The Tree of Death and the Tree of Life: The Hanging of Haman in Medieval Jewish Manuscript Painting

KATRIN KOGMAN-APPEL

In 1272 a Jewish illuminator, probably a man known as Shemaya Hatsarfati (Shemaya the French) designed a peculiar image of the hanging of Haman and his sons (Fig. 262). The book of Esther (7:10) first reports the hanging of Haman on the gallows that had been prepared for Mordechai, and some verses later the execution of his ten sons (Esther 9:13–14). The image appears in the Worms Mahzor (Jerusalem, Jewish National and University Library, Ms. 4⁰781/1), produced, scholars believe, in Franconia, probably in Würzburg.[1] Rather than showing Haman hanged on a gallows, as he is commonly represented in Christian art of the period,[2] the designer of the Worms Mahzor image chose to rely on another pictorial source. The stylized tree with its branches forming medallions in which the hanging men are depicted evokes an immediate association with the imagery of the Tree of Jesse, a theme that had become increasingly popular in Christian art since the early twelfth century. An example of particularly similar design to that of the Worms Mahzor is found in an Antiphonary, probably from Silesia, from the late thirteenth century (Fig. 263).[3]

The Hebrew text in Esther 5:14 reads *ets*, meaning "wood," or "tree," but also "gallows." The fact that the *ets* had to be set up suggests a gallows rather than a growing tree; however, the text per se does not entirely exclude the hanging of Haman on a tree. In fact, medieval Jewish visual renderings of the story prefer to show Haman hanged on a tree. A similar tree motif was used at some time before 1293 in another southern German Mahzor (Fig. 264), now split between Dresden (Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Ms. A 46 a) and Wroclav (University Library, Or. I, 1). The Haman illustration appears in the Dresden volume. Here the tree motif recalls the Tree of Jesse more remotely; the design of medallions was replaced by stylized branches before a colored background. It is the overall composition with the mandorla-like frame for Haman that still creates a strong association with the Tree of Jesse. The image is, however, also reminiscent of Christian depictions of the Tree of Life. A particular resemblance can be observed to an image in the Gradual of Gisela of Kerssenbruck (Osnabrück, Bistum, Diözesanarchiv, Ms. 101; Fig. 265), produced in 1300, probably in Westphalia. Although slightly later, this image makes it quite clear what kind of models influenced the Jewish Haman pictures in compositional type and the design of the branches.[4] The

Tree of Life in the Gisela Gradual displays an image of Jesus in the upper branches, musician angels below him, and female and male clerics in the lower branches. The nuns wear the habit of the Cistercian order. The Dresden image shows a lion and a griffin at the roots of the tree, linking it not only with the Christian Tree of Life, but also with earlier Jewish and Near Eastern traditions of the same motif.

Earlier versions of Haman hanged on a tree can be found in the so-called Laud Mahzor in Oxford, dated c. 1250–60,[5] and in the Kalonymus Bible of 1238, now in Wroclav,[6] both from southern Germany. The Kalonymus depiction is the earliest extant Jewish rendering of the hanging of Haman. Both images create associations with the Tree of Life rather than with the Tree of Jesse. The medallions, a typical feature of the design of the Tree of Jesse, are omitted in these examples. This latter version was followed in the Leipzig Mahzor (Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, V 1102/I–II; Fig. 266) of c. 1310, probably also from Franconia; in the de Castro Pentateuch in Jerusalem,[7] of 1344, from southern Germany; and the Hammelburg Mahzor (Darmstadt, Hessische Landes-und Hochschulbibliothek, cod. Or. 13; Fig. 267), also from Franconia, dated 1348.[8] In all of the prayer books the image occupies the outer margin of a page that contains the end of the poem "*Asapra el choq*," one of the liturgical poems for the Purim holiday.[9] The line "and they hanged Haman" appears toward the end of the text. In the biblical manuscripts, the images illustrate the book of Esther. All of these latter examples display a recurring scheme: Haman, hanged on top of the tree, often appears slightly larger than his sons, who are hanged on the lower branches. The trees are large, and dominate the margins with their lively colors.

What we have here, then, is a distinct local, southern German, Jewish iconographic tradition traceable to between 1238 and 1348. In 1272 we find the variant suggesting the Tree of Jesse, but this did not become a widespread model; however, it had some influence on the Dresden-Wroclaw Mahzor, produced before 1293. The specific relation to the Jesse theme is thus a phenomenon of the two last decades of the thirteenth century.[10]

The Jewish imagery described above takes up the Christian motifs of the Tree of Jesse and the closely related Tree of Life and translates them to represent a sobering, large tree of evil and death, thus inverting some of Christianity's most sanctified images. In the following essay I shall examine the Jewish Haman images in relation to the Christian pictorial traditions of the Tree of Life and the Tree of Jesse. Not only did the Jewish miniaturists borrow a Christian model, but they were aware of its implications and were creative in transferring it into an image with a distinct polemical message. Borrowing from Christian pictorial sources was a common procedure among Jewish illuminators,[11] and it has been suggested that the beginning of Jewish manuscript painting in the thirteenth century was indebted to the development of urban workshops at that time, and that it was there that Jewish artists acquired artistic skills and painting techniques.[12]

The following essay, however, goes beyond the mere question of borrowings from Christian art and the use of models. It shows that models were not only copied and borrowed, but that their meaning was known and understood and could be translated and polemically utilized from one culture to another. I shall first give a short overview of the theological and artistic background of the Christian tree motifs, their theological values and messages that are translated and inverted in the renderings of Haman's hanging. My discussion goes on to Jewish interpretations of the Haman story, and their polemical applications against the historical background of Crusade-related and post-Crusade anti-Jewish persecution and violence.

The Tree of Life and the Tree of Jesse

References to the Tree of Life and the Tree of Jesse are abundant in Christian thought and art; only a brief summary need be given here. When the notion of the Tree of Life entered Christianity the way to associations with the cross was a short one. In the second century Justin Martyr linked the Tree of Life with the Crucified,[13] and in the sixth-century Syrian *Book of the Cave of Treasures* the Tree of Life is described as a type of the cross of salvation, which is the true Tree of Life.[14] In the Middle Ages this theme was further developed by numerous theologians, among them Honorius of Autun in the early twelfth century.[15] According to the medieval *Legend of the Cross*, the cross was made of the wood of the Tree of Life.[16] The motif is also well known in medieval German literature. Around 850 Otfried of Weissenburg described the cross as a tree.[17] In Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Wartburgkrieg* from the 1230s an *edel boum* is used as a symbol of the *vrone kriuze breit*.[18]

In German art of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the motif of the Tree of Life in association with the cross appears in a great variety of visual renderings. An example is an image in a twelfth-century Missal, now in the Library of the Münster in Mönchen-Gladbach (Ms. 1), where the cross-tree grows out of Adam's head (Fig. 268).[19] A more stylized tree figures in a late thirteenth-century Gradual from Regensburg (New York, Breslauer Collection, nos. 35–36).[20]

The iconography of the Tree of Jesse[21] began to appear in the West[22] during the late eleventh century. As Margot Fassler has recently shown, it is rooted in liturgy, in particular a sermon and chants for the feast of the Nativity of Mary by Fulbert of Chartres († 1028).[23] An early example of the theme in fully developed form is a window in Saint-Denis dated 1144,[24] followed by a similar one a few years afterwards at Chartres (Fig. 269).[25] Approximately contemporary with the French windows, or slightly later, the subject appears in a wall painting in the Westwerk at Sankt Michael in Hildesheim.[26]

Renderings of the Tree of Jesse usually show a tree growing out of the chest of Jesse, who is reclining at the base of the composition (Figs. 263, 269). Some examples represent a bust or head of Jesse (or Boaz) instead of the reclining figure.[27] The branches of the tree form stylized medallions populated by Old Testament kings, in particular David and Solomon, the Prophets, and Mary; a Christ of the Majestas type is in the top medallion. Most examples focus on Christ; some, however, emphasize the figure of Mary in the center of the composition, or place her, together with the Child, in the top medallion.[28] Stressing Jesus' human genealogy and thus the doctrine of incarnation, the Tree of Jesse perhaps owed its popularity in the thirteenth century to the battle against dualistic heresies, which rejected the orthodox view of Jesus' human nature.[29] The Tree of Jesse also had typological functions as a sort of visual link between the Old and the New Testaments. As such it often appeared in Psalters after pictorial cycles of the Life of Christ.[30]

A variant of particular relevance in our context is a combination of the Tree of Life and the Tree of Jesse. Based on the identification of the cross as the Tree of Life, these images show the Crucified on the Tree of Jesse. In general the concepts of the two trees are closely linked in Christian theology. Bernard of Clairvaux, for instance, describes the Tree of Jesse as the Tree of Life, "which alone has been reputed worthy to bear the fruit of salvation."[31] Visual renderings of this version of the Tree of Jesse show its upper branches growing into a vegetal cross carrying the Crucified. An example occurs in the Kremsmünster *Speculum Humanae Salvationis* (Kremsmünster,

Stiftsbibliothek, no. 243; Fig. 270).[32] Another variant shows the Crucified within the top medallion of the Tree of Jesse, as in a miniature from a thirteenth-century Missal, now in the Kestner Museum in Hannover (Ms. no. 3985; Fig. 271). This variant thus shifts the emphasis from the genealogical aspect to that of Jesus' death, possible only if he was indeed incarnated. These types were especially popular in Germany and significantly less frequent in other countries.[33] They are based on the notion that the Tree of Jesse marks the beginning of salvation and the tree of the cross its attainment. This relationship between the *virga Jesse* (Isa. 11:10), the rod that grows from the root of Jesse, which brought forth the *virgo*, the virgin Mary, and the *virga cruci*, based on a link between the similar-sounding words *virga* and *virgo*, was discussed, for example, by Peter Damian in the eleventh century.[34]

From the early thirteenth century onward, the tree motif could often convey a polemical anti-Jewish undertone. An early thirteenth-century miniature from Strasbourg (Karlsruhe, Landesbibliothek, St. Peter, perg. 139; Fig. 272), for example, places the crucifixion on the Tree of Life accompanied by personifications of *synagoga* and *ecclesia*. The motif of the triumphant church juxtaposed with the defeated synagogue had become increasingly popular by that time. The merging of the Tree of Life motif with the *synagoga-ecclesia* theme eventually developed into the iconography of the so-called Living Cross, not only legitimizing violent persecution of the Jews and bloodshed, but actually calling for it the Crucified appears on a tree-cross whose right branch grows into a hand blessing *ecclesia*, whereas the sword-grasping extension of the left branch pierces the figure of *synagoga*. The latter is shown in a particularly derogatory manner, riding a goat, or a donkey, or some other demonic creature.[35] The motif of the Living Cross is known only from the visual arts, but never developed as a literary theme. It appears frequently during the fifteenth century; however, it may perhaps go back to the early fourteenth. A wall painting of uncertain date in the Church of the Holy Spirit in Schigra, Slovakia, displays a version of the theme that may suggest an early development. The church in Schigra is decorated by frescoes from both the early fourteenth and the early fifteenth centuries. Based on stylistic and iconographic considerations Dénes Radocsay proposed a date for the Living Cross representation during the first quarter of the fourteenth century. This may be supported by the fact that the fresco appears to have been overpainted and was uncovered only during repair work in 1954.[36] Another wall painting of the Living Cross, in Koprzywnica, Poland, can be dated to the late fourteenth century,[37] and indicates that the theme was known in eastern Europe before it became current in central Europe after 1400.

Another tree with an explicitly polemical message appeared much earlier, as the tree of good and the tree of evil in the *Liber Floridus* of Lambert, written and illuminated in Saint Omer, before 1120 (Ghent, Bibliothèque de l'Université, cod. 1125; Fig. 273). On the left we find the *arbor bona* identified as *ecclesia fidelium*; growing from it are the twelve virtues shown as women's busts. This tree is lively, fresh, and colorful, and its exuberant branches represent a whole variety of botanical species. It makes a strong contrast to the monochromatic, dry *arbor mala* on the right, identified as *synagoga*. The branches are of one species only, the barren fig tree, following Matt. 21.18-20, where it stands for those who do not believe in Christ. At its roots "the axe is laid (Matt. 3:10)," ready to cut off the barren growths of nonbelievers. The medallions incorporated into the dry branches name the vices.[38] At approximately the same period, in a treatise about the *arbor virtutum* and *arbor vitiorum*, attributed to Conrad of Hirsau, the former is equated with the cross.[39] The allegory of the trees of good and evil is based on notions of the biblical tree of knowledge and original sin versus the Tree of Life, which brings redemption through the new Adam.

Seen against the background of these Christian traditions, it would appear, then, that thirteenth-century Jews created a daring image: a subversion of the Christian Tree of Life and Tree of Jesse, conveying the theme of crucifixion and salvation, applied to the theme of persecution and punishment for the persecutor. The Jewish images not only react against the cross-tree theme, but also against the polemic implications of *synagoga-ecclesia*, and the trees of good and evil. It cannot even be entirely excluded that the designers of the later Haman images were probably already aware of early versions of the Living Cross, one of the most brutal anti-Jewish images in the history of Christian art. The Jewish miniaturists adopted the Christian trees unmodified. They did not turn them into dry trees without leaves, which might have transmitted the message of death and evil still more clearly. This, however, would have obscured the association with the Christian cross-tree or the Tree of Life. It is as if they wanted to make sure that the association with the Christian tree motifs would be unambiguous. For the designers of the Jewish images it was the sign of the Christian cross-tree that had brought persecution and only a victory such as the one reported in the book of Esther could bring salvation. This victory, finally, would be able to bring life to the Jews—another inversion of the Tree of Life theme. In the Dresden version this is particularly clear insofar as it incorporates the lion and the griffin, elements of the earlier Jewish and Middle Eastern tradition of the Tree of Life. Through the punishment of Haman the Christian Tree of salvation has turned into the Jewish Tree of Life.

Haman as Prototype of Anti-Jewish Persecution

The notions of crucifying and hanging are somewhat blurred in late antique and medieval Jewish texts. Both the Jewish and the Christian traditions sometimes took Haman to have been crucified. In the Roman world these two methods of execution meant basically the same thing. Being crucified did not entail being nailed to a cross as the Christian tradition pictures Christ. Rather, it was understood as being hanged on a gallows—sometimes in the form of a cross—by the limbs instead of by the neck. The Aramaic word for "to hang" corresponds to the Hebrew word meaning "to crucify" (*tselov*).[40] Since crucifixion, that is, hanging on a cross-form gallows, was the most common method of execution in the Roman world, both the Septuagint and the Vulgate refer to Haman as crucified (*iussit excelsam arari crucem*; Esther 5:17). This would imply that Haman had prepared a cross for Mordechai, a point that frequently aroused the interest of early Latin fathers.[41] This understanding, however, governs only occasional medieval visual renderings of the Esther story.[42]

The Septuagint translation predates Christianity. It was made by Jews, and it was used by Jews throughout the late antique period. In Timothy Thornton's words this meant that "for many Jews Haman would thus be the best-known figure associated with death by crucifixion."[43] On the other hand, the wording of the Septuagint and the Vulgate certainly had some influence on how Christians perceived the Purim holiday, which they soon understood as a festival of mockery of the Crucified.[44] The fact that in Jewish tradition the hanging of Haman took place at Passover likewise did not pass without notice.

Ever since the biblical Esther story came into being, in the eyes of Jews Haman was the paradigm of anti-Judaism. Haman is often identified as Amalekite or a descendant of the Amalekites, the prototype of Israel's enemy.[45] The defeat and hanging of Haman stood for the messianic victory over Israel's enemies. In thirteenth-century Europe the enemy of Israel was Christendom.

What had begun in late Antiquity as a relationship between two competing cultures had grown into a majority culture violently persecuting the Jewish minority. Late antique and early medieval anti-Judaism did not normally call for violence. In the post-Crusade atmosphere of the thirteenth century, however, anti-Jewish hostility and bloodshed became the rule.[46]

Scholars are divided as to how Jewish-Christian coexistence deteriorated into extremes of violence.[47] Pauline doctrine reflects two different approaches toward the Jews. The first, as elaborated in the letter to the Romans, expresses disappointment and hope in relation to the Jews' refusal to convert. The second approach, on the other hand, is one of anxiety and threat, and governs the letter to the Galatians. During the early Middle Ages it was the first approach that determined normative church policy toward the Jews, while only radical voices demonized the Jews on the ground of the letter to the Galatians. Paul's first approach became normative due to Augustine's balancing view, which referred to Judaism as proof of the rightness of Christianity. This function as witness guaranteed the legitimacy of the Jews' existence, and for centuries determined their role within Christian society. Whereas Gregory the Great in the sixth century still accepted the first Pauline approach and the doctrine of Augustine, the second Pauline approach began to gain influence during the early Middle Ages, when the idea of a pure Christian society began to prevail, a direction taken in the ninth century by Agobard of Lyon, who called for the segregation of the Jews.[48] Still, Agobard encouraged neither physical violence nor forced baptism.[49]

In the subsequent decades Agobard's notion of a pure Christian society became more and more influential. Christian rulers became increasingly committed to his ideal; the German emperors saw themselves as obliged to protect the church and to function as guardians of Christian piety. Between the eleventh and the thirteenth century the Jews' constitutional status as citizens changed into one of personal dependence on rulers. They became "servants of the chamber."[50] The Crusade-related attacks against the Jewish communities of the Rhineland in the early summer of 1096[51] were thus not an accidental by-product of the hostility toward Muslim nonbelievers; they were part of the ideal of a pure Christian society.[52] Already in 1010 rumors that Jews were involved in the destruction of the site of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem by Al-Hakim, caliph of Cairo, had resulted in several violent outbreaks in France and Germany.[53] In 1063 a group of knights on the way to fight the Muslims in Spain attacked Jewish communities in southern France.[54]

By the late thirteenth century, when the Jewish images of Haman's execution were composed, religiously motivated violence had become an integral characteristic of Christian society. The period from the eleventh to the late thirteenth centuries thus marks the movement from a policy of limited toleration as a living proof of the rightness of the Christian doctrine to the ideal of a pure Christian society. This ideal implied that Jews and heretics were to be eliminated either by conversion or by persecution and expulsion. During the Second Crusade (1146–1148) the massive anti-Jewish onslaughts called for by preachers such as the monk Ralph in Mainz could still be held back through the intervention of Bernard of Clairvaux. However, even though Bernard tried to prevent large-scale violence, his views were crucial for the development of perceptions of Jewish hostility and suspicions of Jewish blasphemy.[55]

Petrus Venerabilis went a step further: the elimination of the Jewish communities was legitimate, even though he did not recommend it.[56] Petrus's approach was innovative in other respects as well in that his argumentation was based on his knowledge and interpretation of Rabbinic literature.[57] From then on Talmudic Judaism was considered a distortion of biblical Judaism, and hence medieval Jews were no longer fit to function as a witness in Augustine's sense. Robert

Chazan describes this development as a transition from an earlier sense of the Jews as an "abstract historical enemy" to one that viewed contemporary Jews "as devoured by hatred, poised at every moment to bring harm on the Christian society."[58]

This is the period during which many of the medieval anti-Jewish stereotypes were shaped.[59] These stereotypes incited violence, on the one hand, and justified it, on the other. Jews were believed to consort with the devil. The earliest instances of accusations of ritual murder occurred in the 1140s, as in Würzburg in 1146.[60] Bernard Blumenkrantz has argued that it was also during this period that the depiction of Jews in Christian art became defamatory.[61] More attacks occurred during and shortly after the Third Crusade. In 1188 Frederick I took the cross but, realizing that the lives of the Jews of Mainz were in danger, he forbade anti-Jewish preaching.[62]

The thirteenth century carried violence to an intensity not hitherto experienced. During the 1230s and 1250s thousands of Jews were killed in France.[63] Accusations of ritual murder resulted in yet more massive attacks. From this period on violent events frequently followed upon accusations of Host desecration.[64] Jeremy Cohen[65] links this marked deterioration in the conditions of the Jews primarily with the establishment of the Dominican and Franciscan orders in 1216 and 1223, and with their theology and policy in subsequent years. This policy denied the Jews' legitimate right to exist within European society. A first step was the condemnation of Rabbinic literature, which in the Friars' view distorted biblical Judaism. The second step was increased polemic activity, providing the ground for public religious disputes, such as the one in Barcelona in 1263. Such debates had taken place occasionally earlier in the Middle Ages, but on private initiative. Now they became an instrument of official church policy, and were publicly sponsored. From this the way to forced conversion, inquisition, and expulsion was short. Forced sermons aimed at conversion often resulted in physical violence against Jews.[66]

The ideal of holy war against the infidel Muslim was enhanced by the aim of eradicating heresy from Christian society. The ideas of a pure Christian society, of mission and martyrdom, became increasingly influential. Cohen points out that unlike earlier monastic orders, the Friars were not withdrawn from society, but lived within it. They were involved in urban life, university teaching, cultural and intellectual activity, and politics. They were familiar with the needs of the Christian middle class, and its resentment of the Jews in commerce and money lending. They were actively involved in accusations of ritual murder and often incited the resulting attacks.[67]

In Germany it was in particular Berthold of Regensburg, preaching during the 1240s–1260s who fostered physical violence. Berthold grouped Jews together with pagans and heretics; the latter were already outlawed. A crucial step in the deterioration of the conditions of the Jews in Germany was the *Schwabenspiegel*, a legal code from the second half of the thirteenth century that clearly marks a decline of the legal status of the Jews. It has been suggested that it was written in the Franciscan monastery at Augsburg, Berthold's motherhouse.[68]

Whereas the outbreaks of 1096 were local events, those associated with Rintfleisch in 1298 were a regional movement. They were foreshadowed by smaller waves of persecution: in 1265 twenty Jews were killed in Coblenz. A yet more severe wave affected numerous communities along the Rhine during 1287 and 1288, apparently following a ritual-murder accusation in Oberwesel.[69] The Rintfleisch massacres involved the whole of Franconia and parts of Bavaria, including at least forty-four communities, and many scholars refer to them as a turning point with regard to Jewry's physical security. They mark the beginning of a period that Haim Ben-Sasson called "Fifty Years of Horror in Ashkenaz."[70] Particularly brutal events took place during the Armleder massacres

between 1336 and 1338, again mainly in Franconia and the Rhine region. During the Black Plague in 1348–1349 the Jews were persecuted all over Europe.[71]

The visual renderings of the hanging of Haman were all composed in southern Germany during this period, some of them can be located in Franconia. The first extant example, the Kalonymus Bible—not yet very explicit in its link to the Christian Tree of Life—was painted a few years after the Dominican and Franciscan orders were established, two years after severe attacks in France, and two years before the Talmud trial in Paris. Later examples, including the more daring ones of the Worms and Dresden Mahzorim associated with the Tree of Jesse (Figs. 262, 264), appeared while or shortly after Berthold of Regensburg was preaching in Germany, and during constant harassment of the Jewish communities along the Rhine during the 1280s. Those artists and patrons who stood behind the latest images, those of the Leipzig and Hammelburg Mahzorim (Figs. 266, 267), were creating their works in the shadows of the Rintfleisch and Armleder massacres.

European Jews coped with persecution and violence in two ways. One was polemical writing, in which Christian doctrine was logically controverted, by means of exegesis, and with the aim of refuting accusations. During the thirteenth century, in particular, numerous polemical works were written to hearten the Jewish communities, to deal with the accusations made against them, and for use in religious dispute. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries polemical debates with the Christological interpretation of the Hebrew Bible were integrated in Bible commentaries.[72] Abraham Grossman has pointed out that many of Rashi's anti-Christian statements were apparently written to encourage fellow Jews after the events of 1096. Some of his commentaries on the Psalms, for example, include explicit statements on anti-Jewish persecutions.[73] Developments during the thirteenth century resulted in more focused polemics. In the atmosphere of violence and threat numerous texts were written whose purpose was solely polemical.[74]

Besides carefully composed scholarly texts written for the sake of guiding fellow Jews, there were also spontaneous expressions of anti-Christian hostility. Such instances occurred when religious tension was high. This was often the case during the Passover holiday, in particular in years when Passover and Easter fell close, and during Purim, when the story of Esther was read and the defeat of Haman was celebrated. The equation of Haman with the Christian persecutor was a natural consequence in times of violence, harassment, forced baptism, threat of expulsion, and fear of death. Manifestations of anti-Christian expression have been referred to in the past as libelous, but recent scholarship tends to consider them as genuine.[75] Elliott Horowitz discusses numerous examples that include mockery of the cross and baptismal water, and often occurred in the course of a forced conversion. Such utterances resulted in the death of the person involved. Horowitz describes some of these expressions of hostility against the cross as an almost normative "ceremonial," so to speak, performed by Jews facing forced baptism who preferred martyrdom.[76]

Early cases of spontaneously expressed anti-Christian hostility are known to have occurred in late antiquity. They were often related to the Purim festival, and I shall return to them later. In the 930s, as documented in a letter written by the doge of Venice, a Jew mocked the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. The doge writes of his fear that the Jews may be encouraged to mock symbols of the cross appearing on metals, textiles, or other objects.[77] Later expressions of hostility toward the cross were, Horowitz believes, a reaction to the increasing popularity, from the early eleventh century, of crucifixes among the Christian population. In 1021, in Rome, Jews were accused of blasphemy against an image of the Crucified, and a similar affair occurred in 1062 in Artemo, near Pescaro. Both instances took a severe toll on the local Jewish population. In the

course of anti-Jewish violence and Crusade-related Jewish martyrdoms, many more such occurrences are documented.[78]

The figure of Haman not only penetrated polemical discourse in a variety of ways, but also triggered spontaneous anti-Christian hostility. In the circumstances described there can be little doubt that in the average thirteenth-century Jewish mind the overcoming of Christian anti-Judaism and the victory over Christian violence were foreshadowed by the narrative of Haman's hanging.[79]

The basis of this attitude is already found in late antique practice. Not much is documented about the late antique Purim festival, but we do know that it included cursing Haman, and hanging and burning of his effigy.[80] As has been discussed, hanging could also mean crucifying. From the Christian point of view cursing the crucified Haman would imply cursing the cross. The custom of cursing Haman was therefore prohibited in the *Codex Theodosianus*: "The governors of the provinces shall prohibit the Jews from setting fire to Aman in memory of his past punishment, in a certain ceremony of their festival, and from burning with sacrilegious intent a form made to resemble the saint cross in contempt of the Christian faith, lest they mingle the sign of our faith with their jests."[81] Theodosianus's law thus expects the cursing of Haman to lead to the mocking of the Crucified. Early medieval Jewish converts in Byzantium had to swear according to the following formula: "I next curse those who keep the festival of the so-called Mordecai on the first Sabbath of the Christians' fasts [=Lent], nailing Haman to wood and then mixing with him the emblem of a cross and burning them together, subjecting Christians to all kinds of imprecations and a curse."[82]

Horowitz, relying on earlier conclusions by Heinrich Graetz, does not exclude that such mockings actually took place. He suggests that they were a result of the description of Haman as crucified in the Septuagint and the Vulgate, and that later Jewish self-censorship avoided reports of such customs. These Purim-related mockeries were carnival-like folk customs, not formally established rituals. They originated in Byzantium, whence they found their way to southern Italy. From here they moved to northern Italy, and reached Germany via the migration of the family of Kalonymus.[83]

Instances of mocking the cross and related suspicions concerning the Purim festival, however, led to more serious accusations. The custom of burning an effigy of Haman led to the belief that Jews killed a real person during the holiday, and hung him up on a cross to reenact the victory over Haman. Some scholars have suggested that these suspicions were the ground for ritual-murder accusations, which occurred more and more frequently after 1150. In some years Purim coincides with Easter, and Cecil Roth has pointed out that the earliest accusation of ritual murder in Norwich lacks any association with Passover, but was linked, rather, to Purim-related suspicions.[84] Evidence of Purim-related Christian suspicions of blasphemy is plentiful and has been discussed in recent studies by Gert Mentgen[85] and Horowitz.[86]

The Purim holiday indeed acquired a significantly anti-Christian character, and in some cases resulted in violence. An incident at Bray-sur-Seine or Brie-Comte-Robert in 1191[87] began when a Christian murderer was executed during Purim,[88] and resulted in the hanging of several Jews. Horowitz argues that this reaction was made possible due to the carnival atmosphere dominating the Purim holiday, which coincides with Christian pre-Easter festivities. Carnival frequently involved violence, especially from the twelfth century onward.[89] In 1222 a case occurred in Stamford resulting in the incarceration of the Jews.[90] Mentgen links the Fulda blood-libel legend of 1235 to Purim customs rather than to Passover.[91]

Bearing such accusations in mind, one cannot reasonably suppose that any association between Haman and Jesus would appear *expressis verbis* in Jewish polemical texts or other writings. This

was particularly so since the Talmud trial in 1240 in Paris, when Jewish texts began to be censored for potential anti-Christian remarks. It was only in the sphere of visual culture that the Jews dared to equate Haman so firmly with Jesus. The images of his execution speak for themselves.

A Purim sermon by the early fifteenth-century Ashkenazic scholar Israel Isserlein demonstrates how anxious the Jews were to avoid awakening any suspicions of this sort. The sermon was put into writing by one of Isserlein's pupils, and in this form remains entirely ambiguous. It refers to the words "he called upon Moses" (Lev. 1:1), and hints at a Christian interpretation of *wayikra*—"he called." Omitting the *aleph* of *wayikra* leaves a word whose numeric value stands for Jesus.[92] The text ends: "I do not wish to comment on this any further, that who has knowledge, will understand."[93] According to Israel Yuval's analysis of the sermon the oral version must have been more explicit: whereas the Christian understanding would take the New Testament as a natural continuation of the Pentateuch, Isserlein, following the same line of thought, agrees that this verse indeed points to a continuation of the Pentateuch, in effect the book of Esther. He was apparently referring to the notion that the story of Esther is the proper answer to Jesus. The words "he called upon Moses" are repeated also in the story of Amalek (Deut. 25:17–19). "In other words," as Yuval puts it, "the victory over Amalek and the hanging of Haman offer Isserlein a proof of the doom of Christianity." However, if he could express this orally in addressing his community and his pupils, he could not commit himself to writing it down.[94] It should be noted in this context that the Tree of Jesse also functioned as a link between the Old and the New Testaments. If the hanging of Haman is the proper answer to this link claimed by Christianity the choice of the Tree of Jesse as "model" receives a further dimension.

Due to Christian censorship and consequent Jewish self-censorship during the later Middle Ages and the early modern period our view of Jewish perceptions of Jesus is rather blurred and limited.[95] Jewish exegetes never went so far as to associate Haman clearly and unambiguously with Christ. Christians, however, often expected the Jews to establish an equation between Haman and Jesus. Most likely and, considering their circumstances, quite naturally, this is what they did, even though not officially and explicitly in exegetical or polemical texts. In the following paragraphs I shall present a selection of such texts in an attempt to throw light on the background of the visual renderings of this equation.

Johann Maier argues that no references to a Haman-Jesus equation can be found in Talmudic literature.[96] Two midrashic traditions, however, link Haman to Christianity. In both cases we can follow a development from early to later texts toward an association with Christianity. The first tradition describes Haman in a manner that evokes associations with a crusader; and the second refers to the way in which he was executed.

The late antique commentary to the book of Esther *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (I) discusses why Mordechai refused to prostrate himself before Haman: "When Ahasuerus commanded people to bow down to Haman, he engraved an idol on his chest intending to make everyone bow down to an idol. When Haman saw that Mordecai would not bow down to him, he grew angry."[97] A variant appears in the later, eleventh-century part of *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (II): "Bowed down and prostrated: To make it manifest that the homage due him was of an idolatrous character, Haman had the image of an idol embroidered on his clothes, so that whoever bowed down before him worshipped an idol at the same time."[98]

A third version of this line of comment is more explicit in its choice of words: "What did Haman do? He made for himself an embroidered image on his dress, so that everyone who pros-

trated before Haman also prostrated before the abomination [*toeva*] that he made. Mordechai saw this and did not consent to bow down and prostrate himself before his detestable thing [*shikutso*], as it is said (Esther 3:2): and Mordechai did not bow down and prostrate himself."[99]

As Horowitz has shown, in the medieval period the expressions abomination (*toeva*) and detestable thing (*shikuts*) consistently refer to the cross. This is particularly true for "abomination."[100] There can be no doubt that both epithets were understood as a reference to Christians. The reference to the image as an abomination is significantly more hostile; the choice of words reflects a much higher degree of tension in high medieval Jewish-Christian relationships than does the somewhat more neutral version that refers to idolatry.

It is not entirely clear how this version entered exegesis on the book of Esther. The text quoted above appears in some editions of the *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, a text that scholars believe to have been written in ninth-century Palestine, then under Islamic rule.[101] In that original context the wording does not make much sense. Horowitz found that most printed versions, among them modern ones,[102] of *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* give another reading, which is similar to *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (II), whereas early printings normally have the version referring to the image on Haman's dress as an "abomination."[103] *Midrash Esther Rabba* (II) postdates *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, and relies heavily on the latter.[104] Apart from changing "abomination" to "idol," it has the same wording. Bearing in mind that *Midrash Esther Rabba* (II) represents the more moderate version, this would indicate that it also was included originally in *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*. Another midrash on the book of Esther, *Panim Aherim* (A), a collection of commentaries on Esther compiled in the twelfth century, also borrows this particular passage in its moderate version from *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*.[105] If the two texts that depend on *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* read with the more moderate version, it is possible that the references to the image on Haman's clothes as an abomination entered the text in later manuscript versions of the *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* under the impression of anti-Jewish Christian violence.[106] There can be no doubt that the image of a figure with a cross embroidered on its clothes would arouse an association with a crusader in the mind of a thirteenth-century Jewish reader of this text.

The late fifteenth-century commentator Abraham Saba finally leaves no doubt. A native of Zamora, he left Spain in 1492 for Portugal, to be expelled from there in 1496. As Abraham Gross has shown, his Esther commentary reflects the trauma of that expulsion, and was written after the event, when Saba was living in Morocco.[107] His rendering is as follows: "First he [Haman] said that all the slaves of the king must bow before an idol that he had put on his chest and prostrate before Haman . . . As do the kings of Edom, whose clerks have on their clothes [an image] of the cross which is an abomination, and who looks at it bows down or prostrates himself; and Mordechai did not bow before the idol and did not prostrate himself before Haman."[108] Abraham Saba's text cannot have had an impact on our images, but the idea of Haman with a cross on his clothes was, most likely, not new, though it was never explicitly expressed. Remote from Christian persecutors and censorship, Saba could state it more openly.

At all events, whether referring to an idol on Haman's clothes, an idolatrous abomination, or explicitly to a cross, medieval Jews understood even the late antique reference to idolatry as one to Christianity. For them the Christians were *the* idolaters,[109] and the "idol" of late antique Talmudic discussions was none other than the cross.[110]

Naturally the midrashim frequently talk of the planned execution of Mordechai, the tree-gallows that Haman prepared for that purpose, and the hanging of Haman. In most cases these tradi-

tions refer to "hanging." In Esther 5:14 Haman's wife, Zeresh, recommends hanging Mordechai: "His wife, Zeresh, and all his friends said to him, 'have a gallows set up, seventy five feet high, and in the morning propose to the king that Mordechai be hanged on it.'"

The late antique Aramaic Targumim add a list of execution methods, remarking on each that in the past particular persons were saved, but that nobody could be saved from hanging on a gallows.[111] Early medieval midrashim vary on this point; most of them follow the Bible and read "hanged"; some, however, make an explicit reference to crucifixion. *Midrash Abba Gurion* reads, for example: "Crucify him on a cross, because one cannot find anybody who was saved from it."[112] It is certainly possible that this reading was aware of the mockery of Jesus reported in Matt. 27:39–41: "The passers-by wagged their heads and jeered at him, crying, 'so you are the man who was to pull down the temple and rebuild it in three days! If you really are the Son of God, save yourself and come down from the cross.' The chief priests with the scribes and elders joined in the mockery: 'He saved others,' they said, 'but he cannot save himself. King of Israel indeed! Let him come down now from the cross, and then we shall believe him.'" *Midrash Panim Aherim* (B) has a similar tradition in its commentary on Esther 5:9: "He said: I can kick him, and he will die. But: I shall crucify him, so that one can learn from it discipline. And for what purpose wanted he to crucify? Rather he said: this is a time, when the Holy One Blessed Be He can save him from anything."[113]

Some examples citing Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses being saved from precarious situations follow, and the commentary concludes: "[God] saved from everything. But from crucifixion he cannot save."[114] We do not have much information as to when and where these midrashim were written. *Midrash Abba Gurion*, of unknown provenance, is the earliest text and probably predates the Second Targum on Esther. Geniza fragments can be dated to the tenth century.[115] During the Middle Ages this was one of the most popular texts on the book of Esther.[116] *Midrash Panim Aherim* (B) is probably also from the early Middle Ages, but scholars are divided as to its date. Dagmar Börner-Klein and Elisabeth Hollender pointed out that the terms "crucify" and "cross" are more frequently used in *Midrash Panim Aherim* than in other midrashim, and interpret this, certainly correctly, as anti-Christian polemic.[117] More certainty exists as to *Midrash Leqah Tov*, where this commentary appears in similar form. The author, Tuvia ben Eliezer, is known, and scholars assume that he wrote his commentary around 1100 in Bulgaria.[118]

If Börner-Klein and Hollander suppose the mention of crucifixion in the context of Mordechai and Haman in *Midrash Panim Aherim* (B) to be based in anti-Christian polemics, this is decidedly the case for another text, in which the notion of crucifixion is far more frequent. The midrashic anthology *Yalqut Shim'oni*, was, scholars assume, composed in thirteenth-century Germany by Simon the Preacher. If this is so, it was roughly contemporary with the images of Haman on the Tree of Life. The *Yalqut* is neither a rewritten Bible, as is the *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, nor an independent exegetical text. Rather, its approach being clearly anthological, it is a collection of earlier midrashim, most of them going back to the late antique period and quoted literally.[119] In reading the *Yalqut* on Esther, however, two things become apparent: first, it refers again and again to a crucifixion and it does so significantly more frequently than any other midrash; second, despite the overall anthological approach of the work, almost none of these particular comments have earlier parallels. It seems that they must have been the result of modifications made in thirteenth-century Germany, thus adding an explicitly anti-Christian polemical feature to the earlier midrashic sources the *Yalqut* relies on.

On Esther 2:5 the *Yalqut* reads as follows: "Mordechai—yesterday he was intended for crucifixion and now he crucifies his crucifier."[120] And a few lines later: "That who lets us watch the crucifixion of Bigtan and Teresh, will let us watch also the case of Haman."[121] On Esther 5:12 we read: "That is why he was crucified and he was crucified."[122] As commentary to Esther 5:14 the *Yalqut* has the motif quoted above in *Midrash Abba Gurion* and *Midrash Panim Aherim* (B) referring to the advice given by Haman's wife.[123] On Esther 6:10 the *Yalqut* again comments independently: "I [Haman] had put up the cross for him and I came to you to ask for him."[124] Finally, the explanation to Esther 6:13 reads as follows: "If Mordechai is a Jew: When we advised you to crucify him, we did not think that he belongs to those who praise the Holy One Blessed Be He, as the One."[125]

These observations indicate that anti-Christian polemics began to enter midrashic exegesis on the book of Esther at some time during the early medieval period, and became stronger and more explicit under the impression of medieval anti-Jewish violence. Haman as Christian clerk, knight, or crusader with a cross on his clothes appears only in a hinted form in a variant of *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, and explicitly in Abraham Saba's commentary written far from Christian persecution. The association with the cross erected by Haman and used for his own execution appears occasionally in early medieval sources, and becomes dominant in the thirteenth-century *Yalqut*.

On the other hand, since hanging and crucifying meant basically the same in Roman law and later literature, medieval Jewish polemicists usually refer to Jesus as "the hanged one." David Biale traces a link between the tradition of Jesus hanged and a commentary on the book of Esther. The so-called *Sefer toldot yeshu*, a polemical rendering of the story of Jesus written sometime between the sixth and the eighth century, has Jesus asking all of the trees to take an oath not to agree that he be hanged on them. When it finally comes to his execution only a cabbage is willing to cooperate.[126] This account is reminiscent, Biale believes, of a similar story, reported later in *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (II), according to which no tree agrees to have Haman hanged on it, except the thornbush.[127]

Finally, numerous references to Jesus hanged can be found in thirteenth-century polemical texts, such as the *Nitsahon hayashan*: "In addition, ask them why they fast on Friday. If it is because Jesus was hanged on that day, then they should have made it a joyous festival since they maintain that they were saved from hell through his hanging and torments."[128] Or on another occasion: "How old was Mary when she gave birth to the hanged one?"[129]

Haman and Crusade Ideology

The Jewish images of the hanging of Haman produced during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in southern German Mahzorim thus demonstrate what Ivan Marcus calls "cultural mirroring." By that he means the "appropriation of Christian motifs that the Jewish writer used to craft an anti-Christian cultural polemic. One of the weapons Jewish defenders of the faith had at their disposal, was a Jewish awareness of the symbols of Christianity."[130] Recent scholarship has devoted much energy to research on mutual awareness of the other's symbols.[131] Such symbols could either be adapted and translated into one's own culture, or, as Yuval has shown exhaustively, they could be used polemically.[132]

An example of such an adaptation is a commentary on the opening verse of Psalm 22: "My

God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Ps. 22:1). Put into the mouth of Jesus on the cross in Matthew 27:56, Christian theologians naturally interpreted the first verse of Psalm 22 as a reference to the crucifixion.[133] The Jewish commentary *Midrash Psalms* reads it rather as a reference to the book of Esther, and adds a lengthy commentary to the story.[134]

It thus seems that the designs of the images in the German Jewish manuscripts under discussion represent two trends. On the one hand, they show how familiar Jews were with Christianity's most vital symbols; on the other, it becomes clear how this familiarity could be exploited in order to turn these symbols into an unambiguous message of persecution. Crusader enthusiasm created a situation in which, more than ever before, Jewish suffering was linked with the cross. Taking two symbols of particular relevance for the Christian belief in salvation through the cross—the Tree of Jesse and the Tree of Life, or rather the Tree of Jesse as the Tree of Life on which the Crucified is displayed—and turning them into a message of persecution and death conveys a powerful statement that Christian values and symbols in general and crusader enthusiasm in particular had brought the Jews nothing but violence and fear.

The period of the 1260s–1270s, when the visual renderings of Haman's death were developed, is marked by a revival of the Crusade idea. Since the 1230s the Friars had constituted a major channel for the transmission of papal Crusade propaganda.[135] During the crisis between the papal see and Frederick II, and in particular since 1241, during the pontificate of Innocent IV, Crusade propaganda in Germany was aimed against the Hohenstaufens. After Frederick occupied the papal territories, the struggle against the Hohenstaufens received the status of a Crusade. In southern Germany, however, the propagation of anti-Hohenstaufen policy proved risky, and many mendicants were attacked and harassed. In 1249 the German mendicants were again ordered—on threat of excommunication—to preach the anti-Hohenstaufen Crusade despite the danger of harassment. Innocent's propaganda was, however, not successful and the pope turned to diplomatic means to promote his anti-Hohenstaufen case. During the 1250s this kind of Crusade preaching was therefore at its height, in particular in Germany.

Around 1260, however, under Pope Urban IV the idea of the Crusade to the Holy Land was propagated with renewed vigor. Urban died in 1264, but his successor Clement IV continued to encourage the Crusade idea. Meanwhile the situation in Palestine was steadily deteriorating. Haifa and Arsuf fell in 1265; Caesarea, Ashdod, and Safed fell in 1266. Already early in 1260 Urban IV had issued letters to the Dominicans in France, Germany, and Lombardy calling on them to preach the cross.[136] From early 1263 onward, Albertus Magnus preached in Germany, supported by Berthold of Regensburg, who was commissioned to preach in Germany, Bohemia, and other German-speaking areas.[137] In 1265 news about further Mamluk attacks reached Europe and Clement IV issued a bull to the Franciscans and Dominicans in France, Germany, and Scandinavia, again with an urgent demand to preach the cross. Urban's and Clement's efforts proved successful and in March 1267 Louis IX took the cross, followed by Prince Edward, later Edward I of England. In 1269 Louis set out for Tunis, never to return to Europe.

Even greater efforts to launch another Crusade were undertaken under Gregory X, elected in 1271. His hopes for a new Crusade influenced his strong support for the election of Rudolf I of Habsburg in 1273. In 1274 a Crusade was pronounced and planned at the Second Council of Lyon. In consequence in 1275 both Philip III of France and Rudolf took the cross. The planned Crusade, however, never materialized. Rudolf was too occupied with his rival Ottokar of Bohemia and never set out. Gregory died in 1276.

There can be no doubt that the Jews in southern Germany were aware of all of these activities and sensed the atmosphere they created. Since the late eleventh century the propagation of Crusade ideology had been accompanied by outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence. The First Crusade was marked by the massacres in the Rhineland. It was not a coincidence that the earliest blood-libel legends came into being in an atmosphere of Crusade propaganda,[138] shortly before the Second Crusade. While the latter was being preached by the monk Ralph, violence could be prevented only with great difficulty. A similar process can be observed in 1188 around the time Frederick I set out on the Third Crusade, joined by Richard Lionheart of England; in 1190 a massacre of took place in York.[139] Recently Gert Mentgen has shown how anti-Jewish outbursts in early thirteenth-century France were connected with the Crusader movement.[140] This recurrent pattern can still be observed in 1309 and during the shepherds' Crusade in 1320, when Jews were persecuted by Christians who had taken the cross shortly before.[141] Yuval linked the massacres during the Hussite war in the early fifteenth century with Crusader ideology.[142]

The massacres of 1096 were documented in Hebrew chronicles in several versions.[143] A few decades later, when Ralph preached violence against the Jews shortly before the Second Crusade in 1146, Ephraim of Bonn reacted to Ralph's sermons in his *Sefer Hazekhira*, equating him with Haman: "For Radulf was wicked and he treacherously persecuted the Jews. Radulf, the priest of idolatry, arose against the nation of God to destroy, slay, and annihilate them just as wicked Haman had attempted to do."[144] After these experiences, popular preaching by the Friars during the 1260s and 1270s, urged by the popes and performed by such figures as Berthold, undoubtedly aroused severe anxieties in Jewish communities everywhere. Christoph Cluse has recently shown that the Crusade atmosphere in England caused fear and tension, in particular during a Christian procession on the third of Sivan in 1268. The third of Sivan is one of the so-called Three Days of Limitation before the feast of Shavuot (Pentecost). The procession took place in the area of the "Great Jewry" of Oxford and certainly was perceived as provocative by the Jews. Cluse concludes that "the crusading context made the situation really explosive." Moreover, Cluse adds, Crusades could also result in severe financial losses, since crusaders could be exempted from the payment of interest on loans taken from Jews.[145]

It is interesting to observe, finally, that the theme of the Tree of Jesse appears also in Crusade preaching. In a model sermon by Gilbert of Tournai written after his retirement around 1260, and intended to guide fellow Franciscans in preaching the cross, he refers to the Tree of Jesse as follows:

> (6) This is the sign which Christ had to sign his soldiers; he wanted to be signed first, so that he could precede all others with the banner of the cross. John 6: God Father has signed him, to whose flesh the cross was attached, which is now attached to your clothes with soft thread. And just as archers and balisters compete with each other to hit a sign, so the Jews [competed with each other] unanimously to crucify, Christ, Lamentations 3: He set me as a sign for the arrow, he sent the shafts from his quiver into my loins: I became a joke to all people, their song filled me with bitterness all day long.
>
> (7) The cross is aptly called a sign, because it offers itself to the senses and represents something else to the mind. For it is a sign of direction, distinction, recollection [and] reward. So signs are sometimes used in battles, at crossroads, for friendship [and] as prizes.
>
> (8) A sign of direction is put at the crossroads, like crosses, to show the right way, and if one has taken a wrong turn, one can resume the right way at the cross. Isaiah 11: The

> root of Jesse, standing as a sign for the peoples; the nations will beseech him, and his sepulcher will be glorious. The root of Jesse [is] Christ, who descended from Jesse in the flesh and offered himself to a burnt-offering out of burning love. Hence, Jesse is also interpreted as fire or the "island of the burnt-offering." He stands as a sign for the peoples, meaning the cross, which is the sign for the people to show the right way to paradise. If it is right according to the Philosopher that between two lines [there is] a shortest distance, then it is certain that the way of taking the cross is the better way to salvation, because the shorter a way the better it is. The cross most quickly makes devout crusaders, real martyrs indeed, fly from earth up to heaven for the cause of Christ, whence Luke 9: "Who wants to come after me, let him renounce himself and carry his cross and follow me."[146]

Gilbert of Tournai first describes the crusaders with the cross attached to his clothes. He then reminds his audience that the Jews were to blame for the crucifixion; finally, he describes the Tree of Jesse as a sign of the cross and links it to the Sepulcher to be freed by the crusaders. Taking the sign of the cross is the shortest way to salvation.

This idea was not new when Gilbert of Tournai thus expressed it. James R. Johnson argued that the Jesse window at Chartres may have propagated the royal claims of Louis VII of France. The latter took the cross from Bernard of Clairvaux in 1146. It was at Chartres, at the time when the window was probably under construction, that Bernard preached the Crusade twice, first in 1146 and again in 1148. Johnson points out that the window displays a fleur-de-lis, the sign that he expects the Capetian troops to have had on their banners when setting out on the Second Crusade. He therefore links the design of the window with events taking place in Chartres during the late 1140s.[147] If he is right, Gilbert of Tournai may have been aware of this particular background of the Chartres Jesse window.

It cannot be said with certainty that this motif reached Franciscan preachers in Germany. Gilbert of Tournai wrote the sermon sometime between his retirement shortly after 1260 and his death in 1284. His sermons have come down to us in more than sixty manuscripts, indicating that they were quite widely disseminated.[148] Theoretically and hypothetically the motif of the Tree of Jesse as a crusader symbol may have been known in the 1270s in Germany. From the Jewish point of view it would have been expected to bring more violence and death. The image in the Worms Mahzor conveys this idea.

Model sermons such as the one quoted here do not explicitly preach the persecution of Jews. Popular preaching, however, did. And popular preachers were guided by model sermons. Gilbert's linkages between the Jews accused of the crucifixion, the call to take the sign of the cross symbolized by the Tree of Jesse, and the Holy Sepulcher could in a popular version easily have included a call to attack the Jews. Not only that, the general language of Crusader sermons could have incited such attacks, even without explicitly calling for them.

In conclusion, then, in the context of Crusade-related anti-Jewish violence of the thirteenth century, the Jewish depictions of Haman and his sons hanging on a tree whose appearance is that of the Christian Tree of Life or Tree of Jesse emerge as a manifestation of what Christendom meant to the Jews. Referring to Christianity's most precious symbols and inverting them into images of the persecutor's punishment, these miniatures react not only to the general ideas transmitted by these symbols, but also in particular to visual renderings that imply polemical anti-Jewish messages (Fig. 272). The images, however, could also convey a warning. As Horowitz, in his analysis

of Jewish mockeries of the cross, points out, Jews were sometimes attracted by the cross. Hostile gestures denigrating the cross were thus also intended to prevent this sort of attraction.[149] What was believed by Christians to bring redemption, especially to those who set out on a Crusade, brought persecution, forced baptism, and death to the Jews. The images, with their focus on the punishment of Haman, and his followers with him, warn those who might be tempted by the possibility of associating themselves with those who shed the blood of Jewish martyrs in the name of the cross. In the circumstances of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries victory over the persecutor—the only way to salvation—was a purely eschatological hope. Such feelings were particularly acute in times when the Crusade idea was in the air, and Crusade ideology was preached.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at different occasions at the University of Tel Aviv and the Hebrew University. I am grateful to Assaf Pinkus for comments during my Tel Aviv presentation. Elliott Horowitz, Ephraim Shoham-Steiner, and Debra H. Strickland read drafts of my text and I am grateful for their comments and suggestions. Mira Reich edited the English text.

NOTES

1. For a facsimile edition, see *The Worms Mahzor, Jewish National and University Library, Ms. heb. 4⁰781/1*, ed. M. Beit-Arié (Vaduz, 1986). In his contribution to the commentary volume Beit Arié remarks that a marginal emendation referring to the text *wekhol bekhoreihem haragta* ("and all their firstborn you have killed") mentions that it belonged to the Würzburg rite. Beit Arié, *Worms Mahzor*, 20. This confirms also Aliza Cohen-Mushlin's analysis of the illumination style, which she attributes to Würzburg; see her contribution Beit-Arié, *Worms Mahzor*, 92. On the possibility that Shemaya Hatsarfati was responsible for the images, see Beit-Arié, *Worms Mahzor*, 16.

2. This version is rare in Hebrew manuscript illumination; it appears, however, in the so-called Regensburg Pentateuch from southern Germany, c. 1300, Israel Museum, Ms. 180/52, f. 157r.

3. Wroclav, University Library, Ms. I. F 401.

4. Ch. Dolfen, *Codex Gisle* (Berlin, 1926), 10, argued for a later date, c. 1350, and linked the nuns in the image of the Tree of Life with Saint Bridget and her order (c. 1303–1373). This contradicts an inscription in the codex that mentions Gisela and the date 1300, which Dolfen believed to be a fabrication. There is nothing in the image that associates the small figures of the nuns with Saint Bridget. The late date was also rejected by R. Kroos, "Der Codex Gisle I: Forschungsbericht und Datierung," *Niedersächsische Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte* 12 (1973), 17–34.

5. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud Or. 321, f. 51r, G. Sed-Rajna, *Le mahzor enluminé* (Leiden, 1983), fig. 25.

6. University Library, Ms. M1106, f. 301v, Sed-Rajna, *Mahzor*, fig. 54.

7. Israel Museum, Ms. 180/94 (formerly Sassoon collection, Ms. 506), f. 361r, Sed-Rajna, *Mahzor*, fig. 55.

8. In the Hammelburg Mahzor the hanged men are depicted with dogs' heads. Animal heads for human figures are a well known and common feature of Hebrew illuminated manuscripts from Germany up to the middle of the fourteenth century, and various theories have been proposed for this enigma. Lately Ruth Mellinkoff suggested that they are "anti-Semitic hate signs," applied by anti-Jewish Christian illuminators, a theory that has not been widely accepted. R. Mellinkoff, *Anti-Semitic Hate Signs in Hebrew Illuminated Manuscripts from Medieval Germany* (Jerusalem, 1999), with a survey of the earlier literature.

9. D. I. Davidson, *Thesaurus of Hebrew Poems and Liturgical Hymns from the Canonization of Scripture to the Emancipation* (New York, 1924), 1:317, no. 6979.

10. The iconographic link of the Worms image with the Tree of Jesse was pointed out by Sed-Rajna, *Mahzor*, 45, and B. Narkiss, in his contribution to Beit-Arié, *Worms Mahzor*, 82; both refer to this observation in terms of a model-copy relationship, and Sed Rajna remarks that the Jewish illuminators created an antithesis to the pictorial sources they used.

11. See, for example, K. Kogman-Appel, *Illuminated Haggadot: The Visualization of Biblical History in Late Medieval Sephardic Culture* (forthcoming).

12. K. und U. Schubert, *Jüdische Buchkunst* (Graz, 1984), 1:69–70.

13. *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin and New York, 1997), 86; for a recent English edition, see *Dialogue with Trypho*, ed. M. Slusser (Washington, 2003).

14. *The Book of the Cave of Treasures*, trans. E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1927), 63.

15. *De inventione Sanctae Crucis*, PL 172:946. For a detailed discussion of early Christian sources, see E. S. Greenhill, "The Child in the Tree: A Study of the Cosmological Tree in Christian Tradition," *Traditio* 10 (1954), 331–42.

16. Jacobus da Voragine, *Golden Legend*, trans. W. S. Ryn (Princeton, 1995), 1:277–84. Another legend about the cross describes Calvary as a site of barren trees, where men were put to death, and the tree of the cross prior to the crucifixion as a tree of death, *Golden Legend*, 2:168.

17. *Evangelienbuch*, bk. 5, ed. O. Erdmann (Halle, 1882), 262, based on a text by Pseudo Alcuin, *De divinis officiis*, PL 101:1208; for a discussion of German texts on the Tree of Life and the cross, see Greenhill, "The Child in the Tree," 330.

18. *Der Wartburgkrieg*, ed. K. Simrock (Stuttgart and Augsburg, 1858), quoted in Greenhill, "The Child in the Tree," 330.

19. *Aus Geschichte und Kultur einer rheinischen Stadt. Zum 600 jährigen Stadtjubiläum*, ed. R. Bradts (Mönchen-Gladbach, 1955), vol. 1, fig. 96.

20. W. Voelkle and R. S. Wieck, *The Bernard H. Breslauer Collection of Manuscript Illuminations*, exh. cat., Pierpont Morgan Library (New York, 1992), 124.

21. Important early studies on the Tree of Jesse are R. Ligtenberg, "De Genealogie van Christus in de beeldende Kunst der Middeleeuwen, voornamelijk van het Westen," *Outheidkundig Jaarboek. Bulletin van der nederlandse Oudheidkundigen Bond* (Utrecht, 1929); A. Watson, *The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse*, (Oxford and London, 1934); for the textual background, see Ch. E. Scillia, "The Textual and Figurative Sources of the Stirps of Jesse in the First Half of the Twelfth Century with Special Reference to the Rhine Meuse Area," Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1977, with a critique of the term "Tree of Jesse," 4–16.

22. Whether this imagery has Western or Eastern roots is a matter of debate, and this is not the proper venue in which to examine the question; for a summary listing the relevant literature, see V. Milanovic, "The Tree of Jesse in the Byzantine Mural Painting of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," *Zograph* 20 (1989), n. 1; for the role of Italy in the development of the theme, see M. D. Taylor, "A Historiated Tree of Jesse," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–1981), 125–76.

23. M. Fassler, "Mary's Nativity, Fulbert of Chartres, and the *Stirps Jesse*: Liturgical Innovation circa 1000 and Its Afterlife," *Speculum* 75 (2000), 389–434.

24. Emile Mâle believed that the theological background of the imagery was designed for the Saint-Denis window by Abbot Suger. E. Mâle, *Religious Art in France in the Twelfth Century: a Study of the Origins of Medieval Iconography* (Princeton, 1978) (English version of a study originally published in Paris, 1922), 171–77; Watson, however, cited numerous examples from the eleventh and the early twelfth centuries and traced the earlier history of the theme. Watson, *Tree of Jesse*; see also J.A.H. Williams, "The Earliest Dated Tree of Jesse Image: Thematically Reconsidered," *Athanor* 18 (2000), 17–23. Abbot Suger refers to the Tree of Jesse in Saint-Denis as an already well-known topic; see Fassler, "*Stirps Jesse*," 390–91.

25. J. R. Johnson, "The Tree of Jesse Window of Chartres: Laudes Regiae," *Speculum* 36 (1961), 1–22.

26. J. Sommer, *Das Deckenbild der Michaeliskirche zu Hildesheim* (Hildesheim, 1966), 36–39; the wall paintings are no longer extant, but copies were made before their destruction in 1841; see Sommer, *Deckenbild*, fig. 26.

27. An example is a miniature in the Stammheim Missal, Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, f. 146v; for a reproduction, see Fassler, "*Stirps Jesse*," fig. 6.

28. Mary as the center of the composition appears frequently in manuscripts of the *Speculum virginum*; an example is Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, Ms. 72, f. 104r; A. Watson, "The *Speculum Virginum* with Special Reference to the Tree of Jesse," *Speculum* 3 (1928), 445–69; idem, "A Manuscript of the *Speculum Virginum* in the Walters Art Gallery," *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 10 (1947), 61–74. For an example of Mary in the top medallion, see Dolfen, *Codex Gisle*, pl. 7.

29. Taylor, "Historiated Tree of Jesse," 143–54; for the West, see, n. 69.

30. I am grateful to Debra H. Strickland for discussing this with me.

31. *De Adventu Domini, Sermo* II, 4, PL 183:42c–43a; quoted after Johnson, "Chartres," 17; see also P. Bloch, "Der Weimarer Kreuzfuss mit dem auferstandenen Adam," *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (1964), 7–23.

32. W. Neumüller, *Speculum humanae salvationis: Codex Cremifanensis 243 des Benediktinerstifts Kremsmünster* (Graz, 1997).

33. Watson, *Tree of Jesse*, 53; it appears that the iconography of the Tree of Jesse was far more canonical in France than in Germany, where it was more variable; see R. Becksmann, "Das Jesse-Fenster aus dem spätromanischen Chor des Freiburger Münsters," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 22 (1968), 26–27. An example in the cathedral of Pamplona has been interpreted against the background of an early Christian text attributed to either Venantius Fortunatus († c. 600), or Claudianus Mamertus († c. 473); see C. Lacarra Ducay, "Identificación de una iconografía: el supuesto *Árbol de Jessé* de la Catedral de Pamplona," *Archivo Español de arte* 187 (1974), 320–27.

34. *In nativitate beatissima virginis Mariae*, PL 144:761, see Watson, *Tree of Jesse*, 53. The idea goes back to Augustine's disciple Quodvultdeus (Pseudo Augustine), *De cataclysmo ad catechumenos* V, CCSL 60:114–18.

35. For discussion of the *synagoga-ecclesia* motif, and particularly its development during the period of the Crusades, see W. Seiferth, *Synagogue and Church in the Middle Ages: Two Symbols in Art and Literature* (New York: 1970), 95–148; for the Living Cross, see ibid., 146–47; R. L. Füglister, *Das lebende Kreuz. Ikonographisch-ikonologische Untersuchung der Herkunft und Entwicklung einer spätmittelalterlichen Bildidee und ihrer Verwurzelung im Wort* (Einsiedeln, 1964); H. Schreckenberg, *The Jews in Christian Art: An Illustrated History* (New York: 1996), 64–65, with reference to further literature.

36. D. Radocsay, *Wandgemälde im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Budapest, 1977), 182, fig. 88. This early date has been challenged by Ch. Gerhardt, "Das 'Lebende Kreuz' in der Heilig-Geist Kirche zu Schigra (ehem. Ungarn): Ikonographie und Datierung," *Das Münster* 35 (1982), 243–54, claiming that the iconography of the Living Cross is typical for the fifteenth century only; Gerhardt's argument is not very convincing as he admits that he never saw the fresco, and that its state of preservation does not allow clear-cut conclusions.

37. *Die Parler und der Schöne Stil 1350-1400. Europäische Kunst unter den Luxemburgern. Resultatband*, ed. A. Legner (Cologne, 1980), fig. 47; on its date, see idem, vol. 2 of the exh. cat. (Cologne, 1978), 106–9.

38. For a facsimile edition, see *Lamberti S. Audomari Canonici Liber Floridus : Codex Autographus Bibliothecae Unversitatis Gandavensis, auspiciis eiusdem Universitatis in commemorationem diei natalis editus*, ed. A. Derolez (Ghent, 1968); see also A. Grabar and C. Nordenfalk, *Romanesque Painting* (New York: 1958), 156–60; A. Katzenellenbogen, *Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art From Early Christian Times to the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1939), 65–66.

39. *De fructibus carnis et spiritus*, PL 176:997. On earlier attributions of this treatise to Hugh of St. Victoire, see Greenhill, "The Child in the Tree," n. 168; for earlier sources of this motif, see 365.

40. H. Cohen, "The Crucifixion," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus* (New York, 1971), 209 (reprinted in *Jewish Expressions on Jesus: An Anthology*, ed. T. Weiss-Rosmarin [New York, 1977], 305–36).

41. An example is Eucherius of Lyons, *Instructiones* 43 (*De Deuteronomio*), CSEL 31:80–81; for more information, see T.C.G. Thornton, "The Crucifixion of Haman and the Scandal of the Cross," *Journal of Theological Studies* 37, no. 2 (1986), 422.

42. An example is in the Munich Psalter, Munich, Staatsbibliothek, cod. 835, f. 11r.

43. Thornton, "Crucifixion of Haman" (as in note 41), 423.

44. E. Horowitz, "The Rite to Be Reckless: Perpetration and Interpretation of Purim Violence," *Poetics Today* 15, no. 1 (1994), n. 36, with further references.

45. *Midrash Abba Gurion* 3.144 on Esther 3:12, *Sammlung agadischer Commentare zum Buche Ester*, ed. S. Buber (Vilna, 1886), 29; see also A. LaCocque, "Haman in the Book of Esther," *Hebrew Annual Review* 11 (1987), 212.

46. On the development of medieval violence, see, R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (Oxford, 1987). On the fourteenth century in France and the crown of Aragon, see D. Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1996).

47. For long the common view was that early medieval Jewish-Christian relationships were peaceful and friendly, and only from the eleventh century onward, and especially during the thirteenth century, did the situation of the Jews deteriorate. This view has been challenged in recent research by Kenneth Stow, among others, who implies that this deterioration came as result of decreasing royal support in response to ecclesiastical claims. How peaceful the Jewish-Christian relationship was in fact during the early Middle Ages has been an issue of intense discussion in recent scholarship; see, for example, K. R. Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), 1–5.

48. It is interesting to note here that the modern Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz referred to Agobard as Haman. H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig, 1909), 5:234–41; see J. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, 1999), 133.

49. For an exhaustive study on patristic attitudes to the Jews, see Cohen, *Living Letters*; see also Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 10–40.

50. For literature on chamber serfdom, see Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 273–77, and Moore, *Persecuting Society*, 39–42.

51. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 90–120; for the course of events, data on the affected communities, Crusade ideology, and translations of the Hebrew chronicles documenting the outbreaks, see R. Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987).

52. Jewish historiography, in particular the chronicles describing the outbreaks of 1096, resulted in the modern view of the events as a watershed in the history of Jewish-Christian relationships and underscored the contrast between the notion of peaceful pre-Crusade coexistence and post-Crusade violence; see, for example, *Israel in the Diaspora*, ed. B.-Z. Dinur (Tel Aviv, 1972), 2:1; *A History of the Jewish People*, ed. H. H. Ben Sasson, (Cambridge, Mass., 1976), 1:386. This latter view has been challenged by Chazan, *First Crusade*, arguing that, although Crusade ideology implied a radical change in attitude toward the Jews, the impact of the outbreaks was a limited one as it severely affected only three of the leading communities. In his view, the 1096 attacks were a symptomatic step in new developments in Europe during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. On the massacres in Jewish historiography, see also S. Schwarzfuchs, "The Place of the Crusades in Jewish Chronicles," in *Culture and Society in Medieval Jewish History: A Collection of Papers in the Memory of Haim Hillel Ben Sasson*, ed. R. Bonfil, M. Ben-Sasson, and J. Hacker (Jerusalem, 1989), 251–67; on the massacres and modern historiography, see J. Cohen, "A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade in Jewish Historical Memory, Medieval and Modern," in *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. M. A. Signer and J. Van Engen (Notre Dame, 2001), 9–16.

53. R. Landes, "The Massacres of 1010: In the Origins of Popular Violence in Western Europe," in *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, ed. J. Cohen (Wiesbaden, 1996), 79–112; R. Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), 40–46.

54. Moore, *Persecuting Society*, 29.

55. For a detailed discussion of Bernard's approach to Jews and Judaism, see D. Berger, "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 40 (1972), 89–108; Cohen, *Living Letter*, 221–45.

56. R. Chazan, "From the First Crusade to the Second: Evolving Perceptions of the Christian-Jewish Conflict," in Signer and Van Engen, *Jews and Christians*, 48.

57. For details and further reference, see J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982), 24–32; idem, *Living Letters*, 261–65.

58. Chazan, "Christian-Jewish Conflict," 49–50.

59. R. Chazan, *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1997), xi–xiii; the following chapters of this study discuss the specific motifs that developed in the twelfth century.

60. Israel Yuval argues that ritual-murder accusations occurred in part as a Christian reaction to Jewish suicides during the massacres of 1096, in particular to the killing of Jewish children by their own parents. The fact that Jews

could kill their own children, Yuval suggests, made the Christians suspicious, and led to the belief that they were also able to kill Christian children for ritual purposes; see I. J. Yuval, "Vengeance and Damnation, Blood and Defamation: From Jewish Martyrdom to Blood Libel Accusation ," *Zion* 58 (1993), 33–90. The theory presented in Yuval's article led to stormy reactions collected in the subsequent volume of *Zion* 592–93 (1994). For a recent, exhaustive study of mutual awareness of cultural symbols, see idem, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians* (Tel Aviv, 2000).

61. B. Blumenkrantz, *Le Juif medieval au miroir de l'art Chrétien* (Paris, 1966), 15; this was recently confirmed by W. Cahn, "The Expulsion of the Jews as History and Allegory in Painting and Sculpture of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in Signer and Van Engen, *Jews and Christians*, 95; D. H. Strickland, *Saracens, Demons, and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton, 2003), 105–7.

62. *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge* (*Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*), ed. A. Neubauer and M. Stern (Berlin, 1892; reprinted Hildesheim, 1997), 64/196.

63. On these outbreaks, see R. Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: A Political and Social History* (Baltimore, 1973), 133–37.

64. F. Lotter, "Hostienfrevelvorwurf und Blutwunderfälschung bei den Judenverfolgungen von 1298 ('Rintfleisch') und 1336–1339 ('Armleder')," *Fälschungen im Mittelalter (Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Schriften: 33)* 5 (Hannover, 1988), 543–48; M. Rubin, "Desecration of the Host: The Birth of an Accusation," in *Christianity and Judaism* 29, *Studies in Church History*, ed. D. Wood (Oxford, 1992), 169–85; M. Rubin, *Gentile Tales* (New Haven, 1999).

65. Cohen, *Friars*.

66. For more background on this process, see ibid., 82–85.

67. As in two cases in France in 1247 and 1288; see ibid., 41, 43, 244.

68. Ibid., 229–37.

69. G. Mentgen, "Die Ritualmordaffäre um den 'Guten Werner' von Oberwesel und ihre Folgen," *Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte* 21 (1995), 159–98.

70. Ben-Sasson, *History*, 486–87.

71. On the persecutions in Germany between the late thirteenth and the mid-fourteenth century, see, for example, F.-J. Ziwes, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im mittleren Rheingebiet während des hohen und späten Mittelalters. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden*, Reihe A: Darstellungen 1 (Hannover, 1995), 230–37; *Germania Judaica*, vol. 2: *Von 1238 bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Z. Avneri (Tübingen, 1968), xxxvii–xxxix.

72. Research undertaken by Abraham Grossman has brought to light many of the polemical issues integrated in commentaries to the Hebrew Bibles, which were not included in early printed versions for reasons of censorship. Grossman searched manuscripts of Rashi's and other scholars' writings for anti-Christian passages; see, for example, "Anti-Christian Polemics in the Commentaries of R. Joseph Caro to the Bible and the Piyyut (Hebrew)," *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Div. B, vol. 1: *The History of the Jewish People* (Jerusalem, 1986), 71–78, with references to earlier studies in n. 1; A. Grossmann, "Rashi's Commentary to Psalms and the Jewish-Christian Polemics," in *Studies in Bible and Education Presented to Professor Moshe Arend*, ed. D. Rappel (Jerusalem, 1996), 59–74; idem, "Exile and Redemption in Rashi's Teachings," in *From Slavery to Redemption*, ed. Y. Berukhi, H. Halperin, and Y. Milo (Jerusalem, 1996), 239–66; Y. Nevo, "Jewish-Christian Polemics as Reflected in Medieval Commentaries of Twelfth-Century Northern France," in *Studies on Our Heritage*, ed. Z. Bezer, Sh. Z. Havlin, Sh. Vargon (Rehovot, 1999), 29–54.

73. Grossman, "Rashi's Commentary to Psalms," 60, 63–67.

74. On the increase of Christian polemical writing during the thirteenth century, see A. Funkenstein, "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 2 (1971), 373; for an overview of the different kinds of Jewish polemical writing, see J. Cohen, "Towards a Functional Classification of Jewish anti-Christian Polemic in the High Middle Ages," in *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter*, ed. B. Lewis and F. Niewöhner (Wiesbaden, 1992), 93–114. There is a large corpus of literature on polemics; examples are D. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1977); H. Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages* (London, 1982); R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989); H. Trautner-Kromann, *Shield and Sword—Jewish Polemics Against Christianity and the Christians in France and Spain from 1100–1500* (Tübingen, 1993); S. Krauss, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy from the Earliest Times to 1789*, ed. and rev. by William Horbury (Tübingen, 1995), with a list of Jewish polemicists and their texts, 201–61.

75. See, for example, M. Saperstein, " Medieval Christians and Jews: A Review Essay," *Shofar* 8, no. 4 (1990), 1–10, referring to Host desecration accusations; D. Berger, *From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions: Some New Approaches to Medieval Antisemitism*, Second Annual lecture of the V. J. Selmanowitz Chair of Jewish History, Touro College (New York, 1997), 15; more examples and reactions are discussed in E. Horowitz, "'The Pricking Cross' and the Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages," in *Jews Facing the Cross: The 1096 massacres in History and Historiography*, ed. Y. Assis, M. Toch, J. Cohen, O. Limor, and A. Kedar (Jerusalem, 2000), 118–40.

76. Horowitz, "Cross."

77. Ibid., 127–28.

78. Some of them are described and discussed in ibid., 132–40.

79. For a study on medieval Jewish exegetes commenting on the book of Esther, see B. D. Walfish, *Esther in Medieval Garb: Jewish Interpretations of the Book of Esther in the Middle Ages* (Albany, 1993).

80. Thornton, "Crucifixion of Haman," 423–24; E. Horowitz, "Jews Facing Their Enemies During Purim Festivities," *Zion* 59 (1994), 130–31, with further references in n. 5.

81. Codex Theodosianus 16:8:18, trans. after A. Linder,

The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation (Detroit, 1987), 237.

82. Thornton, "Crucifixion of Haman," 424; see also J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1914), 1:115–19; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversos-Judaeos Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.–11. Jh.)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1982), 543.

83. Horowitz, "Purim Festivities," 130; for a discussion on modern scholarship on the Theodosian law on Haman effigies, see idem, "The Rite to be Reckless," 24–28.

84. C. Roth, "The Feast of Purim and the Origins of the Blood Accusation," *Speculum* 8 (1933), 520–26; earlier a similar context was established by J. Jacobs, "St. William of Norwich," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 9 (1897), 752. This thesis was recently further developed by Gert Mentgen, who associates the origins of the earliest ritual-murder accusations specifically with the custom of hanging a Haman effigy. G. Mentgen, "Über den Ursprung der Ritualmordfabel," *Aschkenas* 4, no. 2 (1994), 405–16. Roth's suggestion was rejected by G. I. Langmuir, "Historiographic Crucifixion," in G. I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990), 291–94, on the grounds that it refers only to one instance, which, likely incidentally, occurred during Purim. On the Norwich libel, see recently also J. J. Cohen, "The Flow of Blood in Medieval Norwich," *Speculum* 79, no. 1 (2004), 26–65.

85. Mentgen, "Ritualmordfabel," 410–12.

86. Horowitz, "Purim Festivities."

87. For details, see Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France*, 37–38; William Jordan argued that the reference is to Brie-Comte-Robert rather than to Bray-sur-Seine. W. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia, 1989), 36.

88. Roth, "Feast of Purim," 521–22; Mentgen, "Ritualmordfabel," 410; Horowitz, "Purim Festivities," 147, leaves the question open as to whether the case took place in Bray or Brie. For a discussion of how modern Jewish scholarship refers to the Bray-Brie incident, see Horowitz, "The Rite to be Reckless," 29–37.

89. Horowitz, "Purim Festivities," 143–50.

90. Mentgen, "Ritualmordfabel," 410, referring to R. C. Stacey, "The Conversion of the Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum* 67 (1992), 265.

91. Mentgen, "Ritualmordfabel," 410; see also Langmuir, "Historiographic Crucifixion," 291.

92. Vav—6, yod—10, qof—100, resh—200, totalling 316. Yeshu: yod—10, shin—300, wav—6.

93. *Sefer Leqet Yosher lerabbenu Joseph bar Moshe*, 155, ed. J. Freimann (Berlin, 1903), 1:112.

94. Yuval, *Two Nations*, 146n107.

95. For perceptions of Jesus in Talmudic literature, see J. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung* (Darmstadt, 1978); for a collection of studies discussing this issue from various points of view, see Weiss-Rosmarin, *Jewish Expressions on Jesus*.

96. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 199–203.

97. *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (I) 6:4 on Esther 2:5. *Esther Rabbah I: An Analytical Translation*, ed. J. Neusner (Atlanta, 1989), 137. *Midrash Esther Rabbah* has two parts; the commentary to the first three chapters of the book of Esther (*Midrash Esther Rabbah* [I]) is a late antique midrash whose other parts are apparently lost. The second part is dated to the eleventh century; see M. D. Herr, "Ester Rabba," in *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1972), 6:915–16.

98. *Midrash Esther Rabbah* (II) 7:5 on Esther 3:2. In some of the traditional editions this passage is not included; see, for example, S. Dunsky, ed. (Montreal, 1962), 153; *Midrash Megillat Esther*, Esther 3:1, *Sammlung kleiner Midraschim*, ed. Ch. M. Horowitz (Berlin, 1882), 1:64; *Midrash Megillat Esther*, Esther 2:5, *Beth hamidrash*, ed. A. Jellinek (Leipzig, 1923), 1:23.

99. *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, 1st ed. (Constantinople, 1514, f. 41a), 50, digitized by L. M. Barth, Hebrew Union College, *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer Electronic Text Editing Project*: http://www.usc.edu/dept/huc-la/pre-project/.

100. Horowitz, "Cross," 124–27.

101. H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Minneapolis, 1992), 356, 357.

102. For example, the English translation by G. Friedlander (New York, 1916), 398–99. The Warsaw edition of 1852, ed. D. Luria, 120a, has an almost identical wording, but skips the expression "detestable thing."

103. Horowitz, "Purim Festivities," n. 21.

104. D. Börner-Klein and E. Hollender, trans., *Die Midraschim zu Ester. Rabbinische Kommentare zum Buch Ester* (Leiden, 2000), 2:153.

105. *Midrash Panim Aherim* (A) Esther 3:6, Buber, *Sammlung*, 46. On the relation to Esther Rabbah, see Börner-Klein and Hollender, *Midraschim zu Ester*, 68 n. 19.

106. The evidence from manuscripts offers no further clue in this matter. Many manuscripts, in particular those of Ashkenazic provenance, are incomplete and lack chap. 50; two Eastern examples, one from fifteenth-century Yemen (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Add. Qu. 167), the other from fourteenth-century Byzantium (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, cod. hébr. 334) both read "idolatry." Ms. 75 of the Hebrew Union College Library in Cincinnati has the second version, but that part of the manuscript that includes chapter 50 is a later addition and was copied from the first printed edition; see http://www.usc.edu/dept/huc-la/pre-project/; unfortunately no critical edition of the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer exists.

107. On Abraham Saba in general, see A. Gross, *Iberian Jewry From Twilight to Dawn: The World of Rabbi Abraham Saba* (Leiden, 1995); on the Esther commentary, see idem, "The Expulsions from Spain and Portugal as Reflected in a Commentary on the Book of Esther," *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1986), Div. B, 1:153–58.

108. A. Saba, *Eshkol hakofer* (Drohobycz, 1903), 60.

109. See, for example, A. Sapir Abulafia, "Invectives Against Christianity in the Hebrew Chronicles of the First Crusade," in *Crusade and Settlement: Papers Read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and Presented to R. C. Smail*, ed. P. W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), in her discussion of anti-Christian terminology, 67.

110. L. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters* (Frankfurt am Main, 1920; reprinted Hildesheim, 1967), vol. 1, lists expressions in liturgical poems referring to Christians, and in a separate section those that are meant to be

defamatory—these also include the mention of idolatry; see also D. Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus* (Philadelphia, 1979), 331.

111. *Targum Rishon of Esther* 5:14, trans. B. Grossfeld, *The Two Targums of Esther* (Collegeville, 1991), 67, 68; *Targum Sheni of Esther* 5:14, 165, 66.

112. *Midrash Abba Gurion* on Esther 5:15, in Buber, *Sammlung*, 36, 37.

113. *Midrasch Panim Aherim* (B) 5:154, 155, in Buber, *Sammlung*, 71, 72.

114. *Midrasch Panim Aherim* (B) 5:154, 155, in Buber, *Sammlung*, 71, 72; the same idea recurs similarly as comment to Esther 5:14.

115. Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction*, 348.

116. Börner-Klein and Hollender, *Midraschim zu Ester*, 23.

117. Ibid., 83.

118. *Midrash Leqah tov*, Esther 5:14, in Buber, *Sammlung*, 105; on the author, see Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction*, 389; and Börner-Klein and Hollender, *Midraschim zu Ester*, 351.

119. On authorship, provenance, and date, see Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction*, 383–85; Börner-Klein and Hollender, *Midraschim zu Ester*, 425. On the literary character of the text as an anthology, see Y. Elbaum, "*Yalqut Shim'oni* and the Medieval Midrashic Anthology," *Prooftexts* 17, no. 2 (1997), 133–52.

120. *Yalqut Shim'oni* (Jerusalem, 1967), no. 1053; for a critical German version, see Börner-Klein and Hollender, *Midraschim zu Ester*, 453.

121. Ibid., no. 1054.

122. Ibid., no. 1056.

123. Ibid.

124. Ibid., no. 1058.

125. Ibid.

126. D. Biale, "Counter-History and Jewish Polemics Against Christianity: The *Sefer toldot yeshu* and the *Sefer Zerubavel*," *Jewish Social Studies* 6, no. 1 (1999), 135.

127. *Esther Rabbah* 9:2; see Biale, "Counter-History," 135.

128. *Nitsahon Hayashan*, 226, in Berger, *Jewish-Christian Debate*, 216.

129. *Nitsahon Hayashan*, 220, in Berger, *Jewish-Christian Debate*, 214.

130. I. Marcus, "Jews and Christians Imagining the Other in Medieval Europe," *Prooftexts* 15, no. 3 (1995), 209–11.

131. An early example for this approach is H. Soloveitchik, "Three Themes from the *Sefer Hasidim*," *Association of Jewish Studies Review* 1 (1976), 315–17; more recent works include D. Malkiel, "Infanticide in Passover Iconography," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 56 (1993), 85–99; I. Marcus, *Rituals of Childhood: Jewish Acculturation in the Middle Ages* (New Haven, 1996); I. Marcus, "The Dynamics of Jewish Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century," in Signer and Van Engen, *Jews and Christians*, 27–45.

132. Yuval, *Two Nations*, discusses a whole range of such adaptations. In a similar sense Yuval also suggested that Christian accusations of ritual murder came in part as a reaction to the phenomenon of Jewish martyrdom during the First Crusade; on the other hand, Jewish martyrdom may have developed before the background of the cultural milieu of Christian Crusader ideology, and the willingness to sacrifice one's life for the sake of Christianity; see I. Marcus, "From 'Deus vult' to the 'Wish of God': Extreme Religious Ideologies and Historic Reality in 1096 and in the Movement of Ashkenazic Pietism," in Assis, *Jews Facing the Cross*, 92–100; see also Cohen, "1096 Complex," 21.

133. Jerome, *Commentarioli in Ps.* 21:2, CCSL 72:198.

134. W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* (New Haven, 1959; reprinted 1987), 1:298–326; see also Yuval, *Two Nations*, 52.

135. For details see Ch. T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994), 70–75; on Crusade preaching, see also P. J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991); and, more recently, Ch. T. Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross*, (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

136. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades*, 80, with references to sources.

137. Ibid., 96–97.

138. This was pointed out by Mentgen, "Ritualmordfabel," in the context of the Würzburg case in 1146. On the Würzburg ritual-murder accusation, see Yuval, "Vengeance and Damnation," 80–81; see also Yuval, *Two Nations*, 182.

139. R. B. Dobson, *The Jews of Medieval York and the Massacre of March 1190* (New York, 1974), 18–28.

140. G. Mentgen, " Kreuzzugsmenthalität bei antijüdischen Aktionen nach 1190," in *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge*, ed. A. Haverkamp (Sigmaringen, 1999), 284–327.

141. F. Graus, *Pest, Geißler, Judenmorde. Das 14. Jahrhundert als Krisenzeit* (Göttingen, 1987), 280.

142. I. J. Yuval, "Juden, Hussiten und Deutsche nach einer hebräischen Chronik," in *Juden in der christlichen Umwelt während des späten Mittelalters*, ed. A. Haverkamp and F.-J. Ziwes (Berlin, 1992), 59–93.

143. For English translations of the chronicles, see *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades*, ed. and trans. Sh. Eidelberg (Madison, 1977); see also Chazan, *First Crusade*, 223–98.

144. *Sefer Hazekhira*, in Eidelberg, *Hebrew Chronicles*, 121. For a recent analysis of twelfth-century Crusade preaching and anti-Jewish violence, see R. Hiestand, "Juden und Christen in der Kreuzzugspropaganda und bei den Kreuzzugspredigern," in Haverkamp, *Kreuzzüge*, 153–208.

145. Ch. Cluse, "Stories of Breaking and Taking the Cross: A Possible Context for the Oxford Incident of 1268," *Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique* 90, nos. 3–4 (1995), 431, 434; see also Cole, *Preaching of the Crusades*, 140.

146. A selection of model sermons was published recently by Maier, *Model Sermons*; for Gilbert of Tournai's reference to Jesse, see 179–81.

147. Johnson, "Chartres," 19–20.

148. Maier, *Crusade Propaganda*, 77.

149. Horowitz, "Cross," 120–21.

Index

'Abbas II, the Great (shah of Iran), 13–14, 141–8
Abela, 28
Abigail, 103, 125, 126
Abingdon Abbey, chimney, 27
Abraham, 36, 58
Absalom, son of David, 13–14, 28–9, 64, 124–5, 126; house of, 36
Achan, house of, 29
Ackerman, Susan, 107–8
Acre, fall of, 130
Adams, Frederick, 174, 175
Adonijah, son of David, 124–5, 126
Adorno, Theodor, 66
Aelfric (archbishop of Canterbury), 165, 167
Aethelgar (archbishop of Canterbury), 165
Aethelred (king of England), 167
Agag, death of, 75, 76
Agobard of Lyon, 192
Aja'ib al-Makhluqat (Qazwini), 146
Akbar (emperor), 145
Al-Hakim (caliph of Cairo), 192
Albertus Magnus, 200
Albigensians, 77
Aldobrandini, Cinthio (cardinal), 144
Alexander the Great, 82, 86
Ali Beg, Husayn, 143, 144
Alter, Robert, 66
Amalekites, 75, 191
Ammonites, 53, 75
Andrew of St. Victor, 63
Anno II (archbishop of Cologne), 168
anti-Semitism. *see* Jews
Apocalypse, 19, 56, 83
architecture, 6, 41–2, *see also* chimneys
Arenberg, Dukes of, 165, 173–4
Arenberg Gospels (Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms. M.869), 165–77
Ark of the Covenant, 29, 30, 32, 129
Armenians, 143, 145, 146–7
Armleder massacres, 193
armor, 6, 113–14
Arnold I (archbishop of Cologne), 169
Arras, 115, 116
Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale Ms. 657, 116
Arras, cathedral, 113
Arras, Psalter-Hours of, *see* Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms. M.730
Artemo (Pescaro), 194
Artois, 6, 7, 113, 116
Asad Beg, 147, 148
Ashdod, 28, 34
Augsburg, monastery, 193
Augustine (saint), 56, 192
Augustinian Order, 14, 143, 145, 162, 164
Austria, "S" ms., 7, 151–8
authority, images of, 81–7
Avis du Roys, 82
Avril, François, 112, 113, 115

Baldwin II (emperor), 57
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 3, 174
Barcelona, religious debate, 193
Barnard College, 9
Bathsheba, 32–3, 64, 84, 103, 109, 125, 128; house of, 36–7
battle scenes, 41, 53–4, 75, 113–14, 128
Bäuml, F., 81–2
Bayeaux Tapestry, 31
Beatus of Liébana, 19
Becket, Thomas (saint), 161
Bede (Venerable), 64
Beinecke Library, Ms. 229, 35
Beissel, Stephan, 174
ben Eliezer, Tuvia, 198
Ben-Sasson, Heim, 193
Benedictine Order, 122
Bennett, Adelaide, 6, 7, 114
Berenson, Mary, 16, 21
Berger, S., 101–2
Beringer, Alison, 6, 7
Bernard of Clairvaux (saint), 161, 189, 192, 202
Berry, Duke of, 36
Berthold, Abbot of Weingarten, 21
Berthold of Regensburg, 193, 194, 201
Bestiary, 85–6
Beuckers, Klaus, 167, 168
Biale, David, 199
Bible historiale, 31, 36, 109–10; of Charles V, 36–7; depictions of women, 100–10
Bible passages
  2 Esdras 9-10, 103
  Genesis, 51, 124
  Genesis 11, 103
  Genesis 21, 103
  Genesis 4:23-24, 158
  Genesis 16-18, 103
  Genesis 25-27, 103
  Genesis 29-30, 103
  Lev. 1:1, 196
  Deut. 25:17-19, 196
  Judges 13, 103, 106
  Judges 19: 1-20-25, 52–3
  Judges 4:17-22, 107
  Judges 16:4-22, 107
  Ruth, 74, 103, 105–6
  1 Sam. 16:19, 33
  1 Sam. 11:1-27, 53
  1 Sam. 17:45-47, 61
  2 Sam., 51
  2 Sam. 6, 30
  2 Sam. 12, 33
  2 Sam. 13:1-18:33, 64
  2 Sam. 19:5-7, 64
  1 Kings, 103
  1 Kings 9:2, 77
  1 Kings 10:6, 74
  1 Kings 15:32, 75
  1 Kings 16:10, 124
  1 Kings 24:11, 77
  1 Kings 15:2-3, 13-26, 75
  1 Kings 15-31, 76
  2 Kings, 51, 74, 78, 85, 103
  2 Kings 2:4, 128
  2 Kings 3:1, 128
  2 Kings 4, 35, 103

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

262 Hanging of Haman and his sons. Worms Mahzor, Jerusalem, Jewish National and University Library, MS 4^{0}781/1, f. 57r, Franconia (Würzburg?), 1272

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

263. Tree of Jesse Antiphonary, Worclaw, University Library, Ms. I. F 401, f. 200v, Silesia (?), late thirteenth century

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

264 Hanging of Haman and his sons. Dresden-Wroclav Mahzor, Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Ms A 46a, f. 82, southern Germany, before 1293

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

265 Tree of Life Gradual of Gisela of Kerssenbruck, Osnabrück, Bistum, Diözesanarchiv, Ms 101, f 28, Westphalia, c. 1300

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

266 Hanging of Haman and his sons Leipzig Mahzor, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. V 1022, vol. 1, f. 51v, southern Germany, c. 1310

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

267 Hanging of Haman and his sons Hammelburg Mahzor, Darmstadt, Hessische Landes-und Hochschulbibliothek, cod Or. 13, f. 53v, Hammelburg, 1348

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

268. Crucifixion. Missal, München-Gladbach, Library of the Münster, Ms. 1, f. 2r, Germany, twelfth century

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

269 Tree of Jesse Chartres, stained glass window, c 1145

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

270. Tree of Jesse. Speculum Humanae Salvationis, Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek, no. 243, f. 55r, southern Germany, early fourteenth century

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

271. Tree of Jesse. Page from a Missal, Hannover, Kestner Museum, no. 3985, single page, Germany, thirteenth century

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

272. Crucifixion with synagoga and ecclesia. Schernberg Psalter, Karlsruhe, Landesbibliothek, St. Peter, perg. 139, f. 8G, Strasbourg, early thirteenth century

Aus rechtlichen Gründen steht diese Abbildung nicht im Open Access zur Verfügung

273. Lambert Liber Floridus. Ghent, Bibliothèque de l'Université, Codex 1125, fols. 231v 232r, Saint Omer, before 1120