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ABSTRACT

This study finds solace in image(s) more so than in written text(s) and the religious understanding of anti-Judaic and anti-Semitic distinction, rather than a historian’s perspective. By utilizing both a religious and artistic lens, the images become the text from which the scholar(s) will study. Focusing exclusively on German image(s) and artwork, this study will span up to eight centuries, twelfth to nineteenth. A contemporary look at Medieval and later images will not explain the thoughts of those who originally saw them, but the images will raise their own set of emotions, understanding, and historical lineage, giving credence and validity to those that came after. This message cultivated a theological hatred for a group of people that was ideologically grounded in a codified religion. The images range in context and content, but all surround the idea of a central figure at the hands of the presumed enemy—the central sacrifice.
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I. PREFACE

In Christian artwork, no single image or icon has been reproduced more than that of a Jew—specifically, Jesus of Nazareth. Christian artwork and imagery continues to use the image of that Jew but shies away from the past. Beyond the image and icon of the Christian Messiah, there are virtually no images of Jews from early Christianity. It was after the year 1000 that Jews began to invade the iconographic space of Christian religious imagery.

1 The image of the Jew began to intensify and take its place as the designated Christian “Other.”

Tracing the history of Judeo-Christian relations begins with the Christian New Testament, but the question up for debate is can written text be the only means, the only symbolic form of communicating how Christian groups perceived the Jewish people? The cyclicality of the relationship between Jewish people and their non-Jewish religious counterparts (specifically Christian groups) is evident through the imagery produced—beginning in the late twelfth century and spanning up to the twentieth century. Jewish history, at its essence, is cyclical; a constant influx of disorder, order created out of disorder, and then chaos and disorder once again. A story as old as time, the Jewish people took on the role of the scapegoat, the enemy, and the “Other.”

---

The images that have been produced and reproduced, the images up for comparison in this study, are those that include a central figure—a traditional Jew, a Jewish enemy, a Jewish Other, or Jesus of Nazareth. The qualifying factor for images in this project rests on and around arrest and centrality—a central figure at the hands of enemies. Jesus of Nazareth, depicted as victim to Jewish enemies in the moments before his crucifixion; Jewish men preying on the innocence of a Christian child; or a Jewish figure, falling victim to government officials. The images range in context and content, but all surround the idea of a central figure at the hands of the presumed enemy—the central sacrifice.

This thematic centrality paves the way for anti-Judaic, theological disdain giving way to the later politically driven, anti-Semitism that is commonly used interchangeably with anti-Judaism. This paper poses the difference between the two thought processes. The commonality is the lack of thematic originality within the artwork that poses the Jew as the other. Working towards a term that better encompasses the two ideologies will serve the scholarship looking to define who the Jew is and who the Jew became to Christian regimes over the course of history. For now, the acknowledgement of terminological difference but lack of thematic originality stands before me. The use of images reinforces the notion that no matter the sentiment, theological or politically driven, the notion of central sacrifice resonates with the audience and the viewer to portray the same message of hate, to Other-ize the Jew, and to demonize a people group over the course of thousands of years.
This study finds solace in image(s) more so than in written text(s) and the religious understanding of anti-Judaic and anti-Semitic distinction, rather than a historian’s perspective. By utilizing both a religious and artistic lens, the images become the text from which the scholar(s) will study. Focusing exclusively on German image(s) and artwork, this study will span up to eight centuries, twelfth to nineteenth. In order to understand the shift from anti-Judaism to anti-Semitism, images must be considered as a form of text and communication. They were, for many centuries, the writing for the illiterate masses. A contemporary look at Medieval and later images will not explain the thoughts of those who originally saw them, but the images will raise their own set of emotions, understanding, and historical lineage, giving credence and validity to those that came after.

**Interpretation of Research**

The central sacrifice of Jesus Christ by the Jewish people proved to the Christian church that the Jews were the ultimate enemy of the cross. The most heinous act to be performed by a group of people not only eradicated the Christian Messiah, but placed the Jews in a category all their own – “the Other”. This ideological trend, the sacrificial other, then became not about Jesus himself, but the Christian children. Tales of ritual murders and blood libels, even Eucharistic profanations, allowed the later generations to garner a sense of disdain towards the Jewish people— even though they were many generations removed from the murder of their Savior. The central sacrifice, specifically

---

2 Focusing on this date range not only narrows the data, but it also does not take into account the change in imagery during the Nazi era in the early twentieth century. An acknowledgment of those thematic adoptions is present however does not serve this study specifically.
the anti-Judaic central sacrifice, was Jesus or manifestations, metaphors, and representations thereof. This message cultivated a theological hatred for a group of people that was ideologically grounded in a codified religion.
II. INTRODUCTION

To best explore and understand the topic at hand, a lengthy introduction will best define key terms, qualifications for study, the dynamic of the images, and the situating of this study into its religious, historical, and artistic dimensions.

Images

What is an image? Marco Mostert, scholar of medieval literacy, argues that our preconceived notions of images stop us from questioning the role of imagery as text. Images, Mostert argues, may be used as tools for communication to be perceived through one’s eye. However, the problem with images lies in their analysis; the mere absence “(or present absence)” of an image may result in that image “fulfilling unforeseen functions.” The role of image as text does not announce itself quite as literally as written language. Thematic lack, pattern repetition, and, for the case of this study, the cyclicality of the central victim, can be evidenced from what is seen and what is unseen. Mostert’s question to historians and art historians alike is why do scholars not study images in the context of all forms of communication in a society? Why does the historian limit

---

3 Marco Mostert, introduction to Reading images and Texts, ed. Mariëlle Hageman and Marco Mostert (Turnhout, Belgius: Brepols Publisher n.v., 2005), 2.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 3.
him/herself to words, and the art historian limit him/herself to images? The overlap of texts and images magnifies the scope from which one can understand the culture at hand.

For many scholars, academic tendencies separate disciplines, specifically verbal and visual. However, when studying medieval manuscripts and texts, it is impossible to overlook the images that surround the written word. The pictures, illustration, illuminations, any number of artistic forms, halted the written text. Images specifically interrupted the flow of what was written down. The images and text(s), “were in conversation with one another, collaborating in intricate way… about the kinds of information transmitted by narrative images… and how contemporary viewers responded to such information.” Images became narratives to the illiterate audiences and for the purposes of this project; the images are the only text to be cited.

Images elicit the same or stronger feelings than a written document. Take, for example, illuminated initials of Psalms and Psalters. Before the text has begun, the introductory letter paints a picture, a narrative, of what the text will recount. However, unlike text, the illustrator has the opportunity to depict the written word in any manner he chooses, conjuring up specific, predispositioned feelings. The illustrations move the reader to feel a certain way and react a certain way before the text has even been read.

---

6 Ibid., 7.


9 Ibid.
Anti-Judaism versus Anti-Semitism

One important distinction that will likely be a point of contention is the distinction between what I refer to as religious anti-Judaism and political anti-Semitism. These two concepts vary not only in connotation but also though the artwork during the time of conception. Both “anti-Judaism” and “anti-Semitism” as categories and terms are loaded with historical and cultural baggage. Some scholars chose to use one over the other, use them interchangeably, or refuse to make a distinction at all.

The term “anti-Judaism,” coined after the era of its reign in order to describe the phenomenon for later historians, became a common denotation of theological anti-Semitism. Bernard Lazare first introduced this term in the nineteenth century (coincidentally around the same time that William Marr coined the term anti-Semitism) to ultimately describe and distinguish between the growing hostility that was “anti-Semitism” and early medieval Christian opposition to Judaism. Anti-Judaism is often characterized by a medieval Christian theological rejection of Judaism. It is impossible to conceive of anti-Judaism of “antiquity” and anti-Semitism that began (or was named rather) in the nineteenth century as independent events. For scholars, the two terms came about to distinguish between two events that seem phenomenologically different: anti-Judaism led to an

---


12 Ibid., 276.
amicable theological split while anti-Semitism led to the horrors of the twentieth century resulting in the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{13}

It is important to keep in mind the key points of anti-Judaism when evaluating imagery, specifically imagery dealing with the arrest and betrayal of Jesus. For one, Jesus himself was a Jew. Jesus was deeply and religiously Jewish and only practiced Judaism.\textsuperscript{14} He was born into a society where the cultural constructs were deeply embedded in Jewish tradition and even those who followed him associated him with a belief in the Jewish tradition, the Hebrew Bible, and a people who were the Chosen Ones. In the same way that anti-Semitism cannot be understood independent of anti-Judaism, neither can the historical Jesus be understood outside of the context of early Judaic ideology. Recalling the Johnannie anti-Judaism that Leibig and Bultmann studied, even as early as New Testament scriptures, the issue of identity continues to plague European Christendom. It is as if authors, both Biblical, theological, medieval, and those of the enlightenment age in Europe, fail time and time again to recall that Jesus and his disciples were members of the same Jewish people.\textsuperscript{15}

Beginning with the Christian representatives of early Christendom in the time of the historical Jesus, the emergence of this type of thinking becomes evident. The arguments here did not stem from a place of anti-Judaic thought or action nor from a place of

\textsuperscript{13} This is not to discredit all of the other factors that led to the Holocaust, all of the people groups that also fell prey to the Nazi regime, or to say that the Holocaust was a result of a Christian hatred of Jews exclusively. This simply is denoting the difference in cultural, political, and historical factors between the emergence of this terminology.

\textsuperscript{14} Judaism was not yet a codified religion as would now be understood. Jesus was a part of something that was Jew-ish, rather than Judaism.

\textsuperscript{15} Janis Leibig, “John and the Jews,” 213.
superiority. They laid claim to “legitimacy” because of their Judaic inheritance, their insistence that they carried out a continuation of the Judaic tradition, not a new religious movement altogether. While trying to prove the legitimacy of this newly established and somewhat foreign religious movement, these first Christians experienced ridicule, persecution, and torment from state officials. Jesus, as a pseudo-representative of this newly established tradition, found himself ridiculed, tortured, and eventually persecuted to the same degree as other Christian practitioners. His role in the Christian faith did not exempt him from torment but his presence and persecution symbolized the fulfillment of the promise. However, he was crucified as a member of the Jewish community. This is the ironic twist to the arguments in favor of Jewish persecutions especially in light of the images of the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus. The Christian context for these images came from a place of theological correctness. In actuality, these are images that not only contradict history, but also shed light on the insecurities that began in the medieval era and continue to persist, even today. An important argument that John Gager, scholar of early Christian relations, notes is that by the time the fourth century came about,

Christians had revised history before Christ to correspond to their interpretation of the conflict between Jews and Christians after Christ; they polarized the actors of the Old Testament into bad Jews and good Hebrews...Christians gradually reinterpreted Hebrew Scriptures and the past of Jews in accordance with their own non-rational beliefs...  

This was the first of their reinterpretation of the texts of their “ancestors.” The next, and the one most relevant to the study of images of Jesus’ betrayal from the medieval period

16 Gager, 282-283.

17 Ibid., 287.
and early Modern Germany is the most famous of these early Christian rewrites of history:

The Christian understanding of Jewish history is a perfect example of the failure to distinguish between non-rational and rational empirical thinking...the most famous was the accusation that the Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus Christ...If Jesus had died on the cross because of Jewish disbelief, either Jesus was only a dead human or the Jews had killed him.\(^\text{18}\)

Gager elaborates that not all early Christians hated the Jews, but as this accusation remained and was not extinguished, it became more prominent in society, culture, and the growing Christendom that flourished in the medieval period. It is in this stereotype, persistent through theological agendas of early churches, that issues of images make themselves apparent. Renowned art historian Ruth Mellinkoff agrees, emphasizing that the prejudices against the Jews predate history but because of the teachings of the Church the category of anti-Judaism was born, grew, and began flourishing.\(^\text{19}\) Revealed through imagery, the perspective of the Church was passed onto its patrons to create a church-approved “Christianized” view of Judaism. The Church viewed Jews as no more than, as Mellinkoff states, “infidels living in the midst of a Christian majority. Jews carried the burden of an unpardonable sin; their alleged betrayal and murder of Christ could never be forgotten or forgiven.”\(^\text{20}\)

What must be taken into account when examining images is this issue of anti-Judaic sentiment and anti-Semitism. Anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism are modern terms. They

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 288.


\(^{20}\) Ibid., 127.
were not formed during early Christendom although, as laid out above, they both found roots early into the development of Christianity, specifically the notion of Jews as malevolent. Images were used as a way to express an idea or ideas by mass media production with the intention of promoting a specific belief. Anti-Judaism no longer had a place in the cultural schema when anti-Semitism began to rise. The religious divide no longer existed but rather the state became pitted against an ethno-religious group of people. In the same way that the authoritative figures of early Christianity felt their authority being challenged by the Jewish people, so did political leaders in early modern Germany.

Textually, these ideas are comparable but visually the similarities between the themes and the thematic elements reveal the appropriation of fears from antiquity to the medieval period and into the early Modern Era, keeping in mind the notions of the apparent distinctiveness of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism.

---

21 Gager, 288. The theme of Jewish malevolence does not stop in early Christendom. It is one of the key themes when examining artwork because the evil nature of the Jews to kill Christ insinuates their diabolical nature. This is used time and time again as reasoning for the continued hatred of the Jewish people especially when comparing these themes to political anti-Semitism and the supposed desire of Jewish world domination.
III. HISTORY OF ANTI-JUDAIC SENTIMENT

Artistic Expressions of Otherness in Medieval Art

Navigating the intersection of medieval art and imagery through a historical religious lens requires careful notation that the artists and their products were not independently created. That is to say, while the content of the images was shaped by location, the majority of the artistic influences came from learned cultural and religious biases—specifically when studying the relations between Jews and Christians in medieval art.

The creation of the Christian Jewish figure developed in the early eleventh century and can be traced back as far as the biblical New Testament. Early Christian writers like Augustine and biblical writers of the New Testament like Paul took a more tolerant approach to Judaism than what was later exhibited across Medieval Europe. The teachings of these early authors influenced and unknowingly motivated anti-Jewish sentiment rather than inhibiting it.

The evolution of Christian perceptions of Jews throughout medieval Europe can be traced not only through written texts, as demonstrated above, but also through

---


imagery. By utilizing primary documents and secondary scholarship the Christian idea of the “Jew” and the formation of the “Christian Jew” can be seen throughout medieval works of art, specifically throughout medieval Europe. For clarity, the term “Christian Jew” will be used to reference the specific kind of “Jew” that is mentioned in later stories and tales referencing host desecration narratives or Eucharistic tales. This fictionalized Jewish character was not representative of any particular Jew or Jewish community. The Jews mentioned in these tales were fictitious combinations of the Jews Christian followers assumed that they encountered and the “Jew” that developed as a result of anti-Jewish sentiment over the course of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The incorporation of different Christianized stories, prejudices, and false formations of Jewish anti-Christian sentiment resulted in texts and images from the Medieval Period that began to take on different forms. The changes in subject matter and artistic depictions varied between images, but ultimately the message relayed remained constant: the Jewish enemy hinders Christian progress and therefore must be persecuted. Focusing on the thematic elements found in Christian church images in medieval Europe and then comparing them to the images that arise out of the anti-Semitic claims beginning in the nineteenth century will allow for better evaluation of the images of the central sacrifice and the sacrificial other. Focusing on German artistic images, drawings, cartoons, and sketches, the constant and pervasive themes of the Christian depictions of the “enemies of the cross” will once again rear its ugly head in the form of political expression.
The depictions of Jews in Christian images demonstrated the Christian Church’s desire to persuade the Christian communities into a certain manner of thinking.\textsuperscript{24} The presumed diabolical nature of the Jews and the theoretical Jewish desire to demoralize Christianity became the widespread message across Europe. Jewish populations suffered a series of expulsions as the Christian masses became convinced of Jewish ridicule and torture. As early as Paul’s biblical books and the Canonical Gospels of the Christian New Testament, Christians were trying to find a place for Judaism and the Jewish population within a Christianized world. Searching for the role of the Jews in a primarily Christian Europe began as early as the fifth century with Augustine, Christian theologian and strong influence on Christian anti-Jewish sentiment, and spanned through the late fifteenth century when Jews were expelled from Spain. It was not until the seventeenth century that the Jewish people were let back into England after have been expelled in 1290. Even without a Jewish population present in England for over four centuries, the forces that be continued to elicit fear in the Christian masses, only amplifying the situation and creating a toxic environment for the Jews to return to.

\textit{The Impact of the Gospels on Christian Teachings}

If anti-Judaic sentiment began prior to the first Jewish expulsion in England, where and when did anti-Jewish thought originate? Beginning with the writings of the biblical New Testament, the indoctrinated fear of the Jewish people can be traced back to the biblical writings of Paul as well as to the Canonical Gospels. For example, the Gospel of John provided the Christian authorities ample raw material for anti-Jewish sentiment based

\textsuperscript{24} C-christian denotes the entirety of the European Christian church. The “capital” C-church is used rather than the lower case c-church typically to denote one single congregation.
on evidence that there was a distinct divide between those who believed Jesus to be the Messiah and those who did not.\textsuperscript{25} Looking specifically at John 7:25-42, evidence shows a clear division in ideology about who Jesus was, Messiah or not.\textsuperscript{26} The New Testament gospels, John specifically, have undergone endless scrutiny from scholars and defense from theologians over the past century. It is clear that the “Jew” mentioned in the gospels was not representative of the Jewish population of the day but rather of officials who were Jewish and opposed the teachings of Jesus. However, the language used and employed by the authors of these gospels cannot be overlooked or dismissed as being “misinterpreted.” The gospel authors were intentional in both language and meaning, paving the way for the theological anti-Judaic sentiment that was taught in medieval Europe.\textsuperscript{27} Author and scholar Janis Leibig asserts that no New Testament book has been accused of anti-Judaic sentiment to the extent of the Gospel of John.\textsuperscript{28} The passage from John listed above is often cited as a clear example of the Jews’ misunderstanding about the teachings of Jesus, both in nature and in content. An important theme from the Gospel of John that relates to the present study of depictions of Jesus and Jews in relation with one another is the issue of identity. Leibig states that,


\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., John 7:25-42.


\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 212.
In the Gospel of John the enemies of Jesus are simply labeled "the Jews." Unfortunately, "this identification is so complete that the author almost forgets that Jesus himself and his disciples were members of the same Jewish people." Rudolf Bultmann remarks: “The Jews are spoken of as an alien people; Jesus himself speaks to them as a stranger and correspondingly, those in whom the stirrings of faith or of the search for Jesus are to be found are distinguished from "the Jews," even if they are themselves Jews."29

This issue of identification (or misidentification) is mapped onto images produced during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Europe, specifically the German images that will be discussed later, and also carries over to the writings of Paul, his views on the Gentilian-Jewish relationship, and further still to the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable.

_Beyond the Gospels: The Impact of Gospel Writing(s)_

Beyond the New Testament gospels and towards Paul’s writings, a clear line appeared between what early Biblical writers, like Paul, believed to be the place of the Jews in a Christian society and what early theologians, like Augustine, believed. Paul’s description of the Jews functioned as a reference point. After his conversion to Christianity, Paul became a disciple to the

---

Gentiles and documented his discipleship in different books of the canonical New Testament. Paul saw a need to convert the Gentiles because they, unlike the Jews, did not yet have a place in God’s plan. The Jewish people, as Paul saw it, were the people through whom God worked out the redemption of the world by way of his son, Jesus, also a Jew.\(^\text{30}\) Paul needed the Jews but argued that it was unnecessary for Gentile converts to follow Jewish customs, get circumsised, or otherwise observe Mosaic Law.\(^\text{31}\) Paul’s “unbelieving Israel,” described in Romans chapter nine (the people of Israel stumbling blindly), became a common theme in Medieval artwork, especially with regards to the blind or stumbling Jewish figure(s).

Themes including, but not limited to, Paul’s description of Israel’s “blindly stumbling” coupled with various misinterpretations of scripture, like with Mosaic Law, can be seen in the \textit{Breviaria d’Amor}, “The Devil Impeding the Jewish Comprehension of Scripture,” as shown on the right.\(^\text{32}\) In this collection of images, the upper image depicts a common thematic denotation of the “blind Jew,” a devil blindfolding a Jewish man as he attempts to read scripture. The folio page was flanked on both sides by Old Testament texts from Ezekiel and Genesis.\(^\text{33, 34}\) These commonly cited textual references regarding obedience and idolatry were often directly linked to post-biblical Jews. For Paul, the

\(^\text{30}\) The Holy Bible, New International Version, Romans 3:2.

\(^\text{31}\) The Law of Moses or the Torah of Moses.

\(^\text{32}\) “The Devil Impeding the Jewish Comprehension of Scripture” in the \textit{Breviari d’Amor}, London, BL Ms. Yates Thompson 31, fol. 132v.


\(^\text{34}\) The Holy Bible, New International Version, Genesis 49:10.
Jews had a purpose and a place in Christian society, a theme that carried over into later fifth century Augustinian doctrine concerning the Jews and Jewish witness.

Augustine, like Paul, believed that God had chosen the Jews as a special people. Augustine testified that the Jews were living witnesses to the Old Testament and to Mosaic Law. The Jews, while they blindly read Christian scripture according to Augustine, “contribute[d] [because of] their possession of these books, while they themselves [were] dispersed among all nations, wherever the Church of Christ [was] spread abroad.”35 Augustine’s need for the dispersal of the Jewish people stemmed from the necessity of the fulfillment of the prophecy set forth in the New Testament.

Augustine’s argument for the dispersal of the Jews came from the Psalmic text, “slay them not, lest they should forget Thy law.”36 However, Augustine further interpreted this text acknowledging that,

> It was not enough that [the psalmist] should say ‘slay them not’…unless he also added: ‘Disperse them’; because if they had only been in their own land…and not everywhere, certainly the Church which is everywhere could not have had them as witnesses among all nations to the prophecies which were sent before concerning Christ.37

Augustine’s fairly tolerant stance can be interpreted one of two ways: 1.) As a gracious gesture from an influential leader who valued the Jewish presence within a Christian

---

35 Augustine, *City of God (De Civitate Dei)*, Book 18, Chapter 46, “Of the Birth of Our Saviour, Whereby the Word Was Made Flesh; And of the Dispersion of the Jews Among All Nations, as Had Been Prophesied.”


37 Augustine, *City of God*, Chapter 46.
society or 2.) As an unintentional precursor that would later exacerbate violence directed towards Jewish groups.

According to Jeremy Cohen, scholar and professor of Christian anti-Jewish hostility, the latter proved a more appropriate representation of the historical trajectory of Augustine’s doctrine. Augustine’s ideologies motivated later anti-Jewish thought, although he blatantly forbade Christian acts of violence against the Jews in his writing. His canon, Cohen stated, “contributed to the darker side of the subsequent history of Christian anti-Judaism.”

Paul and Augustine both found a place for the Jews within their social parameters, but they both failed to realize that in doing so they created the “Christian Jew,” one that had now become a quintessential “other.”

Presented as one of his arguments against Augustine’s *Doctrine of Jewish Witness*, Cohen concluded that Augustine created a Jew that fit his social and theological agenda, rather than a historically and socially accurate representation. The Jew that Augustine described was not an actualized person one would have encountered in this Greco-Roman society but rather a Jew that he constructed from interactions with specific Jews and Jewish communities. Augustine’s representations of Jews did not reflect the Jewish communities of the time. With the inclusion of his fictitious Jew and his fanning the flames of anti-Jewish hostility, Augustinian doctrine presented itself as a new form of Christian literature—one that opened the door for anti-Jewish thought and the beginnings

---
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of a representation of a Christianized Jew in thought, word, and image. Once again, the issue of a fictionalized Jewish population, coupled with a misidentification of religious involvement, contributed to growing hostility towards Jewish groups. This hatred continued to grow, eventually culminating in a medieval misunderstanding of the Jewish religion and the eventual progression of this ideology into an anti-Semitic agenda.

**Internecine Debate: Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable**

Just as Augustine tried to protect the Jews by dispersing them, following the prescription of Psalm 59’s, “slay them not,” Bernard of Clairvaux also struggled to protect the Jews during the Second Crusade. Meanwhile, his rival, Peter the Venerable, “invoked the witness doctrine to advocate a fate worse than death for the Jews.”

Following the pattern of protection from Augustine and Paul, Bernard of Clairvaux hoped to protect them during the twelfth century Second Crusade from those who read and misconstrued Augustine’s doctrine.

Bernard of Clairvaux, French abbot and member of the Cistercian order, pulled ideas from Augustine’s doctrine and ideology regarding the Jews in the latter part of the twelfth century during the Second Crusade. At this point, the crusades took a turn towards the eradication of their Jewish enemies and turned their gaze away from the goal of recapturing the Holy Lands. Clairvaux emphasized time and time again that, in line with older views, “the Jews [were] not to be persecuted, killed, or even put to flight”

---


42 The misinterpreted reading of Augustine’s *Doctrine of Jewish Witness* later became a standard reading of this text leading to similar views of Peter the Venerable about a Jewish fate, “worse than death.” When studying anti-Judaism misinterpretation is often a common cause for discrepancy between views.
because they were “the living words of Scripture.” Bernard’s strong emphasis on Jewish witness and dispersion was taken into consideration by some but also refuted by others, like Peter the Venerable.

Bernard’s rival, with respect to the Second Crusades, Peter the Venerable, did not have the same message of tolerance to send to the people of Cluny as the Abbot did. Clairvaux’s “kill them not” was combated by Peter the Venerable’s claim that the Jews should not be killed but preserved for greater torment “in a life worse than death.” Peter responded disdainfully to the Second Crusade for he believed the Jews to be a much more foul race than the Saracens and thus, the Jews needed to be fought against. He longed to draw the attention of the crusaders to those who “live among us,” i.e. the Jews. Scholar Amos Funkenstein summed up the reactions to these two opposing forces for the Second Crusade best. He stated, “The new polemical stand of Peter the Venerable carried a strong potential for the erosion of the existing modus vivendi between tolerating Christianity and tolerated Judaism.” With this newly developed relationship between Christianity and Judaism in the twelfth century, having roots in the ideology of Peter the Venerable, there was the emersion of the newly expressed, and the first of, the blood

---
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libels. Blood libels, a violent accusation imprinted on European Jews, consist of “accusing a particular group of killing people as human sacrifice and using their blood in various rituals.” Beginning in the twelfth century these accusations became specifically associated with Jews killing and drinking the blood of young Christian children at their Passover meal. These accusations were a common point of slander used against the Jews in medieval Christianized Europe, but they certainly were not the last. The beginnings of these allegations were not as dangerous in the twelfth century as they later became, but this was the start of the eroding of the “physical basis of Jewish existence.”

48 Blood Libel narratives were false claims or accusations that Jews kidnapped and murdered the children of Christians and used their blood as a part of religious ritual.

49 The Encyclopedia of Jewish Diaspora, ed. Avrum Ehrlich (Santa Barbara, ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2009), G5V3.

50 Ibid., 104.

51 Amos Funkenstein, Perceptions of Jewish History, 194.
IV. GERMANY

With a brief historical background of anti-Jewish sentiment set up, it will be easier to examine the anti-Jewish imagery that came to rise after the Second Crusade and into the twelfth century. After and during the twelfth century, Jews began to acquire different stereotypes that carried on through medieval art and were only added to and exaggerated. One specific, pervasive stereotype of the greedy Jew was explicitly a product of the twelfth century and became one of the first recycled thematic elements in medieval artwork. 52 The crusades not only stimulated hostility towards the Jews but exaggerated misconceptions and stereotypes that were repeatedly used in images across Europe in medieval art.

These stereotypes, false accusations, and exaggerated thematic ideas not only persisted through the Middle Ages but as society progressed, so did these thematic elements. Ruth Melinkoff, late art historian from University of California, asserts that Jewish stereotypes evolved almost exclusively out of the visual arts. Because the prejudices against Jews can be traced back to these early Christian authors it has only paved the way for these uninformed stereotypes to continue to flourish under the category

of Christian Anti-Judaism. German art, artistic interpretations, and general ideology will serve as the case study for this analysis.

When the words “German” and “Jew” share a sentence, the topic of discussion typically revolves around the Holocaust. However, this event did not occur without provocation. A historical overview of German-Jewish relations will not only place the historical anti-Judaic sentiment discussed above, but it will also set the tone to further discuss the shifts that occurred in religious thought, artistic interpretation, and human interpersonal relationships in Germany.

**A Historic Account of Germany**

The Jewish community in Medieval Germany was, in a certain sense, a state within a state. On the one hand, the Jewish community possessed the privilege of self-government; on the other hand, Jewish autonomy depended heavily on the toleration, and often assistance of the civil government.

Between the ninth and the eleventh centuries the most important Jewish community of the Medieval Era was in Mainz, Germany. Until the thirteenth century, Jewish populations were largely tolerated by the Christian majority, settling in certain areas and fulfilling certain roles in Christian communities that were otherwise nonexistent. The Jewish community in Medieval Germany flourished due to the fact that a single state ordinance calling for Jewish expulsion did not exist. Although many cities and regions

---
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passed edicts of expulsion, the lack of a singular, autonomous authority governing the
German lands “saved” the Jews during a time of rapid, widespread expulsion throughout
other European countries.\(^\text{57}\) Although the relationship between the German citizens and
government authorities remained relatively platonic, the turn of the thirteenth century
brought with it a more hostile anti-Jewish sensitivity. A brief description by John Efron
highlights the transition in ideology during this time. He states:

> The situation for Jews in Western Europe became particularly dire in the
twelfth to fifteenth centuries, with four interrelated factors playing an
especially catalytic role: the Crusades, the rise of the blood libel and other
anti-Jewish accusations, the resentment generated by the role of Jews in the
larger economic and political structure of Europe, and a more hostile and
interventionist Church.\(^\text{58}\)

These four factors not only apply to Germany but to the larger European landscape
during this transition period. However, the conditions for Jews in Western Europe
worsened by the end of the Middle Ages, as demonstrated by expulsions and mass
migrations of Jews out of Western Europe.\(^\text{59}\) While the numbers of Jewish communities
began to rise during the second half of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the
fourteenth, this demographic change took place prior the persecutions during the Black
Death. Both the lepers and the Jews suffered frantic violence in the plague years of the
mid-fourteenth century—a time of social crises and religious enthusiasm that began with


\(^{59}\) Ibid. 148.
the First Crusade. Judaism did not engage with Christianity in a sociological sense during the Medieval Period and Middle Ages but served merely as a representation of the antithesis and negation of Christendom and Christianity.

Interpretations of Scripture and Effects on Religious Tolerance

Recall the terminological differences between “anti-Judaism” and anti-Semitism” outlined early in this study. The later established German state led the field into the blurred lines and blurred distinctions between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, making German the perfect case study for imagery. The images for assessment range from early thirteenth century miniatures to late nineteenth century German chronicle cartoons. The majority of the imagery comes from illuminated manuscripts, miniatures, and later pieces coming from newspapers or chronicles. The questions that remain for interpretation, opinion, and analysis are: Who is the Jew; Why is he central; and What does this centrality do or say about the political, cultural, and religious landscape in Germany moving across centuries of time? More specifically, how does this constant theme fill in the ideological gaps that fall through the metaphorical cracks of language, as well as further give credence to the separation between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism as categories for distinction? Why do two seemingly different ideas, one religious and one political, prey on the same theme(s) of centrality and sacrifice?

---


V. CENTRAL SACRIFICE IN COINED “ANTI-JUDAIC” ARTWORK

In Christ Alone: Jesus as the Central Sacrifice

FIG. 2

Who is the Jew? Melinkoff describes key features of Jewish caricatures found in medieval artwork, specifically those depicted as enemies of the cross. Accordingly, the Jewish enemies were depicted as the responsible party for the murder and execution of Christ, the Christian Messiah, and therefore were shown with facial blemishes representative of the medieval pictographic stereotype for social outcasts. Headgear was often a common marker for individuals or groups, but when coupled with physical features such as hooked noses, enlarged eyes, and heavy lips, the Jewish figure came to
life in the images for the illiterate.\textsuperscript{62} The category of a “bad Jew” often links to the Jews of the New Testament, who often appeared in canonical hats, thus creating the link between biblical, unbelieving Jewry and contemporary, malevolent Jewry.\textsuperscript{63}

The idea of the central figure, now to be showcased in a number of images ranging over a period of time, first appears in images of Jesus led to his execution. This miniature comes from an illustrated German bible from the mid-fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{64} This image, true to the Medieval thematic, depicts three men surrounding a haloed Christ figure. These three enemies of the cross wear the stereotypes of medieval Jewry: pointed canonical hats and hooked noses. While a more modest illustration, this image still demonstrates much to the illiterate eye about the nature of Jews in relation to their Christian Messiah. All three men possess a form of headgear but only one is depicted in the canonical Jewish hat. From this image, the viewer can see that all three men are not necessarily Jewish, but they are all enemies of the cross. Depicted as mockers, flagellators, tormentors, or executioners, the particular focus of the image is on the central figure, the central sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the historic Christian Messiah.

Flanking Jesus, the near right figure is identifiable as a “traditional” Jews based on his headgear and physical distortions. The exaggerated and elongated nose reflects his Jewishness, especially when compared to the figure on the far right; neither headgear nor physical distortions mark him as Jewish. The figure to the left also dons a pointed hat and

\textsuperscript{62} Gager, 230.

\textsuperscript{63} “Contemporary Jewish figures” are to be contrasted with the Old Testament Biblical figures who are not considered to be an enemy of Christ. These figures came before the prophecy. Mellinkoff, \textit{Outcasts: Signs of Otherness}, 167.

\textsuperscript{64} Figure 2.
a bulbous nose. The bulbous nose is not exclusively a marker of Jewishness but with regards to imagery of Christ’s enemies, the usage of this exaggerated facial feature denotes an outcast or ostracized figure. The bulbous nose is less a marker of Jewish affiliation and identity in early medieval iconography, but as images became more realistic, the Jewish distinctions became subtler but continuously persistent.

This image begins the study because of its simplicity and overt theologically driven anti-Judaic sentiment. This image remains strictly religious while demonstrating the demoralization of Christianity. Jesus appears unclothed while his Jewish perpetrators ridicule him. However, no government officials appear to be present, no outside parties are involved, and no figure in the image is protesting the ridicule of Jesus. This image promotes the notion of Jews as malicious enemies of the cross, of Jesus, and of the Christian faith.

The question, who is the Jew, only raises more issues in terms of centrality and sacrifice. Three figures in this image are profoundly Jewish with the central figure standing as the provincial Jew. The issue with this anti-Judaic image stems from the source producing and distributing it as well as the message conveyed. This image was produced and intended for a Christian audience due to their encounters with the Biblical New Testament and textual stories of the arrest and crucifixion of the Messiah. Intended to illicit certain emotions in its audience, this type of image highlights as well as emphasizes the unpardonable sin of the Jewish people.

---
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Jesus appears as the central figure time and time again in early art and imagery. As early as the eleventh century, illuminated manuscripts depicted the innocent Messiah betrayed at the hands of enemies. Figure 3, a full-page miniature from an illuminated German manuscript, offers the same theme of enemy of Christ as above. The central figure, Christ, next to Judas receiving money for his betrayal, is surrounded by three men once again. These men are doting the typical stereotypes of the outcast, the ostracized, and the other commonly kept for representing a Jewish figure. However, these men are not necessarily depicting Jewish figures rather just an enemy of Christ. The common
denotation is that the enemies of Christ are outliers to the faith. They must be easily recognized in artwork. The theological underpinnings of this image suggest that a enemy of Christ is thematically synonymous with a Jewish figure, thus the recycling and reuse of common Jewish tropes and identifiers. The sacrificial central figure does not necessarily have to be Jesus as will be demonstrated later, but the figures flanking that figure are enemies, often portrayed with common Jewish stereotypes. Similarly, the image above, figure 4 also holds true to Jesus as central figure, flanked by enemies of the cross, betrayed by Judas.
A psalter fragment from the *Psalter of Wurzburg*, this thirteenth century miniature painting displays Judas embracing a flanked Christ. Three soldiers, one with a helmet and two with conical hats, surround the Christ figure during his betrayal by Judas. Again, while one of these figures appears to be a soldier, the other two have distinctive markings of Jewish caricatures. Whether these are intended to be Jewish figures, to the Christian audience during early anti-Jewish sentiment, these figures represent theological enemies of the cross. Their disdain and hatred for the Christian messiah stems from a theological ignorance as he is led to his iconic death on the cross.

The Jews in the thirteenth century, specifically the stigma of the Jews in Christian societies, was often a “visual sign” and can be seen as “part of the new emphasis on visual organization and order of society. The most extreme form that visual control of the Other took in this period was making the Jews themselves into images, into spectacles of alterity.”

That Jews were made into image and spectacle in the thirteenth century specifically became a badge of shame, not only to them but also to those who took on the stereotypical dress of the enemy, seen above with the soldiers of Christ.

In order to best understand the misrepresentations of the images during this time, it is imperative to remember that these images served the same purpose that modern art does; art seeks to shape society and express new avenues of thinking. For many of the original viewers, an individual cannot alone believe in something. The images were not


67 Ibid., 185.
merely to articulate symbolic ideas but rather, they were about distortion, objection, and misinterpretation, the familiarity of the Other.  

Two final images that depict the Christ figure as center to the enemies specifically stereotypes his flanking as Jewish. While the previous two images had the ability to be interpreted as simply an enemy with Jewish characteristics, the two final images show scenes of Christ’s arrest and betrayal. The first image, a German Gothic illumination, shows a certain artistic maturity from the previous images. Vibrant colors and beautiful patterning adorn this gruesome scene of the Christian messiah being laid on the rocky ground before his arrestors.  

**FIG. 5**

Titled “Christ’s Arrest,” figure 5 displays a cross-nimbed Christ lying on the rocky ground before a man raising his right hand above the face of Christ while simultaneously pulling His beard. A soldier, one of six, stands opposite the unidentified man and pulls His hair. The character most interesting for his study is the Jewish man, wearing a pointed hat, tying the hands of Christ together with rope. This image not only shows a helpless central figure, but it also presumes that the Jewish man had more
involvement in the arrest of Christ than the soldiers. Many of the soldiers, while armed, stand back while the Jewish figure ties the hands of Christ leaving him virtually immobile. The contrast between this image and the previous ones is that not only is the enemy of Christ explicitly portrayed as Jewish, but he is also representative for a group of people.

The Jewish figure in this image sits in front of the soldiers, showing dominance over the scene. He appears unarmed except for the piece of rope he uses to tie the hands of the Messiah figure. As the rumor of the Jewish betrayal of Christ took flight in Medieval Christian literature, the imagery became more overt and less interpretative. The message to the audience does not fall short; the Jewish people were ultimately responsible for the crucifixion, even if Roman authorities assisted them.

FIG. 6
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The tapestry image above, specifically the first textile square, reflects the arrest of an innocent Christ figure surrounded by two Jewish men grasping his arms with erect swords readied for the aim. Again, this image portrays the Christ figure betwixt and between two enemies of Christ wearing explicitly Jewish headgear. The pointed hats remain a constant theme throughout the course of anti-Judaic imagery and will continue to remain a pervasive element in anti-Semitic artwork.

These specific images, with a central, sacrificial Jesus, did not merely convey the idea of an enemy, but conjured up a specific enemy: the theological enemy that helped to continually push forward the anti-Judaic agenda.

*Jesus and the Cross: The Sacrifice and the Symbol*

Images of Jesus flanked by soldiers of varying stereotypical signs of otherness continued to remain a constant among the German biblical illuminations and illustrated texts. A second category of the central sacrificial figure is that of Jesus carrying or bearing the weight of the cross. This category holds a certain amount of influence because not only is the central figure Jesus of Nazareth, flanked by enemies of the cross portrayed as theologically opposed to Christianity, but Jesus is carrying the ultimate symbol of hatred: the cross on which he was persecuted.

The history of the cross is simple. It was not used exclusively for the execution of the Christian Messiah, but rather was one of the means of death reserved exclusively for rebellious slaves, criminals, and enemies of the state.\(^{69}\) The significance of the cross is downplayed in many other literary sources regarding the time-period due to its relatively

mundane nature. However, as the single most iconographic point of reference for Christian theology, it has evolved into symbolically more than two perpendicular boards holding a rebellious enemy of the state. The cross has become the central symbol of sacrifice in almost all of Christian theology.

Images depicting Christ bearing the cross and the weight of the sins of the Christian people, his role as the central sacrificial symbol becomes split. He shares the burden as sacrificial lamb with the cross. Many of the images are vastly similar, especially those that come from the Germanic lands. Many of the early images, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, behold the same burden of the Jewish figure. No longer can the enemy be a Jewish placeholder; the role of the enemy is to be Jewish and to be the antithesis to the Good News of the Christian gospel.
The three images above showcase similar compositions. First and foremost, they all appear in illuminated manuscripts as Psalter miniatures. This indicates that they were to be additives to text, supplementary images for the less well read audiences. Figure 7 comes from the Germanic south, a miniature psalter painting depicting a mocked Christ and Christ bearing His cross. The upper portion of the image depicts the denial of Christ by the apostle Peter. Jesus is wearing a crown of thorns and is mocked mercilessly by two Jewish men wearing the conical Jewish hat, with the apostle Peter to the far left of the seated Christ. The lower image, Christ bearing his cross, shows him cross-nimbed and flanked by eight Jewish men wearing the typical headgear reflective of a Jewish man at this time.

The lower portion of this image shows the insistence of the Jewish involvement with the death of Jesus. There are no other participants in this image besides Jesus and the Jewish men who mock him. They appear jovial while the Christ figure is burdened by the weight of the cross. This image reflects the specific theme of the central sacrificial figure and the symbolic object of sacrifice: the cross. The Jewish men surround the Christ figure, making his parade to death more specifically religious rather than political. There are no Roman authorities, only strictly perceived observant Jews, mocking another Jewish man.

The later exchange between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism comes from the crossing and mixing of categories and moving from religious to strictly political. This image exudes religious intolerance by the Christian church goers as well as those who commissioned such a painting.
As an accompanying image to a text, many readers would have drawn assumptions based on the images, then read the passages with a skewed understanding of the text(s) themselves. The role of images, as stated earlier, was to illicit emotive thinking rather than literal thinking and then to change the order of societal thought. Figure 7 evokes and provokes religiously driven intolerance and hatred even without the accompanying text.

Figure 8, a similar piece from a similar date range, appears in an illuminated manuscript psalter text. Again, Christ is shown bearing His/the cross, accompanied by two men wearing the conical hat. This image is a decorated initial and would have appeared at the beginning of a line or page. The role of image as text is not lost here. The first thing on the page, prior to any reading or any knowledge of the latter passage, is this illuminated initial with the burdened Christ. Like figure 7, the only enemies of the cross are Jewish men. The religious polemics of the imagery at hand pre-date late anti-Semitic political ideology. As is such, figure 9 looks strikingly similar to the former two images with the exception of the inclusion of authority figures.

Quite similar to figure 5, the Jewish enemy in figure 9 in zone one of the image holds a rope around Christ as he walks, showing authority in the matter of crucifixion. Christ’s crown of thorns is fashioned on his head with the cross painstakingly placed on his left shoulder. The Jewish man holds the rope in one hand and with the other he grasps three nails. The soldier who stands beside him holds a sword and shield, but the ultimate enemy holds the weapons of Christ’s doom. Behind the Christ figure, a Jewish man precedes a soldier helping bear the weight of the cross and urging him forward.
Zone 2 of figure 9, Christ’s crucifixion at the cross, moves the figures down a zone, into a new scene, but with the same stances and placements. The closest figures to Christ remain the Jewish men in conical hats. The man who held the nails in Zone 1 now holds the hammer; the Jewish man to the left of Christ now holds onto a hammer and nail of his own. The soldiers, holding spears and wearing helmets, remain in the background while the image suggests that the Jewish men alone will do the execution.

To once again repeat Ruth Melinkoff, imagery during this time revealed the perspective of the Church in order to create a “Christianized” view of Judaism. The Church intended for the viewer to know that the “Jews carried the burden of an unpardonable sin; their alleged betrayal and murder of Christ could never be forgotten or forgiven.” The final two images for this thematic section come from the fourteenth and fifteenth century. The change in artistic form only brings us closer to images that transform into the less theological, more political anti-Semitic images that are to come. The following images show up as cartoons, or caricatures. They do not appear on folio pages, psalter texts, or illuminated manuscripts. These images show a new accessibility for less religious persons who may not have had access to or been exposed to the former images that show up alongside religious texts.
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Figures 10 and 11, the former a tapestry image and the latter a periodical caricature, reveal the nature of imagery without text. The simplicity of the tapestry piece, more specifically an altar hanging, expresses the sentiment of the mocking Jews crowning Christ with a throne of thorns. The other columns and image boxes recount the story of Christ’s mocking, Christ before Herod, Christ bearing the cross, and Christ with the Virgin Mary. With regards to the symbol of the cross, it shows up in a majority of the scenes always in relation to Christ, either on his back or nailed to it. Christ is the central figure, but the cross, with its contrasted darkness to the lightness of the fabric, stands out. It remains an antithesis to the Jewish figures and a symbolic reminder of their affiliation with the death of Jesus.

Figure 11, a badly preserved caricature from a German periodical, reinforces many of the motifs outlined above: the conical hats, the grotesque faces of the enemies of the cross, Jesus centrally positioned with the cross on his shoulder, and armed soldiers around the crowd. This figure, as the final image for this section, segues nicely into the obvious animated images that show the Jew as the enemy and the sacrifice of the Host wafer and of Christian children. Those images tend to be less artistic and more cartoonesque aimed at a more literate crowd, but for the publics’ eye.

**Jew as Enemy: Sacrifice of Host and Children**

A common trope during this time period, beginning in roughly the twelfth century, was the accusation of blood libels against the Jewish people. The term blood libel “refers to the accusation that Jews were guilty of various kinds of atrocities, most especially the killing of Christians to use their blood to make the unleavened bread eaten during Passover and for other rituals (despite the fact that Jewish law prohibits contact
Another common misconception was the accusation known as host desecration. Following a similar pattern, host desecration presumes that the Jewish people knew and recognized transubstantiation, and thus “stabbed and mutilated the host in a kind of reenactment of the crucifixion of Christ, allegedly causing it to shed blood.” As such, although the Jewish people did not recognize the transubstantive act of the host, the final Jew killed for the accused crime occurred in the seventeenth century, nearly five centuries after the earliest accusation. This lineage of accusatory crimes leads to the trajectory of anti-Semitically based artwork and the necessity to differentiate between theologically and politically driven hatred.
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72 Ibid. Transubstantiation refers to the Catholic doctrine pertaining to the Eucharist in which the host (wafer) literally becomes the body of Christ during the ritual ceremony. The first accusation of host desecration came in 1243.
Figure 12 is a panel from a longer woodcut that shows the alleged desecration of the Host by Jews. The box shown in the first panel contains the host that is carried into
the synagogue. In the second image (top right corner), a Jewish man stabs the host and blood begins to flow after it is pierced with a sword or knife. Following the desecration, the Jewish people are arrested and burned at the stake to show others what the consequences of defiance will be. The animated nature of the image takes away many of the more realistic advances of the early imagery that focused on the Christ figure and the cross.

Rather, these images focus on the centrality of the accused action. Figure 12 centers in on the host, choosing the host as a stand in for Christ. The mimicked reenactment of the crucifixion puts the accusations in real time. The Christian masses are far removed from the death of Christ, using the host to ritually preserve the memory of his murder. Thus, using images in the fifteenth century to symbolize Christ not only makes them more accessible but it posits the Jewish figure as a current threat. The Jew killing Christ motif continues to be a common fear-inducing tactic, but in order to pose the modern Jew as an current enemy of the Christian faith, the images need to reflect modern practices. The host desecration accusations allow the Jewish figure to remain a murderous enemy of the cross while also reminding the people in the communities that measures are to be taken in order to eradicate the Jew from society.

Figure 13 uses the trope of blood libels rather than host desecrations to portray the Jew as enemy. This image, from the Chronicarum Mundi in Nuremberg, is an artistic interpretation of the murder of Simon of Trent. In this image, the artist hopes to portray
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73 Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, 230. According to myth, on Easter Sunday in 1475, a Jewish cook in Italy found the body of a small child in the sewer that flowed through the basement of his Jewish employer’s house. Due to a lack of communication, fear of the Other, and an already existing struggle between the Jewish and Christian people in the
Simon of Trent as a martyr to be venerated, similarly to Jesus Christ. He is shown “mounted” atop a table quite similar to Christ mounted on the sacrificial cross. The young boy takes on the role of central sacrifice quite literally as Jewish men and women surround him, allegedly hoping to use his blood for their Passover meal. The blood that Simon of Trent sheds will be more powerful and catastrophic to the Christian theology than the host desecration. This image places the trope of cannibalism and murder onto a group of people. The Jewish people are no longer simply disbelievers of Christ but they are now enemies to all. Not only are they defiling Christian doctrine; their presumed status as murderer places them as a threat to all those who surround them. The sacrifices they continue to take part in become more real with the passing of time and more applicable to the communities at hand.

As artistry moves away from the image of Jesus’s arrest, the very real and very graphic images of Jews participating in outlandish rituals sends the message that they are no longer simply a threat to the Church but to everyone. This change in ideology drives the terminological change from anti-Judaic to anti-Semitic, all the while using the same motif of central sacrifice stemming from the original image of the arrest and murder of Jesus.

community, twenty-two members of the Jewish community were arrested and accused of murdering the young boy and using his blood during their Passover dinner.
VI. CENTRAL SACRIFICE IN ANTI-SEMITIC ARTWORK: THE JEW AS CENTRAL

Modern anti-Semitism is often characterized as “ideological claims and organizational features that make it different from traditional anti-Judaism.” The characterizing force of modern anti-Semitism for this project is that it is mostly secular. Anti-Semitism became a uniting force across European countries, normally divided along class, religious, and national lines. Anti-Semitism, much like anti-Judaism, demonstrated the best way to acquire a scapegoat for the ills of modernity. Was anti-Semitism a cry for a social revolution? Were the Jewish people simply standing in the way?

The anti-Semitic specific artwork that arose out of the nineteenth century was no more crude or gruesome than the images above. However, the understanding of sacrificial overtness changed; the tone became less religiously hostile and more hate-filled.

Germanic Anti-Semitism in Germany

The social and economic structure of Germany in the nineteenth century provided the organizational structures that fueled the anti-Semitic movement. The primary
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76 Ibid., 300. Much of the historical and information about the anti-Semitic rise in 19th century Germany came from John Efron’s, et.al., text, The Jews: A History. For sake
supporters and encouragers of the anti-Semitic movement were the lower middle classes and farmers—all in rage due to the prosperity of their Jewish neighbors.

Threat of war, political uprisings, and social rebellions against the Jewish people resulted in Wilhelm Marr “coining” the term anti-Semitism. Marr not only defended the Jewish people against still persistent blame for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, but he also claimed that the racial characteristics and peculiarities created an unequal playing ground for Germans (non-Jews) and their Jewish counterparts. Marr’s argument was not that the Jewish people were blamed as an Other, but rather that their integration into German society as a more educated, economically booming middle class would ensure Jewish success over non-Jews.

However, Marr’s theory of the reasons for anti-Semitism quickly became overthrown by those who did not agree with theory of the “Strong Jew versus the Weak German.” Political schemes were concocted, demanding Jewish adherents to remove themselves or be removed from specific jobs. The interesting dichotomy that Germany presents itself in is this: Germany became the first country to acknowledge the rapid anti-Semitism that infiltrated all facets of society. However, this all occurred post-Jewish emancipation. Despite the anti-Semitic claims and threats, the newly won rights of the Jewish people were not retracted nor were their economic and social gains disputed. In

of not constantly re-citing, this section of information comes primarily from there unless otherwise noted.

77 For a more thorough study of Marr’s theory of anti-Semitism see “The Victory of the Jews over the Germans, Considered from a Non-Religious Point of View” (1879).

78 See Antisemite’s Petition. This petition was ultimately declined by Otto von Bismark, but the admission of the idea(s) inlaid gave rise to a number of political movements later on.
America as well as in Eastern Europe during the same time, Jewish persons were faced with violence, racism, and discrimination. However, the imagery that primarily comes during this time comes from Germany. The German-Jews were blossoming. They allowed themselves to feel truly German and truly Jewish, all the while blindly unaware of what was brewing under the surface.

What does this façade of acceptance do to the images that were created and published during this time? Specifically, how do these images reinforce the ideology that images tell a story much deeper and much more significant than text? Regardless of the outward attitude of the German people, the images themselves express a specific sentiment that the Jew is still the enemy, and the German people need the new sacrificial figure in their political martyrdom to be the Jewish figure.

*The Sacrificial Jew: Central Recipient of Violence*

![FIG. 14](image)

The above scenes both depict violence in the street and emerge in the early nineteenth century. Figure 14 is described as an “anti-Semitic fairy tale about tormenting
a Jew.” Figure 15, in contrast, is an etching depicting the Hep-Hep riots against the Jews in Frankfurt. Figure 15 image specifically contains

…Christians of different social classes beating and targeting Jews, as well as looting their homes. Two peasant women are assaulting a Jew with a pitchfork and a broom. A man wearing a waistcoat and cravat, of a higher social class, has a Jew by his throat and is aiming to beat him with a stick.

What appears most interesting about this set of images is the way in which they are authored. One is meant to be mythic—describing a truth, not necessarily the historical truth—while the second image depicts an event that devastated a large Jewish community. However, the images are thematically similar. The difference between the two rests on the portrayal of the Jew. Figure 14 depicts the ultimate enemy. This central figure, the Jewish enemy, resembles the Christian devil. Horns protrude from his head,

79 Description from the United States Holocaust Museum.

80 The Hep-Hep Riots were a series of pogroms against Ashkenazi Jews during the period of Jewish emancipation in Germany. These riots lasted from August of 1819 to October of 1819—during which time many German/Bavarian Jews lost their lives and much of their property.

81 Description from the College of Charleston William Rosenthall Judaica Collection.
his clothing is opaque and flowing, and the ambiance settling over the town is dark and dreary.

The Jewish devil and the entirety of the image resembles many images of a flogged Jesus Christ surrounded by Jewish men looking to take his life. The images themselves, the early ones and these 19th century pieces, do not bear much in common. The number of people has changed, the sophistication of the work has increased, and the setting of the floggings does not revolve around Jesus’s carrying of the cross. The overt resemblance in these images instead is the central figure and the treatment of this motif.

The “anti-Judaic” images that come to us in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have an underlying religious agenda. Figures 14 and 15 do not. The backbone of anti-Semitism strictly instigates the fear of the Other and the fear of a Jewish uprising. Why, then, do these two ideologically different images contain the same thematic make-up of a central figure sacrifice? Why is there an overt need to portray the Jewish enemy in the same manner that early Christians portrayed the betrayed Son of God? What does this imagery do for the viewers and the audience?

*Individual Images to Published Collections: The Literary Advancement of Propaganda*

The early images, the anti-Judaic cartoons and propaganda pieces, appeared either as altar dressings, in illuminated manuscripts, or as individual posters and treatises. No longer were the images that portrayed the Jewish enemy elected to appear in bibles, but entire books were bound and available for the reading pleasure and enjoyment of anti-Semitic, non-Jewish Germans. Rather than individual images, entire books of anti-
Semitic parodies created a vivid visual of the enemy. These books allowed for the readers to view the Jew in a number of different ways—lending money, begging, in synagogues, etc. The Jewish figure in these texts was not safe from any stereotype.

One particular example is an 1885 published Parody of the Hagadah. Held at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the replicated “Hagadah” is bound in burlap and published on papyrus, both an ode to Jewish antiquity and a satirical remark about the backwardness of Judaism, a common theme of anti-Semitism. Many of these books were published around the rise of German Nazism, but a few pioneers of the anti-Semitic book industry paved the way in the early nineteenth century. While much of the Nazi anti-Semitic propaganda is considered its own genre of anti-Semitic artwork, it is worth noting that many of the similarities in trope and context followed with early anti-Judaic images.

Conclusory Images: Tracing a Trend

The final two images tracing the anti-Semitic trend are quite different from anything shown thus far. Nothing more than sketches, these two images pose an artistic dilemma as well as a thematic one. The trend(s) from above have carried over but in different settings.

82 See Figures 5 and 9.
The first image comes from an 1873 German chronicle. At its most basic, this is an arrest image. A Jewish man, surrounded by three guards, appears forlorn. At its most complex, this image reflects the basic thematic of the Christ arrest images that could be seen in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The specific comparison with figure 16 would be that of figure 2.

In figure two, stereotypical Jewish men surround the Christ figure. Pointed hats, elongated noses, and crude features all identify these men as Jewish, or rather, enemies of the cross. Figure 16 is a much more eloquent version of the same image. Three men surround the presumed enemy, but the first image tells a mythic tale and the second reflects a specific sentiment of hate.

This idea of a central sacrificial figure does not fall away during the move from anti-Judaism to anti-Semitism, nor does it fall away during the twentieth century. The following 1960s, German lithograph print by artist Otto Dix represents a modernized version of the crowning of Jesus Christ. While the enemies surrounding Jesus are not explicitly Jewish in nature (the artist does not state that these are Jewish figures), the enemies of the cross, harkening back to the early thirteenth century, wear common
characteristics of the Jewish stereotype. Bulbous elongated noses and pointed tongues bear resemblance to early caricatures of Jews arresting and mocking Christ.

Images such as these, modern images with a rural twist, look to an earlier time. The stylistic commonalities between this image and the crude images found in early German biblical texts and manuscripts bear a certain rustic similarity. But it is images such as these that leave us questioning. Why does this twentieth century piece bear so much resemblance to a twelfth century wooden miniature? Why does the central figure show up as an “otherized” person to the group that surrounds them? Why does the central image of Christ surrounded by Jews become appropriated by Germans as a way to ostracize their Jewish neighbors? Where does this leave us and where do we go from here?

FIG. 17
VI. CONCLUSION: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Questions that arose during this research endeavor exclusively dealt with the issue of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, and why these two were ideologically different. Over the course of the seventeen images shared above, a distinctive change occurs in the ideology, but the themes of the artwork do not.

Central Sacrifice and the Sacrificial Other

The sacrificial Other refers to the Jewish people. This is the anti-Semitic, political, and fear driven ideology of the Jewish people. The central sacrifice become the entirety of the Jewish people, but they also became the sacrificial Other. By sacrificing, murdering, pogroming Jewish communities, the “Other” became the ultimate sacrifice for political gain. This anti-Semitic ideology was restitution for the ultimate act of killing Jesus Christ. Thus, the images remain the same. The centrality of the sacrificial figure remains the same. The themes, ideas, and characteristics of the figures remain very much the same. Jesus was the ultimate central sacrifice, murdered by the Jews, whose death was redeemed by the sacrifice of the “Other.”
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