly committed deicide out of *invidia*, as Bede had, but also out of hatred and malice; he used Jewish post-biblical texts as evidence for the Jews' culpability; and he implied that all Jews, including those living in the *diaspora* were complicit in Jesus's execution. Although deicide was only one facet of his representation of the Jews — whom he also deemed foolish, irrational, overly literal, ritually impure, and unable to please God — it was nonetheless a fundamental one. When he set forth “what is to be believed and hence what is to be understood” in the prologue to the *Dialogus*, Petrus included “that the Jews crucified [Christ] willfully and by design,”⁴⁴ making intentional deicide as much an article of faith as Christ's death and resurrection. Petrus further developed this charge in two chapters (*tituli*), integrating it into both his critique of Judaism (chapter 2) and his defense of Christianity (chapter 10). Although his contentions overlap and tend toward repetition, because deicide functions slightly differently within the two parts of the *Dialogus* and because these accusations sit at the confluence of so many important developments in twelfth-century thought, I will explore them separately and in some depth.

The *Dialogus*'s second chapter is dedicated to explaining the Jews' captivity and exile. From the outset, Petrus explained that denying Christ and choosing not to serve him precipitated the diaspora, which he argued was exceptional for its length and severity.⁴⁵ In dialogue with his Jewish self, he argued that this captivity had lasted countless generations because successive generations

shared in the ancestral crimes for which it was punishment. And, through Moyses, Petrus concluded that “all the following generations remain in their fathers’ captivity, because they follow (*execuntur*) their fathers’ deeds in so far as they are able.”⁴⁶ As *exsequor* carries with it the sense of following to the end or to the grave, Petrus’s choice of it here suggests that subsequent generations did not merely follow their ancestors’ deeds but followed them to the bitter end. Were those descendants to forsake their forbearers’ deeds, Petrus added, their own captivity would be at an immediate end. The present captivity’s length and severity, Petrus continued, was also evidence that it resulted from a particularly grievous sin: namely “you killed Christ, the son of God, calling him a sorcerer and son of a whore,” who would lead the nation into error.⁴⁷ The *maiores* said these and similar things, Petrus asserted, until they convinced all the people, and so they unjustly led a just man to judgment, crucified, and killed him. By preceding this assertion that Jews in the first century killed Christ and the son of God with the argument that their descendants, that is contemporary Jews, shared or would share in that deed, Petrus effectively and affectively cast the historic crime of the crucifixion as an ongoing sin, freezing the Jews at the moment of Christ’s death.⁴⁸

Petrus further charged that the Jews had acted maliciously and knowingly, and he used, among other sources, Jewish post-biblical texts in doing so. After Moyses challenges him to expound on whether “that man” was the son of God and by what authority he could be considered the cause of “our tribulation,” Alfonsi argues that Jewish leaders knew not only that Jesus was the messiah but also that his death would result in the Temple’s destruction and the Jews’ dispersal.⁴⁹ Titus razed the Temple forty years after Christ’s death, he details, and forty years before its destruction, there were premonitory signs and omens to which the Jews’ post-biblical texts attest: red wool tied to the horns of the scapegoat that did not whiten, referred to in the Mishnah’s *Yoma* 6.5–6; a candle extinguished before its customary time; the doors of the Temple thrown open and R. Johannen ben Zakai declaring that fire would possess it.⁵⁰ Alfonsi concludes that Johannen ben

Zakai and other learned men of his day said that *invidia* and malevolence caused the captivity, but “kept silent about the true reason: namely the Jews’ *invidia* and malevolence were the reason for Christ’s death, but Christ’s death was the reason for the captivity.”⁵¹

As in much of the *Dialogus*, Moyses does not so much refute Alfonsi’s contentions as hone them. Here, he replies that if such were the case, no Jew deserves to live. If it is a sin to deny the invisible, incorporeal God, Moyses inquires rhetorically, how much graver a sin would denying God in the flesh, inflicting injuries on him, and affixing him to a cross be? Petrus did not contradict Moyses; rather, he used this interjection to reiterate his argument in a sharper key. God suffers the Jews to live in servitude and blindness, as “a reproach and a tale, accursed in everyone’s eyes” as Deuteronomy 28.37 foretold.⁵² Had God destroyed the Jews at the time of the crucifixion, their infamy would have died with them. Finally, Petrus argued that the Jews were allowed to survive because God foresaw that some would believe and be saved.⁵³

As this chapter draws to a close, Alfonsi expands on the theme of the Jews’ collective responsibility, again in response to Moyses’s counterarguments. Moyses advances, among other objections, that the Jews were already scattered through the world in the first century, so could not all have taken part in Christ’s death.⁵⁴ Alfonsi answers that, although they were not present, when they heard what their co-religionists had done, all of Israel praised it, consented to it, and so shared in it and the culpability for it. Further, he continues, Christ was sold with their “consent, aid, and counsel,” and thus Jews living everywhere committed that evil (*scelus*) no less than those directly involved.⁵⁵ Selling the human Christ, namely the son of God, was, Alfonsi adds, equal to denying God. Indeed, of the four sins that are equal to denying God, Petrus declared this to be the gravest.⁵⁶ By all these authorities, he concluded, it is clear that the present captivity was the result of Christ’s death and Jewish malevolence, and could only be escaped through conversion, an exhortation with which Alfonsi concludes each chapter.⁵⁷

Petrus returned to the crucifixion and the sin of deicide in his tenth chapter, titled “That Christ was crucified and killed by the Jews of their own will,”⁵⁸ a chapter dedicated to proving Christ’s divinity. As before, Alfonsi’s arguments are prompted by Moyses’s protestations. The first of which was if Christ were divine, why had he allowed himself to be killed, and if, as Alfonsi contends, Christ died willingly to redeem humanity, why did Christians condemn the Jews for his death?⁵⁹ Alfonsi replies that had the Jews acted to fulfil Christ’s will, they would not have committed a sin, but “they denied him and killed him out of *invidia*, and so they are answerable for such an evil deed; and they will not escape misery and tribulation either in the present or in the future so long as they persist in their wickedness.”⁶⁰

Alfonsi deploys two analogies to evince the justness of this condemnation. If, Alfonsi asks Moyses, someone wanted to burn another’s boat for its nails and some charcoal, or another wanted to pull down his house to repurpose its stones, how would Moyses judge their enemies if they inadvertently fulfilled the owners’ desires by burning the boat or destroying the house out of odium and *invidia*? In answer to Moyses’s concession that he would consider these enemies culpable, Petrus concluded that those “who killed Christ not to fulfil his will but from the poison of hatred and *invidia*” are (in the present tense) likewise culpable.⁶¹ Jeremy Cohen has read these analogies as evidence that Petrus deemed Christ’s crucifiers to have been blind to his identity. Because these hypothetical malefactors were ignorant of the owners’ intentions, Christ’s crucifiers “too must have been ignorant of Jesus’s intentions and, therefore, of his identity.”⁶² Yet this conclusion rests on the somewhat precarious assumption that to be ignorant of the son of God’s intentions was to be ignorant of his identity. Petrus, in contrast, only stated that the malefactors were ignorant of the owners’ intentions. Within his hypothetical, moreover, their enemies knew exactly who owned the boat and house in question. Nor did Petrus suggest that envy, much less malice or hatred, precluded understanding or intention.

Petrus also expanded on this argument. When Moyses protests that Jesus was a magician whose execution was warranted, Alfonsi rebuts this claim by expounding on the miracles attributed to Jesus, arguing that Jesus must have been a friend and faithful servant of God, sent by God. Thus, Jesus must have spoken truly when he called himself the son of God.⁶³ Moyses marvels that the learned men of Jesus's day could have failed to recognize him, because "if they had recognized [him], why did they spurn his faith and teaching, and knowingly (*scienter*) incur the damnation of their souls by crucifying him."⁶⁴ Alfonsi informs Moyses that the educated Jews of Jesus's day acted out of *invidia* and the fear of losing their authority and renown. Comparing them to Jereboam, Alfonsi further scolds his interlocuter that "you should not marvel if the teachers of the Law and the scribes killed Christ with the poison of *invidia*, since they feared that they would lose their honor and renown through him."⁶⁵ In short, Petrus plainly stated twice in short order that the Jews had acted out of *invidia* and fear, not ignorance. Finally, Petrus concluded this chapter with a reference to Luke 23:34, declaring that Christ loved his crucifiers despite their actions and invoking the day when the sons would acknowledge their fathers' iniquities, lament their sins, and convert.⁶⁶

It is not entirely clear why Petrus elected to wield the accusation of intentional deicide. In writing the *Dialogus*, he was undoubtedly numbering himself among those who believed, in contrast to his Jewish interlocuter, and did so to counter doubts and questions about the sincerity and completeness of his own conversion.⁶⁷ Thus, his deployment of deicide may reflect the precariousness of his own status within his chosen community, an apostate's awareness of Jewish objections to Christian contentions, the hostility of the recent convert, or some combination thereof.⁶⁸ Akin to Bede's use of deicide for contrast, Petrus may also have deployed deicide to exculpate himself and establish himself as a Christian by heightening the difference between who had been and who had become. And, regardless of its impetus, the *Dialogus* represents an inflection point in intentional deicide and polemic, as it presaged a number of twelfth-century developments.

Whether due to its influence and authority,⁶⁹ or because Petrus's liminality made him an early adopter, several polemicists and exegetes advanced similar arguments in subsequent decades. Though only two went so far as intentional deicide, several authors depicted the Jews as having willfully or knowingly rejected and crucified Christ, the son of God, often in ways that echo Petrus.

"LED TO HIS DEATH NOT BY DOGS, BUT BY THE JEWS": POLEMIC

Not all twelfth-century polemicists abandoned the patristic consensus. Most continued to maintain that the Jews were blind to Christ's divinity,⁷⁰ and no other surviving polemic deployed the accusation of intentional deicide. After 1100, however, the Jews' role in the crucifixion was a standard topos within the genre. Even Peter Abelard (c. 1079–1142), who elsewhere argued that the Jews would have sinned had they *not* killed Christ, still nodded to the crimes of crucifixion and deicide in his *Dialogus inter philosophum, Iudaeum, et Christianum*.⁷¹ As Petrus Alfonsi had and other polemicists would, moreover, he did so in colloquy with a Jew, an imagined Jew to be sure, but one who was presumably meant to represent real, living Jews with whom both the author and his readers might interact.⁷² A few polemicists, moreover, directly or indirectly picked up threads of Petrus's arguments, most notably, and perhaps dangerously, the willful rejection of Christ and the image of the Jews as persistent, ongoing crucifiers, tying the Jews' supposed enmity for Christ and his church more firmly to their imagined role in his death.

Writing in 1126, between 1147 and 1149, and in 1198 respectively, Rupert of Deutz, Peter the Venerable, and Peter of Blois echoed elements of Petrus's *Dialogus* in their polemic, among their century's most strident and innovative, and they used deicide and rejection to most effect.⁷³ Of the three, Rupert's assessment was arguably the harshest, though Peter the Venerable's is likely the better known. In his *Annulus*, or "a dialogue on the sacraments of the faith," Rupert claimed that the Jews were led into captivity, because they were Christ's enemies and did not wish to become his

friends through faith.⁷⁴ Indeed, the fictional Jew of the *Anulus* defines himself in these terms, repeatedly referring to Jesus as the man “whom my fathers crucified.”⁷⁵ Rupert also exhorted his Jewish interlocutor to confess that “due to the sin of denying Christ, whom you denied before Pilate and killed,” Jerusalem was destroyed and the people scattered. He added, “you (*tu*) are not the people of him, whom you denied.”⁷⁶ With Rupert’s use of the second person singular, it is not the Jews of first-century Jerusalem, or even the Jews collectively, but the individual (albeit imagined) Jew with whom he was debating who denied and killed Christ.

Similarly, Peter the Venerable scolded the *Adversus Iudaeorum inveteratam duritiem*’s Jewish interlocutor, “Acknowledge that this is the reason for your dreadful damnation, that you did not acknowledge, accept, and worship the coming Christ ... rather you scorned, mocked, and killed him in your detestable way,” albeit in the second person plural.⁷⁷ He also concluded in the chapter dedicated to proving that Christ is God that in denying Christ and Christianity, the Jews had denied God.⁷⁸ Peter of Blois also attributed the Jews’ captivity to their purported role in the crucifixion in his *Contra perfidiam Iudeorum*. Like Petrus Alfonsi decades before, he implied that they knew that Christ’s death would bring it about. As the prophets foretold the messiah’s coming, he argued, the Jew would have seen his own desolation before he denied Christ.⁷⁹ Indeed, such is the obstinance of the Jews, this Peter declares, they “are sensible of the vengeance for their evil deed (*scelus*) and still obdure in their wickedness.”⁸⁰ According to Peter of Blois, moreover, both Pilate and Josephus had blamed the crucifixion on the chief priests’ *invidia*, with the former even declaring that the priests had handed Christ over to Pilate, who had had him tormented, but the priests crucified him.⁸¹

The theme of persistent enmity is especially pronounced in the polemics of these two Peters. Likening the Jews to dogs, Peter the Venerable asserted that in calling for Christ’s death, they had displayed canine bloodthirstiness. Isaiah had foretold, he wrote, “that Christ would be led to his death, not by dogs, but by the Jews, who are far worse.”⁸² Although he was ultimately more

condemnatory of their denial of Christ, for Peter the Venerable it was the Jews' rejection and crucifixion of Christ that made them less than human, indeed less than dogs, exemplifying how integral crucifixion and deicide were to the dehumanizing discourse that proliferated in the later Middle Ages.⁸³ The dangers inherent in this rhetoric and the ways in which it elided the historic sin of Christ's crucifixion with contemporary Jews' ongoing rejection of Christianity, tying difference ever more indelibly to enmity, is even more evident in Peter of Blois's polemic. In Peter of Blois's telling, the Jews were not only the descendants of Christ's crucifiers, they continued to perpetrate the crucifixion quite literally, as "they abduct Christians' children and crucify them in secret."⁸⁴

Peter of Blois was, of course, referring to the charge, which first emerged in the 1140s, that Jews were in the habit of re-enacting the crucifixion by kidnapping and killing Christian children.⁸⁵ Because the link between deicide and ritual murder has been discussed extensively, I will not wade into the scholarly firestorms over ritual murder here;⁸⁶ rather, I will underscore the shared logic between claims that the Jews killed Christ, the son of God, intentionally and those that they re-enacted his death by killing a Christian in his stead. In Thomas of Monmouth's *vita* of William of Norwich, an early exemplar of the accusation, young William was seized, tortured, crucified, and killed in the manner and in the place of Christ. While tormenting him, the *vita*'s Jews fasten William to the cross in mockery and mimicry of Christ's passion: "And they did so, as if to say, 'Just as we condemned Christ to a shameful death, let us condemn this Christian.'"⁸⁷ In this and other narratives from the period, in which Jews reportedly killed a child in contempt of Christ or out of hatred for Christianity, contemporary Jews continued to "pursue the deeds of their fathers" by intentionally crucifying Christ, the son of God, in the person of a Christian child, as they had in the polemics of Petrus and others.⁸⁸ Deicide was, arguably, the archetypal act of imagined Jewish violence against Christians, one that would drive actual violence, both popular and juridical, against Latin Christendom's Jewish communities for centuries after.⁸⁹

“THEY HATED AND KILLED CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD”: CHRISTOCENTRIC PIETY

Latin Christendom’s burgeoning devotion to the human, suffering Christ, exemplified by the appearance of the dying or dead Christ on western crucifixes and portrayals of Jews crucifying him after 1000, arguably underlay much of the potency of charges of ritual murder and deicide.⁹⁰ As Christ’s suffering and death became more intimate and immediate concerns within Christian *praxis* and piety, responses to it became more visceral and assessments of his crucifiers, more condemnatory. The tie between *imitatio Christi* and intentional deicide is particularly evident in the exegesis of Rupert of Deutz, whose own piety was marked by devotions to and ecstatic union with the crucifix, and, to a lesser extent, Robert of Melûn, who not coincidentally also accused the Jews of intentional deicide. In Rupert’s *Anulus*, he contrasted his own devotion to Christ with his rhetorical Jew’s rejection and crucifixion of the same;⁹¹ in his biblical commentaries on the gospels and the minor prophets, on the other hand, devotion and deicide served less as contrast and more as buttresses for Rupert’s christology. Similarly, in Robert’s commentary on the Pauline epistles, the charge of deicide flowed from a discussion of Christ’s nature (in this, as in so many other things, Petrus Alfonsi was a trendsetter).

Rupert maintained that the Jews denied and killed Christ intentionally, out of hatred or enmity, in various ways and through several commentaries over the course of at least two decades. In his commentary on John, completed in 1116,⁹² Rupert contended that not only had the Jews rejected and sought to kill the Lord in the past, but also that

the Jews, those foolish and malicious killers, spillers of Christ’s blood, who even today curse Christ in their synagogues, [bear] the same blood of Christ inherited from their parents. We say that they are Jews, not because they are, but because the liars say that they are Jews, when they are the synagogue of Satan.⁹³

A decade later, in his *De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum*, Rupert argued that the Jews did not deny Christ due to ignorance but blasphemed him out of *invidia*.⁹⁴ The accounts of Christ's crucifixion and death were not, however, the primary lightning rods for deicide in Rupert's exegesis of the gospels. Of the crowd clamoring "take him away, take him away, crucify him" (John 19:15), Rupert stated only "Regard that the wretched Jews said: 'Take away the king from us, take away the prince, take away the priest ... Take away the savior, crucify the proprietor' and thus they squandered salvation, and they have no defense."⁹⁵ In contrast, Rupert excoriated the Jews as spillers of Christ's blood and members of the synagogue of Satan in commenting on a less obviously inflammatory passage recounting how no one spoke openly of Jesus out of fear of the Jews (John 7:13).⁹⁶

Rupert's most unambiguous condemnations of the Jews' supposed role in the crucifixion were made not in his commentaries on the gospels, however, but in his exegesis of the minor prophets, which he dedicated to revealing Christ's mysteries within the Old Testament.⁹⁷ Commenting on Amos, for example, Rupert carried the willful denial of Christ to the point of willful damnation. Such is their implacable hatred of Jesus, he argued, that the Jews prefer (in the present tense) to be damned rather than confess the name of the Lord.⁹⁸ More stridently still, in his commentary on Hosea, completed between 1122 and 1123, the iniquity (*iniquitas*) of Ephraim and the malice (*malitia*) of Samaria (Hos. 7:1) occasion repeated imprecations against the Jews for denying and killing Christ. According to Rupert, Ephraim's iniquity prefigured the Jews, and Samara's malice prefigured the Pharisees and the scribes. The Jews' withdrawal from the house of David and murder of past prophets was thus fulfilled, he declared, by their crucifying the son of David, the son of God.⁹⁹ Although Rupert implied that the Jews' rejection and crucifixion of Christ might well be attributable to blindness, that blindness was not born of ignorance: "their very malice blinded them, so they did not see and did not know" that Christ's cross was a blessing to every nation, and thus Christ cut off their branch.¹⁰⁰

Yet determining the exact degree of guilt that the Jews were to bear was not always, or even often, the point. Rupert's focus was on Christ and the degree of intention and guilt borne by his crucifiers existed in service to that christological focus. As a result, Rupert's exegesis on this point was not entirely consistent. In the same commentary on Hosea, Rupert argued that some Jews, the chief among them, did know that Christ was God. Explicating Hosea 8:4 — "they made kings and not through me; they elected princes and I did not know them" — he turned to the parable of the wicked tenants. Like Bede and others before him, Rupert argued:

the scribes and Pharisees, seeing Jesus, were not ignorant, but hated him, just as he says, "But now, they have seen and hated both me and my father" (John 15:24). And, since the tenants said, "This is the heir," there is no one among them who may absolve himself on account of ignorance. Thus, when they say, "Come, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be ours," rightly and truly [they] say who is killed.¹⁰¹

Rupert not only affirmed that the scribes and Pharisees were not ignorant of Jesus's identity and Christ's nature, he shifted from the past to the present tense as he did so. Jewish leaders knew (*non ignoraverunt*) and hated (*oderunt*) Christ and the tenants said (*dixerunt*) "this is the heir" in the past tense, but the Jews cannot absolve themselves (*se excusent*) and the tenants say (*dicunt*) "come, let us kill him" in the present, much as Christ himself continued to suffer and die in the present tense in much of contemporary Christian thought and devotion.¹⁰² Within Rupert's intense identification with Christ's humanity and suffering, the crucifiers were no more time bound than the crucifixion.

In this section of his commentary, however, Rupert did not attribute the Jews' actions to animus or *invidia* but, consistent with the passage on which he commented, to a love of lucre. Hosea 8.4 bemoans Israel making idols of gold and silver, and Rupert read this to mean that the Jews loved gold and silver more than God: thus, "they hated Christ and God, his father; they hated and killed Christ, the son of God."¹⁰³ While much might be made, and perhaps rightly so, about this mid-

twelfth-century accusation of avarice,¹⁰⁴ arguably it was due as much (if not more) to Rupert's reigning need to read the prophets in light of Christ than to any contemporary exigencies. Certainly, the gold and silver to which he alludes belonged to the first-century Jerusalem, not to twelfth-century Deutz.

Rupert's christological reading of both Hosea and the gold and silver it referenced is comprehensible in light of his exegesis of John. When the Jews deny that Christ is their king because he makes himself the son of God, they antithetically affirm Rupert's own christology, because "Truly, these are the three names of the one Christ, our Lord: man, king, God, or son of God."¹⁰⁵ Denying Christ because he claimed to God, son of God, man, and messiah attests that he *was* God, son of God, man, and messiah in Rupert's estimation. His very nature, Rupert continues, incites the ire of Christ's enemies and the veneration of his friends, evidence of the church's supersession. Christ's nature and the church's election were the twin poles around which his accusations of intentional deicide revolved.

Robert of Melûn, who taught at Melûn and Paris before he became the bishop of Hereford in 1163, rooted his assessment of Jews as deicides less in christology and in Christ's sufferings. His conclusions about intention and ignorance flowed from his arguments about Christ's nature and passion in commentary on Paul's epistles, written sometime between 1145 and 1155.¹⁰⁶ From trying to balance belief in Christ as human and divine with that in the Trinity as one in essence and three in person in his reading of 1 Corinthians 2, Robert reads 1 Corinthians 2:8 against the grain to state that it would seem that the demons and *sapientes mundi* knew Christ on the grounds of Matthew 8:29 and Mark 1:34.¹⁰⁷ Whatever doubts there may have been, after Lazarus's resurrection, when the devil judged that Christ was God, he allowed the Jews to seize, bind, and whip him, so the devil knew he was human. Christ's sufferings at the hands of the Jews were then, the crux of Robert's argument that Christ was fully human. Returning to question of knowledge and the contradictions between the

passage on which he was commenting and Bede's interpretation of the tenants' parable, Robert sought to resolve the central paradox of his suggestion that the Jews knew Jesus was the messiah and God but, nonetheless, sought his death:

Indeed, the Jews seem to have known him. For in the evangelical parable, it is written: "Behold the heir; come, let us kill him" (Mark 12:7) But this blindness was incredible, if they knew that he was the one through whom they would be delivered, and still sought to kill him. Likewise, if they knew that he was God, they knew that he was immortal, and why he could not be killed. How would they seek his death, if they knew that he could not be killed?

Yet, this can also be said, that they are said to have recognized him, because they thought that they had recognized him. Some of them believed because he was, yet spurred by *invidia*, they did not leave off persecuting him. For, this is the nature of *invidia*; that it seeks what is contrary to its own good.¹⁰⁸

In Robert's telling, *invidia* was not a blindfold, but a goad, one which explained how the Jews could know that Jesus was divine and still try to crucify him.¹⁰⁹ *Invidia* did not blind the Jews; it resolved the contradiction inherent in the established reading of the parable of the wicked tenants and the literal reading of 1 Corinthians 2.8.¹¹⁰

"BOTH THE DEED OF JUDAS AND THE JEWS WAS WICKED": SIN AND INTENTION

In moving from exegesis into other spheres, responsibility for the crucifixion also became a case history for law and theology, as well as a more engrained part of how Christians viewed their Jewish neighbors.¹¹¹ Perhaps most infamously, Christians departing on crusade during the twelfth century sought to avenge Christ against the Jews in their midst and the Muslims abroad, not infrequently invoking the crucifixion in the present tense as they did.¹¹² Like the polemics of Petrus,

Rupert, Peter the Venerable, and Peter of Blois, this violence was at the bleeding edge of deicide. Less cutting assessments of Jewish intentions and guilt for rejecting and crucifying Christ appear in other sources, including scholastic theology and law, often as a means of working out other questions. Arguably because of the passion's very centrality to Christian thought and identity, theologians and canonists explored questions of sin and guilt, ignorance and intention, using the crucifixion as a test case while trying to reconcile the very contradictory biblical texts on which their conclusions rested.¹¹³

Within a philosophical discussion of sin and intent in his *Sic et non*, Peter Abelard concluded that those who persecuted Christ sinned, but they would have sinned more gravely had they acted contrary to their consciences and done otherwise. Because of the crucifiers' good intentions, their sin was venial, rather than mortal.¹¹⁴ Rather less-well known are the similar ways in which the *Decretum* and a few decretists used the crucifixion to determine the degree of guilt incurred by the sins of others and unintentional sins.¹¹⁵ Harkening back to Augustine, the *Decretum* used the crucifixion to demonstrate that those who urge others to homicide are guilty of homicide and that people might bear the guilt for others' crimes. Granting that the Jews did not kill Christ with their own hands, the *Decretum* nonetheless maintains that "they are charged with the death of the Lord because they killed him with their tongues, saying 'Crucify, crucify him.'"¹¹⁶ According to Augustine and so to the *Decretum*, this accounts for the discrepancies in the gospels as to the hour of Jesus's death: the Jews crucified him with their tongues at the third hour, but the soldiers with their hands at the sixth. As the *Decretum* itself was subject to explication and reconciliation, later canonists used its canons to explore new issues. Peter Cantor (d. 1197), for example, used the *Decretum*'s treatment of collective responsibility for the crucifixion to argue that a "people had the power and duty to resist its prince's sins," a stance which justified the use of interdicts.¹¹⁷

In a further indication of how invasive responsibility for the crucifixion was, commentators on the *Decretum* even used deicide to discuss sin and guilt when the canon they sought to explicate made no reference to the passion. Huguccio of Pisa (d. 1210), among others, used Christ's death to illustrate the choice between two evils. Perhaps alluding to Abelard's conclusions in *Sic et non*, Huguccio wrote that some claim that while the Jews sinned in killing Christ, they would have sinned more in not killing him because they would have acted against their conscience, which dictated that whoever made himself the son of God ought to die. In this instance, Huguccio argued that there is no perplexity, because the Jews could have avoided sinning by not killing Christ. It was possible to know through the law and the prophets that they sinned by killing and not by not killing. They could have consulted the apostles and others who knew the truth. Anyone in a comparable case of perplexed conscience could, and should, Huguccio continued, consult those wiser than themselves.¹¹⁸

The Jews' purported role in rejecting and crucifying Christ were also used as a jumping off point for discussions of ignorance and intention. The *Decretum*, for example, used the Jews' assigned role in the passion to illustrate the boundaries of exculpatory ignorance of facts. Expounding on *ignorantia facti* and *ignorantia iuris*, the *Decretum* asserted that the ignorance of the Jews and other infidels, who do not know that Christ fulfilled what the prophets had foretold, exemplified ignorance of what ought to be known. It was consequently inexcusable.¹¹⁹ Peter the Lombard, author of the twelfth-century's other great textbook, put the crucifixion and deicide to similar use. Commenting on 1 Corinthians in the *Collectanea*,¹²⁰ the Lombard expanded on Walafrid's and the *Glossa ordinaria*'s distinction between the *maiores* and the *minores*, arguing that the latter had committed intentional christicide, though neither were intentional deicides. The chief priests, scribes, and Pharisees knew that Jesus was the messiah, but did not know that he was God, and "thus, of both it can be said, 'if they had known, either the *minores* that he was the messiah promised in the law, or the

maiores that he was God or the son of God, never would they have crucified the Lord of glory.”¹²¹

Even those who knew that Jesus as the messiah did not grasp the mystery of his incarnation, passion, and redemption, which Peter then explicated in greater detail.

Much like the Lombard, Peter of Poitiers (d. 1205), another well-known Parisian theologian and teacher, resolved the contradiction between the blame traditionally accorded to the Jews and Paul’s exoneration in 1 Corinthians, by distinguishing between the *maiores* and the *minores*.¹²² He argued that had the *maiores* believed Jesus to be God or the son of God, they never would have crucified him. The *maiores* did, however, believe Jesus to be the messiah but crucified him out of *invidia* and because he seemed to be the law’s destroyer. The *minores*, on the other hand, did not rate him as messiah or son of God, and they never would have handed him over if they had. Thus, it was for the *minores*’ forgiveness, because their actions seem excusable, that Christ prayed. Those same *minores* then “converted, as is read in the Acts of the Apostles, four thousand on one day, five thousand on another (Acts 4:4),”¹²³ defining all contemporary Jews as descendants of the *maiores*, who had acted out of *invidia*, not the *minores* who had acted from misguided zeal.

Peter the Lombard and Peter of Poitiers further used *chresticide* and *deicide* to explore the question of whether God wills the evil that people do. Returning to the vexed question of God’s role in Christ’s death in the *Sententiae*, Peter the Lombard argued that God wanted Christ’s death “with good will” (*bona voluntate*), but the Jews crucified him with “impious will” (*impia voluntate*). God and the Jews alike wanted Christ to suffer and to die, but to different ends. According to the Lombard, God wanted the passion but did not want Christ to die, “because it was an evil deed and a sin.”¹²⁴ In attempting to address the inherent contradictions in this position, the Lombard simply concluded that God’s good will was fulfilled through the Jews’ wicked will.¹²⁵ Elsewhere in the *Sententiae*, he summarized this argument as: “Christ and the father’s deed was good, because the father and the son’s will was good; the deed of Judas and the Jews was wicked, because their

intention was wicked.”¹²⁶ In his own. *Senteniarum libri quique*, written a decade or so later, Peter of Poitiers likewise wrestled with the problem of how to blame the Jews for fulfilling God’s will. Although Christ’s will and the Jews’ would seem to be in accord, Peter of Poitiers asserted otherwise, because Christ’s will was out of love or charity, while the Jews’ was out of hatred.¹²⁷ Launched on a disquisition as to how the Jews could be blamed for the passion but not responsible for this, the central act of Christian redemption, Peter of Poitier repeatedly returned to the question of intent. Some Jews’ part in the proceedings was wicked because it proceeded from wicked intent, whereas Christ’s was good because it was due to good will.¹²⁸ Further, although some Jews acted out of zeal for God, it was wicked to kill a teacher and an innocent, especially since they had heard the messiah promised in the law. If they were ignorant, Peter of Poitiers maintained, their ignorance was stupid, but “those who acted from *invidia* sinned more than others” nevertheless.¹²⁹

CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing previous centuries’ arguments in his *Summa theologiae*, Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) reiterated many of the competing scriptural passages and disagreements about how they ought to be read. His dialectic illustrates how far from Augustine, or even Anselm of Canterbury, Latin theologians, polemicists, and jurists had migrated since 1100. Beginning with the parable of the wicked tenants, Thomas marshalled several exegetical arguments that would suggest that the Jews knew Jesus to be the Christ or the son of God when they crucified him (a premise long since established since the patristics). He cites 1 Corinthians 2:8 and Acts 3:17 as evidence that the Jews acted in ignorance. Aquinas concluded, however, with the Lombard’s argument that the *maiores* and the demons knew that Christ was the messiah, but not divine. Nonetheless, he continued, their ignorance did not exculpate them, because it was affected. The *maiores* saw the signs of Christ’s divinity, but their *invidia* and hatred blinded them. On the other hand, the *minores* did not understand

scripture, so they did not understand that Jesus was Christ or God, and they were deceived by their rulers.¹³⁰ Aquinas's conclusion reiterated that the Jews' ignorance was affected and so does not excuse their actions; indeed, it exacerbates their guilt, and the Jews sinned regardless as Christ and God's crucifiers. Their sin was the more serious on account of its nature and their malice. Further, the Jews' sin was graver than that of Pilate who condemned Jesus or the soldiers who carried out his execution, because Judas acted out of greed and the chief priests out of *invidia* and hatred.¹³¹ Although it modulated some of the bitterest charges, Aquinas's dialectic illustrates how entangled crucifixion and deicide had become in the ways in which Christians thought about Jews and their place in Christendom, as well as Christian understandings of Christ, guilt, and intent.

Aquinas was, as Jeremy Cohen has argued, writing on the cusp of another major fracture in the history of deicide.¹³² Even harsher condemnations would become more common in subsequent centuries. Aquinas was not, however, looking forward so much as he was looking back at the exegesis of figures like Bede and Peter the Lombard, the treatises of polemicists like Petrus Alfonsi and Peter the Venerable (albeit indirectly), and the divergent scriptural references on which they had all built their conclusions. While Aquinas and his predecessors were drawing from a common well, namely the Christian Bible, they were not, as we have seen, always or even often doing so for the same reasons and consequently did not reach the same or even similar conclusions. Arguing for Christ's divinity within newly (or partially) Christian Rome and against competing Christian sects, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine of Hippo, and others maintained that the Jews were to blame (while acknowledging that technically speaking they were not) for Christ's death but had acted in ignorance of his identity as messiah and son of God or God in rejecting Jesus and calling for his crucifixion. Reading the same scriptures three hundred years later and in newly (or partially) Christian England and seeking to establish the election of both the church and the English, Bede concluded that some Jews had known Christ to be the son of God and sought his death regardless. Adapting Bede's

supersessionist exegesis to their own christological and epistemological battles, Paschius Radbertus, Rabanus Maurus, and Walahfrid Strabo intimated that the Jews had known Jesus to be the Christ and, possibly, God at the time of his death.

The twin accusations of rejection and crucifixion assumed new force and ferocity, and much of their present form, over the course of the twelfth century when Petrus Alfonsi, Rupert of Deutz, Peter the Venerable, and others turned to decide with new preoccupations. Writing at the confluence of evolving anti-Jewish enmity and polemic, christology and piety, and notions of intention and guilt, Petrus Alfonsi portrayed all Jews, not only the Jews of Jesus's day, as intentional and ongoing deicides who knowingly rejected and killed Christ, the son of God, out of *invidia* and enmity. Petrus's charge was to prove remarkably sticky. Wrestling with questions of sin and intent within the spheres of law and moral theology, Peter the Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, the *Decretum*, and other jurists and scholastics used the crimes of christicide and deicide to test their notions of knowledge, ignorance, and culpability. Like the Carolingians, they tended to concur that Jewish leaders recognized Christ as the messiah, but not as God, and lesser folk acted in ignorance, though these authors disagreed about the degree of culpability or fault that each group bore as a result. Within the innovative invective of Peter the Venerable, Rupert of Deutz, and Peter of Blois, first-century Jews' assigned role in the crucifixion fed arguments both about Christianity's supersession as well as Jews' enmity, eroding further perceptions of the Jews' very Jewishness and even humanity. Rupert of Deutz and Robert of Melun advanced their charges of intentional deicide in service to their individual christological needs and devotions, illuminating how deeply enmeshed deicide and crucifixion were with the emerging devotion to the human, suffering Christ, and how inextricably entangled with medieval, Latin Christianity.

The form each accusation took depended on its author's own preoccupations and ends, and which of the prevailing streams — christology, christocentric piety, antagonism toward Jews and Judaism, intention and ignorance, among them — served as their arguments' headwaters.

¹ Melito, *On Pascha* 74–105, pp. 34–61; Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law* (Berkeley, 1999), 10–11; J. Christopher Edwards, *Crucified: The Christian Invention of the Jewish Executioners of Jesus* (Minneapolis, 2023), 55–59; Eric Werner, “Melito of Sardes, ‘The First Poet of Deicide,’” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 37 (1966): 191–210.

² Susannah Baxendale used this evocative phrase at the California Medieval Seminar and kindly allowed me to quote her.

³ Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, *Antisemitism: Myth and Hate from Antiquity to the Present* (New York, 2002), 18. This point may seem obvious, but few have taken notice of it. Christ's identification as God has an extensive history of its own. See, *inter alia*, Raniero Cantalamessa, *Dal kerygma al dogma: studi sulla cristologia dei Padri* (Milan, 2006), 11–77; Paula Fredericksen, *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Christ*, 2d ed. (New Haven, CT, 2000), 205–215; Larry W. Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2005), 13–107; Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, *Lehrbuch der Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 1, *Alte Kirche und Mittelalter* (Gütersloh, 1995), 577; Charles H. Talbert, *The Development of Christology during the First Hundred Years and Other Essays on Early Christian Christology* (Boston, 2011), 26–40; Geza Vermes, *Christian Beginnings: From Nazareth to Nicaea (AD 30–325)* (London, 2012), 155–234.

⁴ The following is far from exhaustive: Anthony Bale, “Richard of Devizes and Fictions of Judaism,” *Jewish Culture and History* 3 (2000): 55–72; Heather Blurton, *Inventing William of Norwich: Thomas of Monmouth, Antisemitism, and Literary Culture, 1150–1200* (Philadelphia, 2022); Jeffrey J. Cohen, “The Flow of Blood in Medieval Norwich,” *Speculum*, 79 (2004): 26–65; Gilbert Dahan, *Les juifs en France médiévale: dix études* (Paris, 2017), 65–78; Harvey Hames, “The Limits of Conversion: Ritual Murder and the Virgin Mary in the Account of Adam of Bristol,” *Journal of Medieval History* 33 (2007): 43–59; Geraldine Heng, “England's Dead Boys: Telling Tales of Christian-Jewish Relations Before and After the First European Expulsion of the Jews,” *MLN* 127 (2012): S54–S84; Hannah R. Johnson, *Blood Libel The Ritual Murder Accusation at the Limit of Jewish History* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2012); Gavin Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1996), 209–298; John M. McCulloh, “Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich, Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of a Myth,” *Speculum* 72 (1997): 698–740; Gerd Mengen, “Über den Ursprung der Ritualmordfabel,” *Aschkenas* 4 (1994): 405–416; Christopher Ocker, “Ritual Murder and the Subjectivity of Christ: A Choice in Medieval Christianity,” *Harvard Theological Review* 91, no. 2 (1998): 176–83; E.M. Rose, *The Murder of William of Norwich: The Origins of the Blood Libel in Medieval Europe* (New York, 2015); Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven, CT, 1999); Miri Rubin, “Making a Martyr: The Norwich Blood Libel,” [Hebrew] *Zmanim: A Historical Quarterly* 114 (2011): 64–69; Uri Z. Shachar, “Inspecting the Pious Body: Christological Morphology and the Ritual-Crucifixion Allegation,” *Journal of*

Medieval History 41 (2015): 21–40; Robert Stacey, “From Ritual Crucifixion to Host Desecration: Jews and the Body of Christ,” *Jewish History* 12 (1998): 11–28; Magda Teter, *Blood Libel: On the Trail of an Antisemitic Myth* (Cambridge, MA, 2020); Paola Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2019), 47–69; Ariel Toaff, *Pasque di sangue: ebrei d’Europa e omicidi rituali* (Bologna, 2008); Israel Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, trans. Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (Berkeley, 2006), 92–204.

⁵ Cohen, “The Jews as Killers of Christ,” *Traditio* 39 (1982): 1–27; Cohen, *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big Screen* (Oxford, 2007).

⁶ Watt, “Parisian Theologians and the Jews: Peter the Lombard and Peter Cantor,” in *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff*, eds. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999), 55–76.

⁷ Edwards, *Crucified*, particularly pp. 39–75. While Edwards does not approach his sources as historically or critically as he might, his book is a valuable effort to grapple with this thorny issue, and I am grateful to Paola Tartakoff for bringing it to my attention.

⁸ See Barbara Hurwitz, “*Fidei causa et tui amore*: The Role of Petrus Alphonsi’s Dialogues in the History of Jewish-Christian Debate” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983); Andrew P. Scheil, *The Footsteps of Israel: Understanding Jews in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2004), 23–119; David Timmer, “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, Notre Dame, 1983), 60–62; John Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi and his Medieval Readers* (Gainesville, FL, 1993), 19–22.

⁹ The Medieval Seminar’s most common plea was for greater precision about what medieval authors thought the Jews intended, thought, envied, or sought to achieve; explanations that cannot be advanced using the extant sources.

¹⁰ The Seminar’s most common plea was for the context that would explain the emergence of intentional deicide. My thanks to Fiona Griffiths for suggesting that I foreground this methodological problem and the ways in which intentional deicide defies straightforward explanation(s) in ways that echo the approach taken by Rowan Dorin in *No Return: Jews, Christian Usurers, and the Spread of Mass Expulsion in Medieval Europe* (Princeton, 2023). For a brief overview of the methods, perils, and promise of relying on context to explain a thinker’s conclusions, see Emmanuel Bloch, “The Image of the Non-Jew in the Responsa of David Zvi Hoffman,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 35 (2024): 160–180.

¹¹ Cohen, “The Jews as Killers of Christ,” 3–8. See also, Edwards, *Crucified*, 7–38; Geza Vermes, *The Passion* (London, 2005); Perry and Schweitzer, *Antisemitism*, 28–42.

¹² Ambrose of Milan, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 1.6, ed. Marc Adriaen, CCL 14 (Turnhout, 1957), 9. “Non viderunt eum Iudaei; obcaectatum enim cor eorum. Ipse quoque non se posse a Iudaeis uideri testificatur dicens: *duces caeci, liquantes culicem, camellum autem glutientes*. Non uidit eum Pilatus, non uiderunt illi qui clamabant: *crucifige eum; si enim uidissent, numquam dominum maiestatis crucifixissent*.” The thrust of Ambrose’s exegesis was not what role the Jews had played in the crucifixion but rather what it meant to see and hear God in the context of Luke 1:5–7.

¹³ Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei* 18.46, eds. Bernard Dombart and Alfons Kalb, CCL 48 (Turnhout, 1955), 644; *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 17 and 118, ed. Radbodus Willems, CCL 36 (Turnhout, 1954), 168–79, 654–58; *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 62.15–19, eds. Eligius Dekkers and Jean Fraipont, CCL 39 (Turnhout, 1956), 806; *De Catechizandis Rudibus* 23.42.5, ed. Johannes B. Bauer, CCL 46 (Turnhout, 1969), 166. Such a multitude of opinions is consistent with Augustine’s complex and multi-faceted thinking about Jews and Judaism.

¹⁴ Augustine of Hippo, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 118.1, p. 654. See Watt, “Parisian Theologians and the Jews,” 57–60; Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 9–10.

¹⁵ Augustine of Hippo, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 17.16, p. 178. “Ecce ipsi caeci, ipsi interfectores Christi, intellexerunt tamen uerba Christi. Non eum intellexerunt esse Christum, nec eum intellexerunt Filium Dei, sed tamen intellexerunt in illis uerbis, quia talis commendaretur Filius Dei, qui aequalis esset Deo.”

¹⁶ Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job* 9.24, ed. Marc Adriaen, CCL 143 (Turnhout, 1979), 487. “Iste itaque impius uultum iudicum eius operuit quia corda persequentium, ne auctorem suum cognoscerent, malitiae nubilo uelauit. Vnde et per Paulum dicitur: *Vsque in hodiernum diem cum legitur Moyses, uelamen est super cor eorum*. Qui rursus ait: *Si enim cognouissent, numquam Dominum gloriae crucifixissent*.”

¹⁷ In this parable, a landlord sends his son to collect rent from recalcitrant tenants, who had killed previous agents, and the tenants kill the landlord’s son.

¹⁸ Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, ed. David Hurst, CCL 120 (Turnhout, 1960), 403. “Notandum sane quod non pro eis qui liuoris ac superbiae stimulis accensi quem filium Dei intellexere crucifigere quam confiteri maluerunt sed pro eis utique qui zelum habentes sed non secundum scientiam nesciere quod fecerunt patri preces obtulerit.” See, Scheil, *The Footsteps of Israel*, 33–35; Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 10–11.

¹⁹ Bede, *In Marcum Evangelium Expositio* 3.12.7, ed. David Hurst, CCL 120, 585. “Manifestissime dominus probat Iudaeorum principes non per ignorantiam sed per inuidiam crucifixisse filium Dei. Intellexerunt enim hunc esse cui dictum: *Postula a me et dabo tibi gentes hereditatem tuam*, et propterea quasi sibi consultantibus aiebant, *Ecce mundus totus post eum abiit, et si dimittimus eum sic, omnes credent in eum*.” *Invidia* is most often translated as envy, but can also be read as ill-will, jealousy, or odium. According to Gregory I, who deemed it one of the seven major sins, *invidia* begets hatred, whispers, slander, exultation at others’ misfortunes, and pain at others’ good fortune. *Moralia in Job* 31.88, ed. Marc Adriaen, CCL 143B (Turnhout, 1985), 1610. Envy seems inadequate in this context, so I will simply use the term *invidia*.

²⁰ Bede, *In Marcum Evangelium Expositio* 3.12.12, p. 586.

²¹ On Bede, election, and the hermeneutic Jew, see, *inter alia*, Stephen J. Harris, “Anglo-Saxons, Israelites, Hebrews and Jews,” in *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, ed. Samantha Zacher (Toronto, 2016), 27–39, at 37–39; Kathy Lavezzo, *The Accommodated Jew: English Antisemitism from Bede to Milton* (Ithaca, NY, 2016), 30–55; Scheil, *Footsteps of Israel*, 3, 19, 23–119, especially 65–76; Samantha Zacher, *Rewriting the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon Verse: Becoming the Chosen People* (London, 2013), 26–28; Zacher, “Introduction,” in *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, 3–24, at 11–14. Bede’s reading was

so influential that even modern scholars, including Edwards, do not always recognize that it is exegesis. See Edwards, *Crucified*, 8–9.

²² Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 12.

²³ Johannes Heil, “Labourers in the Lord’s Quarry: Carolingian Exegetes, Patristic Authority, and Theological Innovations, a Case Study in the Representation of Jews in Commentaries on Paul,” in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, eds. Celia Chazelle and Burton VanName Edwards (Turnhout, 2003), 75–95, at 84.

²⁴ Adoptionist theologians, in Abigail Firey’s words (“Carolingian Ecclesiology and Heresy: A Southern Gallic Juridical Tract Against Adoptionism,” *Sacri Erudiri* 39 [2000]: 253–316, at 259–60), were read by their opponents as “dividing the person of Christ and declaring that Jesus was not God’s begotten Son.” See also Rainer Berndt, ed., *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794: Kristallisationspunkt Karolingischer Kultur (Akten zweier Symposien vom 23. bis 27. Februar und vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1994) anlässlich der 1200-Jahrfeier der Stadt Frankfurt am Main* (Mainz, 1997); John C. Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820* (Philadelphia, 1993); Florence Close and Christiane Veyrard-Cosme, “Procédés et enjeux de l’écriture polémique: Dossier épistolaire anti-adoptionniste du concile de Francfort (794),” in *Écriture et genre épistolaires (Epistola 1)*, eds. Thomas Deswarte, Klaus Herbers, and Hélène Sirantoine (Madrid, 2018), 85–98, at <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.cvz.4901>; Florence Close and Christiane Veyrard-Cosme, “Blessen par mots au nom du Verbe dans la controverse adoptionniste: Étude historique et littéraire des échanges épistolaires entre Alcuin, Félix et Élipand (797–799),” in *Lettres et conflits: Antiquité tardive et Moyen Âge (Epistola 3)*, eds. Thomas Deswarte, Klaus Herbers, and Hélène Sirantoine (Madrid, 2018), 85–98, at <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.cvz.27145>; Amancio Isla Frez, “El adopcionismo y las evoluciones religiosas y políticas en el reino Astur,” *Hispania* 58 (1998): 971–93.

²⁵ Rabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Matthaum* 6, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCM 174A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 565. Similarly, Pseudo-Bede reiterated and Chrétien de Stavelot paraphrased Bede’s assertion that the parable of the tenants demonstrated that the princes of the Jews had crucified Jesus not through ignorance but *invidia*. Pseudo-Bede, *In Mattheaum Evangelium Expositio* 3.21, PL 92: col. 95; Chrétien de Stavelot, *Expositum in Matthaum* c. 51, PL 106: col. 1438.

²⁶ Rabanus Maurus, *Ennarationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, Bk. 9, *Expositio in epistolam ad Corinthios primam*, PL 112: col. 23–24. “Quamvis dicat Lucas evangelista de daemonibus: Sciebant enim Christum ipsum esse Jesum (Luke 4); scierunt quidem ipsum esse, qui in lege promissus erat, mysterium tamen ejus quo filius Dei est nesciebant.”

²⁷ Rabanus Maurus, *Ennarationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, Bk. 9, PL 112: col. 23–24. “Ex forma enim servi crucifixus est et tamen Dominus gloriae crucifixus est: talis enim erat illa susceptio quae Deum hominem faceret, et hominem Deum.”

²⁸ Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 12.

²⁹ Paschius Radbertus, *Expositio in Mattheo libri XII* 9.21, ed. Bede Paul, CCM 56B (Turnhout, 1984), 1057. “Non quod nescissent eum patris familias Dei esse Filium sicut quidam incaute adfirmant sed invidia cecati et fastu superbie atque concupiscentia rerum obfirmaverunt faciem suam sicut et fratres Ioseph ne eum fratrem agnoscerent.”

³⁰ Paschius Radbertus, *Expositio in Mattheo libri XII* 9.21, p. 1057. “Sed signa et prodigia uidentes intellexerunt eum esse Christum quem confiteri noluerunt sed moliebantur magis eum occidere quem credere detrectabant. Sicut Herodes impiissimus cum didicisset a magis natum esse regem Iudeorum inde acrius inflammatur et molitur exstinguere quem ex Dei oraculis didicit repromissum.”

³¹ Walahfrid Strabo, *Evangelium secundum Matthaum*, PL 114: col. 155.

³² Walahfrid Strabo, *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, PL 114: col. 347. “Non pro eis orat, qui per invidiam et superbiam Filium Dei intellexerunt, negant et crucifigunt, sed pro eis qui zelam Dei habentes, sed non secundum scientiam, nescierunt quid fecerunt.”

³³ Walahfrid Strabo, *Epistola I ad Corinthios*, PL 114: col. 521. “Si enim cognovissent. Vel minores illum esse Messiam in lege promissum vel maiores Deum esse, vel Dei Filium: numquam Dominum gloriae crucifixissent.”

³⁴ Alcuin, *Adversus Elipandum* 4.14, *De incarnatione Christi in eo naturis libelli duo* 2.14, PL 101: col. 298.

³⁵ Haimo of Auxerre, *Epistola ad Romanos* 9, PL 117: col. 459–460. In Haimo’s telling the destruction of the Jews was the salvation of the gentiles. Sedulius Scotus *In Epistolam I ad Corinthios* 2, PL 103: col. 131–132.

³⁶ Anselm of Laon, *Enarrationes in Mattheum* 22, PL 162: col. 1433.

³⁷ Anselm of Laon, *Enarrationes in Mattheum* 8, col. 1326. “Si autem objiciatur quod Apostolus dicit: Si enim cognovissent, nunquam Deum gloriae crucifixissent [1 Cor. 2:8], respondit Beda huic objectioni. Non ideo Judaeus eum crucifigere persuasit, quia Christum sive Filium Dei esse putavit, sed quia se morte illius non praevidit esse damnandum.”

³⁸ *Glossa ordinaria cum Biblia latina* (Luke 23:34), ed. Martin Morard (Paris, 2023), <https://gloss-e.irht.cnrs.fr/php/editions.php?id=glo&numLivre=57> (accessed 21 May 2024). “Non pro eis orat qui per invidiam et superbiam filium Dei intellexerunt negant et crucifigunt, sed pro eis qui zelum Dei habentes sed non secundum scientiam, nescierunt quid fecerunt.”

³⁹ *Glossa ordinaria cum Biblia latina* (1 Cor. 2:8), ed. Martin Morard (Paris, 2015–2016), <https://gloss-e.irht.cnrs.fr/php/editions.php?id=glo&numLivre=61> (accessed 21 May 2024). “SI COGNOVissent. Vel minores illum esse messiam in lege promissum. Vel maiores Deum esse vel Dei Filium: numquam dominum glorie crucifixissent.”

⁴⁰ Michael Signer, “The *Glossa ordinaria* and Medieval Anti-Judaism,” in *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honour of Leonard Boyle*, eds. Jacqueline Brown and William Stoneman (Notre Dame, IN, 1997), 591–605, at 596–98.

⁴¹ Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” (see n. 7) 11. Cohen dismisses these arguments’ impact on the grounds that they do not specifically concern the Jews’ putative motives and their authors were not actively polemicizing.

⁴² Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus Homo* 2.15, *Pourquoi Dieu s’est fait homme*, ed. René Roques (Paris, 1963), 406. “Deum enim occidere nullus homo umquam scienter saltem velle poset, et ideo qui illum occiderunt ignoranter, non in illud infinitum peccatum, cui nulla alia comparari peccata possunt, proruerunt.” Compare Anna Sapir Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in*

the Twelfth Century Renaissance (New York, 1995), 44; Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 12–13.

⁴³ On Petrus and his *Dialogus*, see Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth Century Renaissance*, 52; Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, Darko Senekovic, and Thomas Ziegler, “Modes of Variability: The Textual Transmission of Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogus*,” in *Petrus Alfonsi and His Dialogus: Background, Context, Reception*, ed. Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann and Philipp Roelli (Florence, 2014), 227–248; Isabelle Draelants, “*Libellus elegans satis contra Iudeos et Sarracenos*: la rédaction du *Dialogus* dans le *Speculum historiale* de Vincent de Beauvais,” in *Petrus Alfonsi and his Dialogus*, 249–300; Amos Funkstein, “Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages,” *Viator* 2 (1971): 373–382; Irven Resnick, “Introduction,” *Petrus Alfonsi: Dialogue against the Jews* (Washington, DC, 2006), 3–36; Clare Soussen, “Spoken and Unspoken in Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogus*,” in *Jewish-Christian Disputations in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Sébastien Morlet (Leuven, 2020), 199–211, at 207–208; Ryan Szpiech, “‘Petrus Alfonsi ... Erred Greatly’: Alfonso of Valladolid’s Imitation and Critique of Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogus*,” in *Petrus Alfonsi and his Dialogus*, 321–28; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi* (see n. 10), 12–19, 95–131. Calculating the date of composition is complicated by Petrus’s preference for round figures. Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann and Darko Senekovic have dated it to 1109–1110, “Reading Petrus Alfonsi Before the Talmud Trials: The Manuscript Evidence,” in *Jewish-Christian Disputations in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, 159–179, at 159; Manfred Kniewasser dates this text to after 1109, “Die Antijüdische Polemik des Petrus Alphonsi (Getauft 1106) und des Abtes Petrus Venerabilis von Cluny (d. 1156),” *Kairos* 22 (1980): 34–76, at 42; Irven Resnick dates it to 1109, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 3; Tolan dates it to 1108–1110, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 13. Burnett, in contrast, suggests that Petrus composed the *Dialogus* in Aragon sometime after 1125, on the grounds that Petrus borrows from Qusta ibn Luqa’s *De differentia spiritus et animae*, which was translated between 1125–1152, “The Works of Petrus Alfonsi: Questions of Authenticity,” *Medium Aevum*, 66 (1997): 42–79, at 47–49.

⁴⁴ *Petrus Alfonsi Dialogus*, vol. 1, *Kirtische Edition mit Deutscher Übersetzung*, eds. Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, Darko Senekovic, and Thomas Ziegler (Florence, 2018), 2–4. “Vnde perpendimus et quod in eis intelligendum et quod inde est credendum uidelicet ... unus itaque Christus tribus perfectus substantiis, corpore scilicet anima et deitate, idem et Deus et homo est; et quod eum Iudei crucifixerunt sua dispositione et uoluntate, ut sicut erat creator, fieret et redemptor totius sancte ecclesie fidelium, scilicet precedentium et sequentium: mortuusque corpore et sepultus et tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit etiam in celum et ibi simul est cum patre, uenturus in die iudicii uiuos iudicare et mortuos, sicut prophete locuti sunt et futurum predixerunt.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 39; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 19–22.

⁴⁵ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 101; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 97.

⁴⁶ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 114. “Hoc autem ex tuis uerbis intelligi datur, quod omnes sequacium generationes iccirco in patrum captiuitate permanent, quod patrum suorum, in quantum possunt, opera execuntur. Quod si patrum opera dimitterent, et de captiuitate exirent.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 105. On Petrus’s use of Moyses, generally, see Anna Sapir Abulafia, “Moyes in Service of Petrus,” in *Petrus Alfonsi and his Dialogus* (see n. 45), 111–27, at 121–22.

⁴⁷ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 116. “Quia Christum Dei filium occidistis, dicentes eum magum et de scorto natum, et quod totam gentem in errorem induxit.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 106.

⁴⁸ My thanks to Jessica Ryen for this insightful observation. Justin Martyr made a similar argument in the second century, but rather than arguing that the Jews continued or would continue to crucify Christ, he argued that they persecute Christ in the present by persecuting Christians. See Edwards, *Crucified* (see n. 3), 49–51.

⁴⁹ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 116. “Vtrum ille homo filius Dei fuerit, latius postea disputare oportebit, quia tante questionis auctor ualidissimi argumenti uehiculo indiget. Nunc interim hoc modo ostendi uolo quonam modo aut auctoritate coneris asserere, quod is, de quo loqueris, homo nostre tribulationis causa extiterit.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 106.

⁵⁰ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, pp. 116–118; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, n. 31–34, p. 107; Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth Century*, 117; Pierro Capelli, “Jewish Converts in Jewish-Christian Intellectual Polemics in the Middle Ages,” in *Intricate Interfaith Networks in the Middle Ages: Quotidian Jewish-Christian Contacts*, ed. Ephraim Shoham-Steiner (Turnhout, 2016), 33–83, at 40–41; Hurwitz, “*Fidei causa et tui amore*” (see n. 10), 163, 190–193; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 21.

⁵¹ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 118. “Sed et hoc cum aliis doctoribus uestris Iohannes intellexit, quod mors Christi captiuitatis causa extiti. Non autem eam sed maliuolentiam hominum et inuidiam causam, scilicet cause captiuitatis causam, esse dixerunt. Sed ueram causam tacuerunt: Inuidia quippe Iudeorum et malitia causa mortis Christi fuit, mors autem Christi causa captiuitatis.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 107.

⁵² Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, pp. 120–22. “Neque enim Deus ideo reliquias de uestro uiuere patitur populo, quod de eorum aliquid cogitet commodo, sed ideo tantum, ut uniuersis gentibus seruiatis, et in omnium oculis inproperium et fabula et maledicti sitis, sicut uobis promisit lator legis dicens: *Eris perditus in prouerbum ac fabulam omnibus populis, ad quos te introduxerit Domnius*.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 108–109.

⁵³ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 122. Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 109.

⁵⁴ This argument would appear in later Jewish polemics, see Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 20; Nizzahon *Vetus* 32, 34, 127, 129, and 133 in *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus*, ed. and trans. David Berger (Philadelphia, 1979), 63–65, 136–140; Daniel J. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1977).

⁵⁵ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 136. “Obiectio tua nulla rationis innititur anchora, quia qui, ut Christus uenderetur, consensum, auxilium atque consilium adhibuerunt, non minus, quam si ipsi uendidissent, scelus incurrerunt.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 117–118; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 20–21.

⁵⁶ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 138; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 119.

⁵⁷ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2, p. 138. Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 119.

⁵⁸ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 324. “Quod uoluntate spontanea a Iudeis crucifixus est Christus et occisus.”

⁵⁹ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 324–344; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 220–231; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 20. This second objection was raised by R. Joseph Kimhi in his *Book of the Covenant*, trans. Frank Talmage (Toronto, 1972), 76.

⁶⁰ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 344. “Quia uero eum negauerunt et ex inuidia occiderunt, ideo et tanti huius sceleris rei sunt et nec in presenti seculo nec in futuro miseriam ac tribulationem exhibunt, quamdiu in hac sua nequitia permanebunt.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 231

⁶¹ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 346. “Eadem ergo ratione rei sunt atque iudicio, qui Christum non pro eius uoluntate complenda sed odii occiderunt inuidieque ueneno.” Resnik, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 232; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 83.

⁶² Cohen, *Living Letters* (see n. 3), 215. Cohen makes a similar argument in *Christ Killers* (see n. 7), 78.

⁶³ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 346–352; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 232–236. Petrus, not surprisingly, skated past the different meanings of the phrase “son of God” in the Jewish and Christian traditions.

⁶⁴ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 354. “Quod si agnouerunt, quare fidem eius doctrinamque respuerunt et eum crucifigendo suarum dampnationem animarum scienter incurrerunt?” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 236.

⁶⁵ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 356. “Mirari igitur non debes, si legis doctores et scribe inuidie ueneno Christum occiderint, cum per eum gloriam ac dignitatem suam amissuros se esse timuerunt.” Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 237.

⁶⁶ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 10, p. 356; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 237.

⁶⁷ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus*, Prologue, 4–12. Petrus attributed these doubts to his former co-religionists, though he manifestly wrote to and for a Christian audience and arguably did so to justify both himself and his conversion. See Nina Caputo, “The Voice of a Jew: Petrus Alfonsi’s *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* and the Question of True Conversion,” in *On the Word of a Jew: Religion, Reliability, and the Dynamics of Trust* (Bloomington, IN, 2019), 181–200, especially 181–184; Hurwitz, “*Fidei causa et tui amore*” (see n. 10), 10–11; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 13–17; Soussen, “Spoken and Unspoken in Petrus Alfonsi’s Dialogue” (see n. 45), 199–211; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 13. On contemporary doubts about Jews as converts, see Jonathon M. Elukin, “From Jew to Christian? Conversion and Immutability in Medieval Europe,” in *Varieties of Religious Conversion in the Middle Ages*, ed. James Muldoon (Gainesville, FL, 1997), 171–189; David Malkiel, “Jews and Apostates in Medieval Europe — Boundaries Real and Imagined,” *Past and Present* 194 (2007): 3–34; Jessica Marin Elliot, “Jews ‘Feigning Devotion’: Christian Representations of Converted Jews in French Chronicles Before and After the Expulsion of 1306,” in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, eds. Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York, 2015), 169–82; Jessie Sherwood, “Jewish Conversion from the Sixth through the Twelfth Century” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2006), 269–312; Paola Tartakoff, “Testing Boundaries: Jewish Conversion and Cultural Fluidity in Medieval Europe, c.1200–1391,” *Speculum* 90 (2015): 744–62.

⁶⁸ See, *inter alia*, Caputo, “The Voice of a Jew,” 182–84; Hurwitz, “*Fidei causa et tui amore*,” 10–11; Resnick, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 13–15, 41–43; Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi*, 13.

⁶⁹ As the work of Tolan, Cardelle de Hartmann, and Senekovic demonstrates, the *Dialogus* enjoyed considerable popularity and authority in the decades after its publication in the realms of anti-Jewish polemic and moral theology (among others). Cardelle de Hartmann and Senekovic, “Reading Petrus Alfonsi Before the Talmud Trials” (see n. 45) 164–178; Tolan *Petrus Alfonsi*, 95–131.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Guibert de Nogent, *Tractatus de Incarnatione contra Iudaeos* 3.2, PL 156: col. 508; Richard of S. Victor, *De Emmanuele* 1.1, PL 196: col. 606; Joachim of Fiore, *Adversus Iudaeos*, in *Agli Ebrei*, ed. Massimo Iritano (Soveria Mannelli, 1998), 120; Cohen, “Jews as Killers of Christ,” 13–16.

⁷¹ Peter Abelard, *Dialogus inter philosophum, Iudaeum et Christianum*, ed. Rudolf Thomas (Stuttgart-Bad, 1970), 51.

⁷² On the concept of the hermeneutic or imagined Jew, see, *inter alia*, Cohen, *Living Letters*; Steven F. Kruger, *The Spectral Jew: Conversion and Embodiment in Medieval Europe* (Minneapolis, 2006); Ivan G. Marcus, *How the West Became Antisemitic: Jews and the Formation of Europe, 800–1500* (Princeton, 2024), 2–19, 178–80; 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, IN, 1995), 1–15.

⁷³ John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 244–47; eds. Rhabanus Maurus Haacke and Maria Ludovica Arduini, eds., *Ruperto di Deutz e la controversia tra Cristiani ed Ebrei nel secolo XII: con testo critico dell' Anulus seu dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum* (Rome, 1979), 17–49; Alessio Magoga, ed., *Anulus seu dialogus de sacramentis fidei*, CCM 299 (Turnhout, 2020); Timmer, “Religious Significance of Judaism” (see n. 10), 128–37, 169–70; Yvonne Friedman, ed. *Adversus Iudeorum inveteratam duritiem*, CCM 58 (Turnhout, 1985); Langmuir, *Toward a Definition* (see n. 6), 131–133, 197–207, 305–310; Dominique Iogna-Pratt, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca, NY, 2002), 30, 284–322; Anna Sapir Abulafia, “Twelfth-century Christian Expectations of Jewish Conversion: A Case Study of Peter of Blois,” *Ashkenas* 8 (1998): 45–70, at 54. On the influence of Petrus on Peter the Venerable and Peter of Blois, see Abulafia, “Twelfth-century Christian Expectations of Jewish Conversion,” 61; Jean-Pierre Torrell, “Les juifs dans l’œuvre de Pierre le Vénérable,” *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 30 (1987): 331–46, at 334–338.

⁷⁴ Rupert of Deutz, *Anulus sive dialogus Christiani et Iudaei de sacramentis fidei* 3, ed. Magoga, 253–54. “Dico tibi quia regnum et sacerdotium eius ab Iherusalem incipiens adgentes sese extendit; et inter inimicos suos, Iudaeum scilicet et gentilem, crevit nomen eius et praedicantur ipse Dominus omnium; et propterea Iudaei captivi ducti sunt inter gentes, quae credunt in eum, quia inimici eius sunt et amici per fidem esse noluerunt.”

⁷⁵ Rupert of Deutz, *Anulus* 1 and 3, ed. Magoga, 213, 252, 255. “Michi autem ratio suppeditat, ut persistam immobilis firmiter tenens quod Ihesus ille quem crucifixerunt patres mei non sit Messias, id est Christus, quem expectauerunt patres mei”; “Scio quo tendis, uidelicet ad Iesum Christum, quem crucifixerunt patres mei.” “Dixisti enim, ‘Vbi ille, quem crucifixerunt patres mei, sacerdos demonstratus est’”

⁷⁶ Rupert of Deutz, *Anulus* 3, ed. Magoga, 269–270. “Confitere igitur quia propter peccatum negationis Christi, quem negasti ante faciem Pilati et occidisti, ciuitatem Iherusalem et sanctuarium dissipauit populus Romanus cum duce, scilicet Vespasiano siue filio eius Tito, et statuite perseuerat desolation et tu non est populus eius quem negasti.”

⁷⁷ Peter the Venerable, *Adversus Iudaeorum*, Prol., 2. “Agnoscite tam dirae dampnationis uestrae causam hanc esse, quod Christum quem tanto ante tempore uenturum cantastis, letistis, praedicastis, uenientem non agnouistis, non suscepistis, non coluistis, immo illo detestabili more uestro spreuistis, subannastis, occidistis.”

⁷⁸ Peter the Venerable, *Adversus Iudeorum* 2, pp. 57–58.

⁷⁹ Peter of Blois, *Contra perfidiam Iudeorum* 13, in *Petri Blesensis Bathoniensis Archidiaconi Opera Omnia*, ed. I.A. Giles (Oxford, 1846), 3:87–88.

⁸⁰ Peter of Blois, *Contra perfidiam Iudeorum* 20, 3:94. “Quicquid enim in Passione Domini factum est: verba, scilicet consilia, et opera Iudaeorum, prodicionem Iudae, confixionem pedum et manuum, sicut Evangelistae, sicut prophetae aperte denunciant, tantoque damnabilior est obstinatio Iudaeorum, qui sceleris ultionem sentiunt et adhuc in sua malitia se obdurant.”

⁸¹ Peter of Blois, *Contra perfidiam Iudeorum* 23–24, 3:99–104.

⁸² Peter the Venerable, *Adversus Iudaeorum* 3, p. 57. “Patet ergo quia non ab huiusmodi canibus, sed a Iudaeis longe hiis deterioribus Christus ad occisionem ducendus a propheta praedicatus est.”

⁸³ Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 131–133, 197–207, 305–310; Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth Century* (see n. 44), 116; Iogna-Pratt, *Order and Exclusion*, 319–22; Irvén M. Resnick, *Marks of Distinction: Christian Perceptions of Jews in the High Middle Ages* (Washington, DC, 2012), 37–45.

⁸⁴ Peter of Blois, *Contra perfidiam Iudeorum* 28, 3:116. “Hoc crimen pessimum de quo Iudaei traducuntur, arguuntur frequentius, et etiam damnatur, quia Christianorum parvulos abducant et in abditis crucifiunt.”

⁸⁵ Ocker, “Ritual Murder and the Subjectivity of Christ” (see n. 6), 162, 176–83. See also Anthony Bale, *Feeling Persecuted: Christians, Jews and Images of Violence in the Middle Ages* (London, 2010), 50–58; Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Paris, 1999), 24–34; Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 209–36; Shacher, “Inspecting the Pious Body” (see n. 6), 32–35, 37–39; Marcus, *How the West Became Antisemitic* (see n. 74), 135; Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder* (see n. 6), 61–67; Susanna A. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Farnham, UK, 2011), 106.

⁸⁶ Suffice it to say that recent scholarship on the question is both rich and contentious. See note 6.

⁸⁷ Thomas of Monmouth, *De vita et passione Sancti Willelmi martyris Norwicensis* 1.5, ed. and trans. Augustus Jessop and Mantague Rhodes James, *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich* (Cambridge, 1896), 21. “Factumque est ac si dicereunt: Quemadmodum Christum more te turpissimi condempnauimus et christianum pariter condempnemus ut dominum ac seruum pari

plectentes pena improprii eius penam quam nobis ascribunt in ipsos retroqueamus.” See also, Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, 235; Bale, *Feeling Persecuted*, 55; Heather Blurton, “Egyptian Days: From Passion to Exodus in the Representation of Twelfth-Century Jewish-Christian Relations,” in *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts*, eds. Sarah Rees-Jones and Sethina Watson (York, 2013), 222–37, at 224; Marcus, *How the West Became Antisemitic*, 108–122, 126–29; Tartakoff, *Conversion, Circumcision, and Ritual Murder*, 67.

⁸⁸ Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogus* 2 (see n. 46), p. 114. “Hoc autem ex tuis uerbis intelligi datur, quod omnes sequacium generationes iccirco in patrum captiuitate permanent, quod patrum suorum, in quantum possunt, opera execuntur.”

⁸⁹ On the ways in which imagined violence propelled actual violence, see, in particular, Bale, *Feeling Persecuted*.

⁹⁰ Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth Century* (n. 44), 116–134; Cohen, *Christ Killers* (see n. 7), 125–35. On devotion to Christ and *imitatio Christi*, see Anna Sapir Abulafia, “The Intellectual and Spiritual Quest for Christ,” in *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews: Medieval Roots, Modern Perspectives*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia (New York, 2002), 61–85; Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Le juif médiéval au miroir de l’art chrétien* (Paris, 1966), 96–98; Giles Constable, “The Cross in Medieval Monastic Life,” in *Christianity and Culture in the Middle Ages: Essays to Honor John Van Engen*, eds. David Mengel and Lisa Wolverson (Notre Dame, IN, 2014), 236–50; Giles Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge, 1995), 124, 169–217; George Duby, *Les temps des cathédrales: l’art et la société, 980–1420* (Paris, 1976), 108; Mary Dzon, *The Quest for the Christ Child in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2017), 39–63; David Nirenberg, “The Historical Body of Christ,” in *The Body of Christ in the Art of Europe and New Spain, 1150–1800*, ed. James Clifton (Munich, 1997), 17–25 at 17–19; Ocker, “The Subjectivity of Christ,” 176–83; Shacher, “Inspecting the Pious Body,” 24–28; Stefan Rohrbacher, “The Charge of Deicide: An Anti-Jewish Motif in Medieval Christian Art,” *Journal of Medieval History* 17 (1991): 297–321.

⁹¹ Rupert of Deutz, *Anulus* 3, Magoga, ed. (see n. 75), pp. 264, 267. On Rupert’s devotions, see *De gloria et honore filii hominis super Matthaëum* 12, ed. Rhabanus Maurus Haacke, CCM 29 (Turnhout, 1979) 366–85; Abulafia, “The Intellectual and Spiritual Quest for Christ,” 66; Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (see n. 75), 51–54.

⁹² Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 95–158.

⁹³ Rupert of Deutz, *In Iohannis Evangelium* 7.13, ed. Rhabanus Maurus Haacke, CCM 9 (Turnhout, 1969), 391. “Contrario huic significationi Iudaeos dicimus istos insipientes et malignos homicidas effusores sanguinis Christi, qui usque hodie maledicunt Christum in synagogis suis, hereditarium a parentibus suis super se portantes eundem sanguinem Christi. Dicimus enim eos Iudaeos non quia sunt, sed quia Iudaeos se esse dicunt, mentientes cum sint synagoga Satanae.”

⁹⁴ Rupert of Deutz, *De gloria et honore* 4, p. 116.

⁹⁵ Rupert of Deutz, *In Iohannis Evangelium* 9.15, p. 738. “Put a dixisse infelices Iudaeos: Tolle a nobis regem, tolle principem, tolle sacerdotem! Extunc enim impletum est, quod per prophetam fuerat ante praedictum, quia multis diebus sedebunt filii Israel sine rege et sine principe et sine

sacrificio et sine altari. Item: In hostiis et muneribus uadent ad quaerendum Dominum et non inuenient eum, ablatum est eis. Et merito, quia dixerunt: Tolle saluatorem, crucifige propriatorem, idcirco perdidit salutem et nullam habet defensionem.”

⁹⁶ Rupert of Deutz, *In Iohannis Evangelium* 7.13, p. 391.

⁹⁷ Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 237–238, 240–42; Timmer, “Religious Significance of Judaism” (see n. 10), 167, 175–78.

⁹⁸ Rupert of Deutz, *In Amos* 3.6, PL 168: col. 342. “Malunt damnati esse et damnationem aeternam exspectare quam publica confessione confitentur vel audire nomen huius Domni, suffusi mirabiliter felle amaritudinis, odiumque spirantes implacabile contra nomen Domni nostri Jesu Christi, gentiumque invidentes saluti.”

⁹⁹ Rupert of Deutz, *In Osee Prophetam commentariorum* 3.7, PL 168: col. 103–104.

¹⁰⁰ Rupert of Deutz, *In Osee* 3.7, col. 117. “Hanc in *me malitiam cogitauerunt*, sed haec ipsa malitia eorum excaecavit eos, ut non viderent ac scirent quod contrario per crucem ejus in omnes gentes benedictio, id est, peccatorum daretur remissio, et per eam omnia traheret ad seipsum (John 12).” Compare Cohen, *Living Letters* (see n. 3), n. 140, 214–15.

¹⁰¹ Rupert of Deutz, *In Osee* 3.8, col. 124. “Quod haec parabola innuit, nisi quia Scribae et Pharisei, videntes Jesum, non ignoraverunt, sed oderunt illum, quemadmodum et ipse dicit: *Nunc autem et viderunt et oderunt et me, et patrem meum* (Jn. 15). Cum enim agricolae dixerunt, *Hic est haeres*, nemo est in eis qui se de ignorantia excuset. Ergo cum dicunt, *Venite, occidamus eum, et nostra erit haereditas*, recte et veraciter dicat is qui occiditur.”

¹⁰² On the crucifixion in the present tense, see Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance* (see n. 87), 61, 106; Iogna-Pratt, *Order and Exclusion* (see n. 75), 183.

¹⁰³ Rupert of Deutz, *In Osee* 3.8, col. 125. “Et est sensus: Argentum et aurum plus dilexerunt quam Deum, imo ne ullum auri et argenti detrimentum paterentur, oderunt Christum et Patrem ejus Deum, oderunt et crucifixerunt Christum Dei Filium.”

¹⁰⁴ Though as far as I can tell, nothing has been.

¹⁰⁵ Rupert of Deutz, *In Iohannis Evangelium* 9.14, p. 738. “Haec tria uerissime nomina sunt unius Christi Domini nostri: Homo, Rex, Deus siue Filius Dei. Quae quidem irridentes et cum risu adorantes confessi sunt inimici sed uenerantes et serio adorantes confitemur amici.”

¹⁰⁶ D.E. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1969), n. 4, p. 281.

¹⁰⁷ Robert of Melun, *De Epistola I ad Corinthos* 2.1–2.8, in *Œuvres de Robert de Melun*, vol. 2, *Questiones Theologicae de Epistolis Pauli* ed. Raymond Martin (Louvain, 1938), 178–80.

¹⁰⁸ Robert of Melun, *De Epistola I ad Corinthos* 2.8, p. 181. “Iudei etiam videntur eum novisse. Nam, in parabola evangelice sic habetur: *Ecce heres; venite, occidamus eum*. Sed mira cecitas fuit, si scirent eum esse per quem liberarentur, et tamen eum quererent interficere. Item, si sciebant eum esse Deum, sciebant eum esse inmortalem, quare nec mori posse. Quomodo ergo eius mortem querebant, si eum non posse more sciebant?

“Sed et hic dici potest sunt cognovisse quia cognovisse se putabant. Credebant enim quidam eorum quia ipse esset; invidia tamen concitati, persecui non desistebant. Huius enim nature est invidia, ut contrasua bona aliena incommoda querat.” A commentary misattributed to Hugh of St. Victor, similarly, wonders that the Jews could have failed to recognize Christ or attempted to kill him if they had. It inverts Robert’s conclusion, arguing that some recognized Jesus as the messiah, but none believed him to be God. See *Questiones et decisiones in Epistolas Pauli* 2, q. 21, PL 175: col. 518.

¹⁰⁹ Cohen’s decision to excise “Sed et hic potest quia dicti sunt cognovisse quia cognovisse se putabant. Credebant enim quidam eorum quia ipse esset” substantially affects his reading of this passage; see *Living Letters* (see n. 3), n. 140, p. 214–15.

¹¹⁰ George Rigg, an unfailingly generous teacher, brought this to my attention while assisting me in the translation of this passage.

¹¹¹ Watt, “Parisian Theologians and the Jews” (see n. 8), 61; Cohen, “Killers of Christ” (see n. 7) 22–27; Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, 101–107; Thomas H. Bestul, *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society* (Philadelphia, 1996), 69–90.

¹¹² Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, 52–57, 61, 64–70, 100–107. See also, *inter alia*, Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987); Cohen, *Christ Killers* (see n. 7), 119–25; Dahan, *Intellectuels chrétiens* (see n. 87), 24–35; Norman Golb, *Les juifs de Rouen au Moyen Âge: portrait d’une culture oubliée* (Rouen, 1985), 77–91; Marcus, *How the West Became Antisemitic* (see n. 74), 15–16, 49–55; C. Matthew Phillips, “Crucified with Christ: The Imitation of the Crucified Christ and Crusading Spirituality,” in *Crusades: Medieval Worlds in Conflict*, ed. Thomas F. Madden, James L. Naus, and Vincent Ryan (Burlington, 2010), 25–33; Jonathon Riley-Smith, “Christian Violence and the Crusades,” in *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews* (see n. 92), 3–15; Shacher, “Inspecting the Pious Body” (see n. 6), 26; Robert Stacey, “Crusades, Martyrdom, and the Jews of Norman England, 1096–1190,” *Vorträge und Forschungen* 47 (1999): 233–51, at 239.

¹¹³ Foil though he was, Moyses clearly raised questions with which Christians grappled.

¹¹⁴ *Scito te ipsum* § 35–45, in *Scito te ipsum (Ethica): Erkenne dich selbst*, ed. Philipp Steger (Hamburg, 2006), 66–86; Cohen, *Living Letters*, 287; Anna Sapir Abulafia, “*Intentio recta an erronea?* Peter Abelard’s Views on Judaism and the Jews,” in *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman* (Ramat-Gan, 1995), 13–30; Stephan Kuttner, *Kanonistische Schuldlehre von Gratian bis auf die Dekretalen Gregors IX: Systematisch auf Grund der handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt* (Vatican City, 1935), 137–38.

¹¹⁵ For an overview, see Kuttner, *Kanonistische Schuldlehre*, 42–43, 45–46, 137–38, 142–45, 153, 267–69.

¹¹⁶ *De penitentia* D1, c.23, in *Gratian’s Tractatus de penitentia: A New Latin Edition with English Translation*, ed. Atria A. Larson (Washington, DC, 2016), 12. “Set tamen illis Domini mors imputatur, quia ipsi eum lingua interfecerunt, dicentes, *Crucifige, crucifige eum*. Vnde unus Euangelista dicit, Dominum crucifixum esse hora tertia, alius sexta, quia Iudei crucifixerunt eum hora tertia lingua, milites hora sexta manibus.”

¹¹⁷ P.D. Clarke, *The Interdict in the Thirteenth Century: A Question of Collective Guilt* (Oxford, 2007), 42; P.D. Clarke, “Peter the Chanter, Innocent III and Theological Views on Collective Guilt and Punishment,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001): 2–20.

¹¹⁸ Huguccio of Pisa, *Summa Decretorum* D. 13 pr., *Huguccio Pisanus Summa Decretorum: Distinctiones I–XX*, ed. Oldřich Přerovský (Vatican City, 2006), 213–14. Johannes Faventinus (d. 1187), the *Summa Lipsiensis*, and Honorius of Kent (d. 1210) used the crucifixion to advance similar arguments. See Kuttner, *Kanonistische Schuldlehre von Gratian*, 269, n. 1; *Summa Lipsiensis* D. 13 pr., in *Summa ‘Omnis qui iuste iudicat’ sive Lipsiensis*, eds. Rudolf Weigand, Peter Landau, and Waltraud Kozur (Vatican City, 2007–2018), 1:42–43; Honorius of Kent, *Summa de iure canonico* D. 13 pr., in *Magistri Honorii summa “De iure canonica tractaturus,”* eds. Rudolf Weigand, Peter Landau, and Waltraud Kozur (Vatican City, 2004), 142–44.

¹¹⁹ *Decretum* C. 1, q. 4, p.c. 12, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, 2d ed., eds. Aemilius Richter and Emil Friedberg (Graz, 1959), 1:422.

¹²⁰ The *Collectanea* was first compiled between 1139 and 1141, with a second redaction written between 1155 and 1158. See Marcia Colish, *Peter the Lombard* (Leiden, 1994) 1:23–24; Matthew Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students* (Toronto, 2016), 90.

¹²¹ Peter the Lombard, *Collectanea in omnes Pauli apostoli Epistolas: In epistola I ad Corinthios* 2.1–8, PL 191: col. 1549. “Et ideo de utriusque sic potest accipi: si cognovissent, vel minores illum esse messiam in lege promissum, vel majores illum Deum esse, vel Dei Filium, nunquam Dominum glorie crucifixissent.”

¹²² On this Peter, his works, and his methods, see, among others, Christopher Beckwith, *Warriors of the Cloisters: The Central Asian Origins of Science in the Medieval World* (Princeton, 2012), 171–83; Philip S. Moore, *The Words of Peter of Poitiers: Master in Theology and Chancellor of Paris (1193–1205)* (Washington, DC, 1936), 1–50; Philip S. Moore and Marthe Dulong, “Introduction,” in *Sententiae Petri Pictaviensis* (Notre Dame, IN, 1943), 1:v–lix.

¹²³ Peters of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque* 4.16, PL 211: col. 1203–1204. “Messiam vero vel Dei Filium, vel Deum minores non aestimabant, quia si hoc putarent, nunquam tradidissent, et ipsi quidem zelum legis habebant, sed non secundum scientiam, et ideo quia quodammodo excusabiles videbantur, pro eis oravit Christis: ‘Pater ignosce illis, quia nesciunt quid faciunt’ (Luke 23:34), et conversi fuerunt, ut legitur in Actibus apostolorum, una die quatuor milia, alia quinque milia (Acts 4:4).”

¹²⁴ Peter the Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* 1.48.2.1, 3d ed., ed. Collegium S. Bonaventurae (Rome, 1971–1981), 1:325–26. “Et volebant Iudaei mala voluntatae quiddam quod Deus bona voluntate volebat, scilicet ut Christus pateretur, moreretur; sed volebant et aliquid aliud, quod Deus non volebat, scilicet occidere Christum, quod fuit mala actio et peccatum.”

¹²⁵ Peter the Lombard, *Sententiae* 1.48.3, 1:327.

¹²⁶ Peter the Lombard, *Sententiae* 3.20.5.2, 2:128. “Et fuit actus Iudae et Iudaeorum malus, et actus Christi vel Patris bonus. Opus Christi et Patris bonum, quia bona Patris et Filii voluntas; malum fuit opus Iudae et Iudaeorum, quia mala fuit intentio.” Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 1:467–68.

¹²⁷ Peters of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque* 4.--, col. 1199–1200.

¹²⁸ Peters of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque* 4.16, col. 1203. “Alia actio fuit Judaeorum, quae fuit mala per malam intentionem; et alia Christi propter bonam voluntatem bona.”

¹²⁹ Peters of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque* 4.16, col. 1203. “Talis fuit actio Judaeorum: licet proposuissent bonum finem, tamen malum erat inficere magistrum et innocentem, praecipue cum audissent Messiam promissum fuisse in lege, et si ignorabant, crassa erat ignorantia. Nam hoc ab ipso Christo didicisse poterant. Quidam tamen plus peccaverunt aliis qui ex invidia hoc fecerunt.”

¹³⁰ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 3.47.5, ed. Thomas Gilby, Timothy McDermott, and Herbert McCabe (New York, 1964–1981), 54:66.

¹³¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.47.6, 54:70–72.

¹³² Cohen, “Killers of Christ” (see n. 7) 19–21.